The following notes summarize feedback received during the Master Plan Forum held on campus, the Leadership Interviews that were conducted, and the results of the survey. At the Forum, 28 boards were displayed throughout the room, inviting participation and discussion on various topics. Each group of boards was attended by one of the design team members to engage attendees, facilitate discussion, and record observations. Additionally, two design team members were roving throughout the area, sparking conversation and engaging with the public. The notes are organized by subject per the board titles/sections around the room. The Leadership Interviews were conducted in person and over the phone, and the take-aways have been summarized by topics. The surveys were conducted electronically and e-mailed out to 40,000 addresses. The results are summarized in broad themes.

---

**FORUM – 3 May 2018**

**Present**

- John Gibbs
- Poonam Narkar
- Atisha Varshney
- Ryan Wofford
- Ishwar Dhungana
- Lauren Mattern
- Stacey White
- Brad Leathley
- Kim Swanson

**Representing**

- WRT
- WRT
- WRT
- Affiliated Engineers
- KPFF
- Nelson\Nygaard
- Mode Associates
- Flad Architects

**Make your Mark on Campus...Ideas Wanted (AV)**

(big interactive boards)

1. Least Favorite Spot: McCarthy Hall was clearly highlighted as the most uninhabitable and unliked building on campus by faculty, staff and students. There were very clear concerns about the outdated MEP system, bathrooms and other basic building conditions.
2. Favorite Spots: Arboretum was the most liked spot on campus by faculty, staff and students.
3. Enhance the Quad: The quad is the geographical and historic heart of the campus, but is in poor condition and does not adequately serve desired programs (gatherings, events, hang-out).
4. Improve Access to and within Campus:
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- Many students live across Hwy 57 and expressed need for a pedestrian connection (underpass or ped/bike bridge) between the two exit ramps.
- A ped/bike connection down to campus from the Loma Linda overpass was specifically desired.
- Clear bike paths, skate board paths and pedestrian paths all over the campus.
- Circulation and access to the Nutwood parking garage is dangerous for drivers and pedestrians alike.
- The pedestrian traffic across Nutwood is very high. Students jaywalk and have caused accidents. Improved crossings and safety are desired.
- Better pedestrian access across State College Blvd was clearly expressed, especially to the new ACS building.
- The campus should be better connected to downtown Fullerton, regional transit, etc.

5. Strategies to an Improved Campus:
   - The Visual and Performing Arts College building are old and need major rehabilitation or new buildings, especially the studio building.
   - Open space within the Engineering block is underutilized, the physical design does not support study areas or congregation.
   - Replace some of the older low story buildings with new multi-story buildings to add the programmable square footage of the campus. Underutilized space was specifically called out at the engineering block and facilities offices.

6. Improve the Campus Identity: The perimeter and campus core lack legibility, hierarchy of spaces, clear wayfinding and places making. No buildings or landscape features are seen as iconic.

Campus Environment (AV)

1. Create a 24x7 Campus: The idea of 24x7 campus was strongly presented by both student and faculty seeking more amenities to support current lifestyle (they are already on campus at night) and to increase the feeling of vitality on campus.

2. Need to Overcome a Car Centered Environment: The dominant presence of cars and has impacted the pedestrian environment on the campus by creating numerous points of conflict and acres of parking lots. Interestingly garages seem to serve as socials hot spots as students congregate there.

3. Lack of Outdoor Spaces for Students: Students need more indoor and outdoor social and study spaces, equipped with appropriate furniture, power outlets, and WI-FI. The current student life activities are concentrated indoors at the TSU and library. It was suggested to spread out student life programs to other areas and provide WI-FI hotspot and power outlets in outdoor spaces with suitable site furnishings.
Facilities (KS)

........

Building Age – Is a building’s age an obstruction to the integration of the internal & external communities? Is there outdated architecture or are there outdated trends?

1. Many buildings have been perceived to be well past their sell-by date. Issues range from having out-of-date bathrooms, flooding issues, ADA accessibility challenges

2. Buildings specifically identified as out-moded and in need or work/love/replacement include:
   a. McCarthy Hall ("MH takes away my fervor to learn b/c of the architecture")
   b. EC Building
   c. Humanities Building
   d. Computer Science Building
   e. Green House
g. Visitor Information Center (needs to be more visible)

h. HSS

i. T-Buildings

Building Condition – Does the building’s condition affect the user’s experience? Does it demote the students’ success and program growth?

1. The poor condition of many of the buildings was viewed as very depressing, old, gross, disruptive, unwelcoming, scary, and bad for recruiting.

2. It was noted that many buildings are not in code compliance.

3. Outdated technology was mentioned as a barrier for student success in the old buildings.

4. It was noted that acoustical issues with noise transferring between hallways and classrooms is challenging concentration.

5. McCarthy is again singled out with most of the comments, including noting the poor condition of the bathrooms and elevators.

6. Other buildings mentioned as in poor condition include:
   a. HSS
   b. EC
   c. ECS
   d. Alumni House
   e. CTVA Building
   f. CPAC
   g. Visual Arts (updated spaces/technology for visual learners)

7. “A gallon of paint is not enough”

Building Utilization – Does a building’s over-utilization affect the user’s learning environment? Does it affect the instructor’s? Does it jeopardize the student’s success?

1. Several commented that the commuter student is underserved and suggested a commuter student center for a sense of belonging and a place to have lunch and store some of their belongings while on campus.

2. Crammed staff offices were noted as a problem trying to serve a growing student population.

3. A need for more lunch/break areas for staff was noted.

4. Needs for flexible, modern spaces and large lecture rooms is identified.

5. One participant noted that the PLS Library access is great.

6. It was noted that there needs to be a separate dedicated IT building.
Planning Context & Academic Programs (SW)

1. There is a general lack of awareness the size and distribution of enrollment across the colleges. The perception is generally that Business is the largest school, which is NOT the case.
2. Lack of informal gathering space outside and in the academic buildings is problematic. The Business Building is beloved because it is one of the few buildings that has seating AND coffee.
3. Faculty commute times are a barrier to recruiting AND retention. Because they are so extreme (commutes to Riverside, Thousand Oaks, etc.), faculty are less likely to engage across disciplines due to lack of time.
4. There is an abundance of underutilized outdoor space.
5. Parking issues are exacerbated by the fact that the students don’t have on-campus home (ie. No place to store their stuff). They drive so that they can keep stuff in their car!

Sustainable Campus (RW)

1. Based on input from students/faculty/staff on the “How will you help CSUF achieve its sustainability goals” question, the main sustainability practices that people are passionate about seem to be reducing and recycling physical waste as well as waste segregation.
2. One comment was made on the board requesting financial support for academic research in sustainability.
3. Better education for students/faculty/staff on sustainability and was requested a few times.
4. The director of the Desert Studies Center stopped by the event and mentioned that the energy usage of their remote campus should be analyzed as well.
5. Engage campus engineering and facilities groups throughout all processes.
6. Consensus among many people to continue strong push with sustainable building/campus practices.

Infrastructure (ID)

1. Participants were able to confirm several of the flooding locations that we had identified on our stormwater utility board and provide additional locations that they had experienced flooding or ponding. Specifically, they identified flooding at the University Police Building and on both north and south sides of Dan Black Hall.
2. Additionally, participants were able to confirm the presence of a stormwater BMP north of the Student Housing.
3. There was limited discussion regarding the other site utilities such as sewer, storm drain, water, etc. Additional meetings with Facilities Trades will be scheduled for additional information.

**Getting Around (LM)**

The following notes summarize feedback received at the “Getting Around” outreach station during the Master Plan Open House Forum. Feedback given was in response to boards requesting feedback on transportation vision, a “Transportation Preferences” exercise, and feedback received via a map exercise, each of which is described in further detail below.

**Transportation Vision**

Idea posted included:

1. Cost-effective, direct multimodal connections, including transit to Metrolink/Fullerton Transportation Center
2. Create better space for students (flexible work)
3. Campus circulator
4. Use parking structures to be more space efficient and maintain enough parking to meet diverse commute needs
5. Incentivize sustainable travel
6. Lot-specific parking permits to make parking easier
7. Affordable housing on and near campus to reduce the need to drive
8. Better amenities on campus
9. Better communication and promotion of non-driving modes
10. Direct enrollment to regional students
11. Better support for people with disabilities

More detailed comments included:

1. People are passionate about improvements that reduce the need to drive to campus. This comes through in a number of ways:
   - More food options
   - Affordable student housing options on and around campus
   - Connections to campus from the Fullerton Transportation Center/Metrolink
   - Campus circulator
   - Incentives for and overall awareness of sustainable transportation
2. A few comments were centered around using space more efficiently and creating flexible space for study and work
3. Comments around parking discussed the importance of making parking easier and also acknowledged parking may generate revenue and to be mindful of the balance when removing parking.

Transportation Preferences
1. When asked about parking price and proximity to destinations, the majority of participants were neutral, though more people preferred to pay less and park farther.
2. Almost all participants want the center of campus to be more walkable and active and are ok with not having parking at the core.
3. Though few participants stated a neutral response rate to variable parking rates, there was a fairly even split between those who want consistent pricing throughout campus and those who are ok with pricing varying by convenience.
4. Almost all participants want amenities on campus to increase affordability and make a more walkable environment over dedicated campus parking areas.
5. The majority of participants are in favor of reallocating campus streets for active transportation modes rather than cars, though some participants were neutral or in favor of keeping vehicle access through campus.

Mapping Exercise
A mapping exercise asked participants to note where it is easy to get around, where it is difficult to get around, and where they enter campus. The exercise also allowed general geographic comments, and received many types of overall comments.
Results included
1. Traffic and parking ingress/egress back-ups at key locations on Nutwood Avenue, State College Boulevard, and Yorba Linda Boulevard. The majority of the “where it is difficult” dots were placed where major roads and major parking facilities interact.
2. Requests for improved bicycle infrastructure to the east and west of campus, and specifically connecting to downtown Fullerton. Respondents found the east side of campus, near the freeway, easiest to navigate via bicycle.
3. Similar to other boards, support and various ideas to improve transit connections to downtown Fullerton.
4. Frustration with too many electric carts on campus.
5. Notes that parking has gotten better (presumably due to remote parking arrangements), but also notes on the parking challenges experienced.
6. A desire for improved wayfinding, as well as recognition that campus pathways and building arrangements could be more intuitive to navigate.
7. A request for on-campus shuttle service to connect to peripheral on-campus parking lots.
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Living + Learning Spaces (KS)

1. In support of student life on campus and regarding desired features of campus open space, many contributors commented on the need and desire to incorporate the landscape and physical campus environment into the curriculum and coursework that is happening on campus. This was strongly conveyed by faculty from the geology and general ed departments. Examples given included providing a rock selection and specification to be woven into the campus landscape that relates to the geographic region of California or of the US (apparently there currently is a limit to what the campus is allowed to use based on an existing rock specification). Landscape planting is another example identified that could reflect the needs of coursework occurring in classes. A preference was expressed to be able to take students outside and study plants ON campus rather than plan for a field trip off-campus (currently often done).

2. It was shared that tying the grounds with the curriculum could also support interdisciplinary interaction, with different departments and groups interacting with the same site features (i.e. dancing on rocks, identifying features across campuses, making associations with a site feature and the building/department it is adjacent to, making associations with site features as education progresses – when I was I freshman we studied this!, - etc.)

3. Additionally, we heard a desire for the landscape to be reflective of current teachable-moment conditions, such as climate change or drought.

4. One faculty member proposed utilizing the campus landscape as a differentiator within the CSU system (and beyond) similar to the University of Worcester and their GeoGarden app, which identifies rocks on campus and provides geological history and technical facts about them, based on the app-user selections from a 3-d map.

5. A number of visitors to these posters expressed a strong interest in integrating the arboretum into the curriculum, in providing a more friendly and direct internal access for students, and to removing the perceived barrier between the arboretum and the campus.

6. A couple of staff members conveyed their interest in seeing the campus become more appealing to walk across and to walk to from the surrounding neighborhood. It was conveyed that some seasoned staff and students have no cognitive idea where they are on campus or where other buildings or departments are – they only know their buildings or departments. They suspected that having more interest in the outdoor campus environment would get people out of their buildings or departments to go places other than their car.

7. The idea of transparency at the ground floor of buildings was expressed, providing a window into activities going on in any given building, to make a connection to education and learning, and to maintain a connection to the outdoors from within. A desire was expressed for having appealing spaces immediately adjacent to the building entrances, inside and outside, for students to hang out, wait for friends, wait for class to start, study or review, etc. (this was also expressed regarding the entrances to classrooms and the spaces in hallways).
8. An interest in more green space and more shade to create cheerful, welcoming, intimate and comfortable outdoor environments was conveyed.

9. Club spaces, learning spaces specifically for graduate students, group spaces, quiet spaces, studio space for theater majors, and space for commuters were all articulated in order to make the campus more supportive of informal learning and to support academic growth. TSU was identified as a model for many of these types of spaces being successfully incorporated. It was also noted that the active learning spaces provided in McCarthy have made a difference.

10. Also, to support informal learning, there is an interest in any site art reflecting STEM students and topics.

11. It was suggested that an inter-professional learning center to provide opportunities for innovation in healthcare would be welcome and would touch many majors on campus.


------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

INTERVIEWS – Conducted between April 16th and April 27th 2018

Conducted by
Brad Leathley

Representing
Flad Architects

Interviewees
Dr. Emily Bonney, Interim Dean of Library
Dr. Sheryl Fontaine
Dr. Marie Johnson
Dr. Laurie Rodases
Dr. Susan Barua
Greg Saks
Fram Virjee
Amir Dabirian
David Forgues
Dr. Edward Fink

Representing
CSU Fullerton – Interim Dean of Library
CSU Fullerton – Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences
CSU Fullerton – Dean of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
CSU Fullerton – Dean of Health and Human Development
CSU Fullerton – Dean, College of Engineering and Computer Science
CSU Fullerton – VP University Advancement
CSU Fullerton – University President
CSU Fullerton – VP Information Technology
CSU Fullerton – VP Human Resources, Diversity & Inclusion
CSU Fullerton – Dean, College of Communications
Flad Architects

650 California Street/17th Floor  San Francisco, CA 94108  P 415 398-1600  www.flad.com

Meeting Notes
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Meeting Date

Dr. Lisa Kirtman  CSU Fullerton – Dean, College of Education
Dale Merrill  CSU Fullerton – Dean, College of The Arts
Dr. Morteza Rahmatian  CSU Fullerton – Interim Dean, College of Business
Dr. Kari Knutson Miller  CSU Fullerton – Provost/VP Academic Affairs

Living and Learning Spaces

Having spaces for informal learning:

Desire for hang-out space for students and faculty all over campus. (“All you need is shade, power & data, and coffee”). Prioritize both outdoor and indoor space dedicated to various types of gathering for opportunities to study, hang out, etc.

Characterizations of open space:

Desire take advantage of California’s climate while also breaking down broad open spaces to create smaller, more intimate outdoor spaces (more like Chico State). Prioritize guidelines that support smaller outdoor spaces that are wired and the choice of shade trees and building shade elements

Relation of Activities in a building to external perception/understanding; Transparency:

Desire for appealing in-between spaces: spaces between threshold to classrooms and circulation, spaces immediately inside and outside building entrances and understanding these from campus. Explore changes to ground floors of buildings and hallways and classroom configuration to support visual transparency into activates within buildings and vice-versa.

The importance of the Ground Plane:

Transparency is pretty minimal and so, so is the community hard to sense. Especially in a climate like Orange County, there are opportunities to blur the boundaries between inside and out for all kinds of reasons: academic, social, physical, cultural expressions included.

- An essential element of this master plan is to break down the artificial barriers that hide the community members from each other.

Identity:

Colleges struggle to create an identity that explains their ambitions within their own realm and the fit between themselves and the rest of the university. There are many aspects to this that come into play, not the least of which would be implementing some sort of consistent “beginning” to each college’s facilities. President Fram Virgee put it in terms of establishing a “front porch” for every college.

- An essential element of this master plan should be establishing the stories that drive the colleges and a way for them to be manifested in physical terms.

Pushing the Boundary of Definition:
Nearly every Dean saw there to be benefit if they could drive exceptional scholarship through multidisciplinary collaborations and innovation through use of a student focused “Innovation Hub” kind of idea. This would be a building that would “belong” to the Provost as opposed to a building governed by any one college, a kind of special projects /simulation/ immersive/ making place that would be used by all colleges. This would enable students and faculty to drive their ideas further in a way that would be more space efficient for the university as a whole. It would be a “Buzz driver”.

- **As essential element of this master plan is to establish a series of means to drive innovation across the campus, perhaps in this innovation hub but also in other ways in many buildings. Such spaces would be valuable in nearly building.**

**Opportunities for collaboration:**

There is a desire to have a space or spaces that invite cross-departmental and inter-departmental exchange. Explore creating guidelines for modifying existing real estate and/or in new construction to create such spaces.

**Campus Environment**

**Diversity:**

There is a desire to galvanize the diversity that is represented on campus. The campus should be looked at as a “crucible of the future of California”. Look at how a physical master plan can provide guidelines to celebrate and support diversity.

**Campus Environment:**

Connection to community. There is a desire to create meaningful connections to capture campus involvement and collaboration and community, i.e. the 30,000 people per year that come for performances on campus – just one department (Arts). Create better physical connections to provide safe traversal to events from off campus, and provisions for evening campus use.

Open campus vs intentional campus:

The discussion about creating meaningful relationships as manifested by adjacencies and collaborations came forward quite often. The feeling is that something like “neighborhoods” would bring benefit, help highlight the ties that bind that could be exercised routinely and episodically in the course of an academic year….Art Week, Jazz Week, Engineering Fair, etc kind of idea wherein everyone heads to that neighborhood to see what is going on.

- **An essential element of this master plan is to make clarity of clusters and ease of navigation better. That means perhaps refashioning open space into more intentional landscape/hardscape that serves to reinforce and direct intentionality.**
Infrastructure & Facilities

Sustainability:

Desire to take advantage of roof real estate (PV’s, Green Roofs, public space). Look at creating criteria for access to roof space and/or (further) allocation for generation of power via PV arrays.

State of Existing buildings:

60’s era and some other buildings cannot support today’s models for teaching and learning, and they do not reflect the value that the CSUF wants to express of its students. (“old buildings send a message that students aren’t worth much more than this”). Make recommendations regarding gutting and re-use or demolition of out-of-date structures and plan for new buildings to replace them.

Pedagogy:

Outmoded buildings face very different approaches to the teaching/learning experience than what was in place 50 years ago. Emphasis is now on active learning as the basis for every college’s approach and yet nearly every building is designed for the sage on the stage. Further, the role of informal learning is the new measure of accelerated student learning and that is hard to do when most buildings are designed with 6’ double loaded corridors and no front door.

• An essential element of this master plan should be the prioritization of renovations based on pragmatics of strategic intent, need and enabling future moves to happen in the least disruptive manner.

SURVEYS – Conducted between May 3rd and May 24th 2018

Survey Groups

Students

CSU Fullerton – 1,888 Responses

Staff

CSU Fullerton – 171 Responses

Faculty

CSU Fullerton – 114 Responses

Enhancing Performance (Campus Environment, Living + Learning Spaces, and Facilities)
Focused attention on creating more gathering spaces, inside and outside, is important to all three groups. Students want informal study space and seem inadequately served by their current two choices: TSU and the library. Faculty prefer this kind of space for meeting colleagues and the same is true for staff. The older buildings were developed in a different time and under different ways of working so eventually the transformation of the social environment will need to ripple across all of CSUF. A huge request is simply for more “quiet”. People want to be by each other but not try to perform in an environment filled with noise and distractions.

Creating Identity and Connection (Campus Environment)
All three groups express their need to have a home that they belong to and come in contact with on a daily basis. People want to feel connected and a part of something special to them. There is a sense of pride and a desire to show off the work and culture.

Different setting for teaching/learning desired – a cultural shift (Living + Learning Spaces)
Students, faculty and staff share in the ideas that will grow CSUF reputation for innovation: Active learning – students working in small groups, project based learning, research-as-teaching and more work with business and industry partners. These are all spaces that are for the most part make shift currently on campus. Along with social learning/informal settings, this direction completes the need for transformation. These practices are not nearly as space efficient as everyone sitting in tablet arm chairs facing forward, so regardless of population growth, space becomes even more precious. That means more use of hours/day and more days/week to meet demand.

Values (Campus Environment, Living + Learning Spaces, Infrastructure, Facilities)
The answers to the Grand Challenges question were pretty aligned between students and faculty. The two that are shared are Sustainability and Socio-economic Equality. Students added Personal Security and faculty added Social Justice. In terms of values affecting campus design, students listed focus on health and wellness, display and celebration of student work and display of art and artifacts.

The Value of Outdoor Space (Campus Environment, Living + Learning Spaces)
Clearly, everyone values the ability to use space outside for all kinds of uses: gathering, studying, eating, displays, fairs, celebrations, art and artifacts. The campus is fairly nondescript in its design and use of open space…it isn’t designed to serve anything particularly well.

The Demands of CSUF (Campus Environment, Living + Learning Spaces, Facilities)
The faculty operate under tremendous loads and need their colleagues around them for support. At the same time, they were initially attracted to CSUF by the opportunity to look over the traditional walls that silo knowledge. How can they think creatively and work collaboratively when their hair is on fire every day? The students want it, so how do they deliver?

Parking and Entry to Campus (Campus Environment, Infrastructure)
Parking is a huge hindrance to working productively. It robs (75% of) people of their time and the undefined edges of campus make building a mental map that they can navigate with difficult at best. There is a concern over personal safety out there in parking land. Faculty want the neighboring community to use the campus to increase their quality of life. Business and industry partners presence on campus is valued by students and faculty.

CAMPUS TOUR (informal) – March 2nd 2018

Present
Atisha Varshney
Laila Dadabhoy

Representing
WRT
CSU Fullerton – ASI President

Campus Environment & Living + Learning Spaces

- Academic Programs
  - Some majors or similar types of majors are spread out on the campus, could be brother closer in proximity. There is 10 mins of break between the classes and the students often get late to walk across the campus to next class.
  - The students at the communications building across Nutwood feel detached from rest of the campus
  - Grad student population is very low on campus limited to computer science and nursing programs.

- Open space
  - Student need more study space - both indoor and outdoor
  - Students need more power plugs and better wifi around the campus.
  - There is a lot of open space but not used by students as there is lack of power plug and wifi outside. Students cannot study outside. The open spaces are designed more like parks and do not meet student life needs.
  - Annual events: 6,000-person concert in the athletic field
  - Small concerts and events are hosted in the OAT by the student union
  - Students use Arboretum for study and recreation activities.
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- Lack of identity for open spaces on the campus. Very few open spaces and campus axis have names, clear hierarchy or design elements that students can relate to.

  - 24X7 campus life: Food, retail and other facilities
    - Lack of facilities open 24x7 throughout the year
    - Library and rec center is open till 10pm on regular days, and 24X7 closer to exams.
    - Most of the student clubs and organization meet on campus after classes on Thursday. The café at Student Union closes at 7pm, makes it difficult for students to stay late on campus or they have to go out to bring in food.
    - Students usually walk across Nutwood Ave for lunch and dinner.
    - The food at dining hall is not usually liked by student due to some humor around cleanliness.
    - Students living on campus do not have late night food options. Vending machines are the only available option.
    - Scattered students’ amenities- amazon locker, ATMs, post office
      The two Starbucks on the campus have the highest sales in the entire city. (need to check this fact)
    - There is lack of healthy, especially vegetarian/vegan food options on campus.
    - Many students pack meals from home. There is generally lack of kitchenettes on the campus with basic microwave, hot water facilities.
    - Need for more employment opportunities on campus
    - There is lack of basic affordable retail on campus for students to buy basic supplies like tooth brushes, Band-Aids, etc. There is small store in the resident hall which is very expensive. The students have to go to Target, which is not very walkable. Student to do not have access to a grocery store/pharmacy kind of retail on campus or nearby, where they can safely walk to.
    - A general social divide between academic students to athletic students.
    - Some areas on campus have informally become designated smoking areas (especially in front of the library building), which creates a social divide.
    - A big population of students live at UCA apartments across Nutwood Avenue and on east of Highway 57

Transportation & Infrastructure

- Parking and Transit:
  - Parking is $269 per semester approx. 3 months, which is not considered expensive, especially compared to conveniences it offers.
Many students prefer living downtown as it has more activity and night life. Driving to campus is their only option. There are no other options- bike or transit to commute between campus and downtown/transit station.

Student do not feel safe biking on city streets as there are no designated bike lanes.

The surrounding streets are not conducive to biking

The campus is small enough, students prefer scooter, skateboards and walking

A big portion of students go across Nutwood both for food and classes. The pedestrian crossing is east, away from the main campus circulation. The traffic signal cycle is very long to support high on/off traffic volumes. It is not pedestrian friendly, forcing many students to J-walk across Nutwood.

The Transit station long Commonwealth is poorly marked and lacks all kinds of amenities - rather a hostile environment to wait for the next bus.

Bike part theft is big issue on campus. Most of the time it is people from outside (non-students), involved in such campus crimes.

There are regular break-ins into parked cars.

Below are the comments shared by ASI President in an e-mail to AV:

- **What are the current major challenges to student success?**
  - Limited academic resources (computers on campus or for rent), limited study space, limited class space

- **Where is there greatest demand for enrollment growth?**
  - Current impacted majors at CSUF: ALL
  - Most: FTF- BS/MS Computer Engineering & Nursing

- **What are key limitations on growth?**
  - Land, Money

- **Who most needs to have a voice in this process?**
  - Students, Advisors, all PAB reps

- **What do you consider as shortcomings of campus' buildings and infrastructure in relation to student success?**
  - Ventilation (NSM, ECS), drainage (DB), need more visibility for success centers (i.e. centralized location for all DIRC), lack of clarity in book organization in the library, KHS and MH so far apart but so similar, Comm too far considering the size, lack of study space within buildings
The foregoing represents our best understanding of the discussions held and decisions reached at these meetings. Please advise the writer of any errors or omissions of substance.

Prepared by: Kim Swanson