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A. INVITATION

The Coast Community College District is seeking a qualified California Registered Architect consultant to lead a professional team in the review and assessment of buildings, structures, and site conditions (i.e. landscaping) at Orange Coast College which may have significance as a historical resource.

The District is seeking a multidisciplinary team approach that may include the services of historians, architectural historians, urban planners, landscape architects, architects, structural engineers, mechanical engineers, electrical engineers, hazardous waste specialists, materials scientists, building code consultants, and other specialists. The resultant product will be a comprehensive Potential Historic Structures Assessment Report that will serve as one of the mitigation measures required by the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responses must conform to the requirements of this Request for Proposal (RFP). The District reserves the right to waive any irregularity in any proposal or reject any proposal which does not comply with this RFP.

There will be a mandatory walk-thru on Wednesday, September 18, 2014 from 2 to 4 PM starting at the Orange Coast College, Building 172, Construction Management office (a map is included as Attachment F). Parking passes will be provided.

All proposals shall be submitted to the District no later than 4:00 p.m. on October 2, 2014. Interviews if necessary are expected to be scheduled October 9, 2014.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that all State and local agencies consider the environmental considerations of projects over which they have discretionary authority. The EIR is intended to provide decision-makers and the public with information concerning the environmental effects of the proposed projects, possible ways to reduce or avoid the possible environmental damage, and identify alternatives to the projects. The EIR must also disclose significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided; growth inducing impacts; effects found not to be significant; as well as significant cumulative impacts of all past, present and reasonably anticipated future projects.

The District has prepared an EIR for its proposed Vision 2020 Master Plan and the document is currently being circulated for public comment. Identified in the EIR are potential historic resources whose demolition, reconfiguration, and/or redesign may affect building integrity and/or pose an impact to potential historic resources. For your review the proposed mitigation measures and Historic Resources Technical Report are included as Attachments D and E, respectively.
The Scope of Work contemplated in this Request for Proposal (“Project”) will review and assess Orange Coast College’s (OCC) existing 50 year or older district, buildings, structures, and site (i.e. landscaping) that may have significance as a resource. Specific tasks are outlined in Attachment A, and will generally include:

1) Evaluation of buildings and structures for compliance with California Division of State Architect (DSA) Codes, and Title 24 Building Codes for Fire, Life, Safety.
2) Incorporation into the evaluation, both DSA and Community College Facilities Coalition (CCFC) Facilities Evaluation Reports for structural, HVAC, roofing, and abatement.
3) Evaluation and review of District hazardous building materials, and mold reports.
4) Assess the continuing use and potential for reuse of the buildings and structures.
5) Retention, restoration, reconfiguration, redesign, abatement, and/or demolition of the buildings and structures and the associated costs with each option.
6) Reevaluation of the 7 aspects of integrity of the buildings, structures, district and site: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association with respect to incorporation and implementation of the findings of tasks 1 thru 5 above.

In November 2012, the voters of the Coast Community College District passed a $698M General Obligation Bond initiative (Measure M) which will fund the capital improvement projects outlined in the District’s “Vision 2020” Master Plan. As a result, the District expects to conduct significant construction/development projects at the OCC campus over the next 15 years. The RFQ seeks to select a consultant to analyze and prepare all necessary reports to lead the District through the review and assessment of its potential historic structures in support of the CEQA process in preparation for our upcoming capital improvement program.

C. PROJECT SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP’s Due</td>
<td>October 2, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalist Interview(s)</td>
<td>October 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Recommendation to Board</td>
<td>October 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Approval</td>
<td>November 19, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. SCOPE OF SERVICES:

Detailed Scope of Services set forth in Attachment A.

E. MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS
1. Previously completed two (2) Historic Structures Reports;

2. Acceptance of the terms and conditions defined in the Professional Services Agreement. (Attachment D)

F. PROPOSAL CONTENT

Proposals must contain sufficient detail to enable the District Selection Committee to determine the merits of the firm. Proposals shall clearly demonstrate satisfaction of the minimum qualifications above, and should address all elements requested below, and **not exceed 30 pages.** (Excluding Transmittal letter, cover pages, tabs/dividers, and District required forms.)

1. **Transmittal Letter:** The proposal shall be transmitted with a cover letter describing the firm’s/team’s interest and commitment to the proposed project. The letter shall state that the proposal shall be valid for a 90-day period and that staff proposed are available to begin work on this contract. The person authorized by the firm/team to enter into a contract with Coast Community College District shall sign the cover letter and the letter should identify the individual to whom correspondence and other contacts should be directed during the consultant selection process.

2. **Company Information:** The proposal shall include the legal name, description of the organization, names of principals, number of employees, firm’s longevity, client base, areas of specialization, and any other pertinent information to assist evaluators to understand the overall capability, stability, and resources of the organization.

3. **Expertise:** In a narrative format, the proposal should illustrate the firm’s understanding of this project and an indication of any strengths or unique expertise the firm would bring to the project.

4. **Proposed Project Team:** Names, qualifications, education and experience (biographies and/or resume) of the proposed project team and an indication of their proposed roles.

5. **Project Management Plan:** Discuss methods to be employed in managing this project and how these will ensure success of the project.

6. **References:** Five references for which Consultant has performed historic structure assessments and/or services. Include the organization name, address, the contact person’s name and telephone number, the nature of the project, and a brief narrative describing the scope, complexity, and outcomes of the project.
Identify specifically the two references which satisfy minimum qualifications item #1.

7. Disclosure: A complete disclosure of any prior or ongoing incidents involving proposer. Identify the parties and circumstances involved.

8. Proposed Cost: Respondents shall state their **total proposed fees and a table of reimbursable expenses**. Any optional work or tasks that are not included in your cost proposal must be clearly identified as such.

Respondents shall also include a fee schedule identifying all personnel that may be, directly and indirectly, assigned to the project as well as proposed hourly rates. These should be quoted as fully-burdened (e.g., direct labor + overhead + profit) hourly rates.

9. Local Business Participation – Describe the respondents plan for inclusion of local businesses in the services to be provided for the District. The District is interested in assisting local businesses and as such would like to see how its consultants and vendors plan to utilize local entities of any type who could benefit from association with the work contracted.


11. Signatures: The signature(s) of the company officer(s) empowered to bind the firm, with the title of each (e.g., president, general partner).

**F. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

Proposals will be evaluated by a selection committee on a variety of criteria. The District will award a contract to the firm with the **most advantageous** proposal based on an evaluation of qualifications and price. This means the lowest cost proposal may not be selected. The District may, at its sole discretion, award to a firm based on their proposal and interview it alone without further consideration; or, the District may interview other top firms. **INCOMPLETE PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED.**

Evaluation Criteria (100 points total)

- Consultant’s approach to this project and management plan (25 pts)
- Experience and qualifications of the team assigned to the project (20 pts)
- Cost/Rates (20 pts)
- References (20 pts)
- Local business participation (5 pts)
Consultant’s overall capability, stability, resources (10 pts)

G. **SELECTION PROCESS**

The Selection Committee will make its recommendation to the Chancellor of Coast Community College District. It is anticipated that a finalist will be recommended by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees on October 31, 2014 for subsequent Board action on November 19, 2014.

H. **CONTRACT AWARD**

The District reserves the right to contract with any entity responding to this RFP. The awarding of a contract is at the sole discretion of the District. The District may select a firm or firms based on the highest rated proposal and an interview without further discussion or interviews with other firms.

The firm selected will be expected to enter into a Professional Services Agreement with the District within ten (10) calendar days from approval by the Board of Trustees. The District shall not be bound, or in any way obligated, until both parties have executed a contract. No party may incur any chargeable costs prior to the execution of the final contract. The firm selected, nor any of their officers, principals or affiliates will be eligible to bid on, or contract with the District with respect to any of the prime construction contracts.

I. **REJECTION AND WAIVERS OF PROPOSALS**

This Request for Proposal does not commit the District to award a contract or to pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a proposal in response to this Request.

The District reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals received; to negotiate with qualified proposer(s) or cancel the Request; and, to waive any minor irregularities and informalities in the proposal or proposal process.

The District reserves the right to evaluate proposals for a period of sixty (60) days before deciding which proposal, if any, to accept.

J. **NON-COLLUSION**

By submittal and signing the enclosed Non-Collusion Affidavit (Attachment B), the proposer is certifying that the proposal document is genuine and not a sham or collusive, and not made in the interest of any person not named and that the Consultant has not induced or solicited others to submit a sham offer, or to refrain from proposing.

K. **COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND REGULATIONS**
The Consultant shall comply with federal, state and local laws, regulations, and Industry standards. The proposer shall also comply with the Drug Free Workplace Act requirements of California Government Code Sec. 8350 et seq. (Attachment C)

L. QUESTIONS / CONTACT PERSON

The District will accept written questions via e-mail until Friday, September 23, 2014. Questions regarding the work must be submitted to:

John Eriksen, Director of Purchasing
E-mail: jeriksen@mail.cccd.edu.
Telephone: (714) 438-4680

The District will respond to each question by email directly to the firm submitting the question. If the question demonstrates that clarification or additional information is needed, an addendum will be issued to all proposers by e-mail. Consultant should acknowledge any and all e-mails sent by the District regarding this RFP by replying to the e-mail sender that the e-mail was received.

Proposers shall not contact any District employee or official regarding this proposal other than the individual listed above as the contact person. Contacting District staff or officials regarding this work may result in disqualification. No verbal comments made by District staff or officials are binding regarding this RFP except for that which is made in writing by the above mentioned contact person. This will assure that all proposers receive the same information in a timely manner.

N. DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

To be considered, proposals must be received at the address below no later than 4:00 P.M. October 2, 2014. Late proposals will not be considered. The District highly encourages early submittal of proposals.

Proposer shall submit one electronic version of the proposal on a CD or flash drive; one (1) printed original and four (4) printed copies of the entire proposal including any supporting documentation in a sealed box or package addressed as follows:

Attention: John Eriksen
Coast Community College District
Purchasing Department
1370 Adams Ave
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

The box or envelope must also be clearly marked on the outside with the words: Proposals Enclosed: RFP # 2033 Potential Historic Structures Assessment Report; Deadline: 4 p.m., October 2, 2015.
Scope of Services
Potential Historic Structures Assessment Report

This Potential Historic Structures Report is being prepared prior to any alteration, relocation, or demolition of any contributing buildings, structures, objects, features, or landscape elements located within the identified OCC Historic District. The work shall be completed by a qualified historic preservation professional who meets the requirements of the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications for history, architectural history, or historic architecture. The report shall be prepared in a manner consistent with the recommended approaches outlined in the National Park Service Preservation Brief 43: The Preparation and Use of Historic Structures Reports. The report shall document the significance and physical condition of all contributing buildings, structures, objects, features, and landscape elements with photographs, text narrative, and existing drawings. This documentation shall include at a minimum:

- A written historic and descriptive report completed in narrative format, including an architectural data form for each contributing resource.
- A site plan showing the location of each building. This site plan shall include a photo key.
- A sketch floor plan shall accompany each architectural data form.
- Large format (4-inch x 5-inch or larger negative) photographs in accordance with Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) guidelines and standards.
- Views shall include contextual views, all exterior elevations, details views of significant exterior architectural features, and interior views of significant historical architectural features or spaces.
- Field photographs (digital) based on HABS guidelines to ensure full documentation of the site. Views should correspond to and augment those in the large format photographs. Such photographs shall be logged, tagged, and collected onto a media storage device for safe archiving.
- Available historic photographs and historic and/or current as-built plans of the site and its contributing resources shall be reproduced digitally or photographically and included in the recordation document.

1. Report Preparation

Upon completion of the research, physical investigation, evaluation, and work recommendations, the Potential Historic Structure Report shall be compiled. The Project Manager shall submit an outline of the Report for the District for review at the beginning of the Report preparation. A draft report may also be submitted for review when the report is partially complete, especially if there are many new research findings, significant physical distress conditions to be addressed, or complicated choices to be made in determining the treatment. It is the intent of
this Report to review and supplement the Historic Resources Technical Report (Attachment E) and specifically address the Tasks 1 through 4 in the 2. Project Section and the mitigation measures and strategy in 4. Mitigation.

2. **Schedule**

The Consultant shall submit a Project Schedule to include all of the work tasks and proposed meetings. In addition to meetings with key stakeholders early in the study process, it is essential for the Project Team to meet with the District at key points during the research, investigation, and development of the Potential Historic Structure Report. It is anticipated that the duration of the will be 120 days.
NON-COLLUSION AFFIDAVIT TO BE EXECUTED
BY BIDDER AND SUBMITTED WITH BID FORM

____________________, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he or she is of the party making the foregoing bid that the bid is not made in the interest of, or on behalf of, any undisclosed person, partnership, company, association, organization, or corporation; that the bid is genuine and not collusive or sham; that the bidder has not directly or indirectly induced or solicited any other bidder to put in a false or sham bid, and has not directly or indirectly colluded, conspired, connived, or agreed with any bidder or anyone else to put in a sham bid, or that anyone shall refrain from bidding; that the bidder has not in any manner, directly or indirectly, sought by agreement, communication, or conference with anyone to fix the bid price of the bidder or any other bidder, or to fix any overhead, profit, or cost element of the bid price, or of that of any other bidder, or to secure any advantage against the public body awarding the contract of anyone interested in the proposed contract; that all statements contained in the bid are true; and, further, that the bidder has not, directly or indirectly, submitted his or her bid price or any breakdown thereof, or the contents thereof, or divulged information or data relative thereto, or paid, and will not pay, any fee to any corporation, partnership, company association, organization, bid depository, or to any member or agent thereof to effectuate a collusive or sham bid.

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

____________________
Signature & Date

____________________
Printed Name & Title
DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE CERTIFICATION

This Drug-Free Workplace Certification is required pursuant to Government Code Sections 8350, et seq., the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1990. The Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1990 requires that every person or organization awarded a contract for the procurement of any property or services from any State agency must certify that it will provide a drug-free workplace by doing certain specified acts. In addition, the Act provides that each contract awarded by a State agency may be subject to suspension of payments or termination of the contract and the contractor may be subject to debarment from future contracting, if the state agency determines that specified acts have occurred.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 8355, every person or organization awarded a contract from a State agency shall certify that it will provide a drug-free workplace by doing all of the following:

a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the person's or organization's workplace and specifying actions which will be taken against employees for violations of the prohibition;

b) Establishing a drug free awareness program to inform employees about all of the following:
   1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
   2) The person's or organization's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;
   3) The availability of drug counseling, rehabilitation and employee-assistance programs;
   4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations;

c) Requiring that each employee engaged in the performance of the contract be given a copy of the statement required by subdivision (a) and that, as a condition of employment on the contract, the employee agrees to abide by the terms of the statement.

I, the undersigned, agree to fulfill the terms and requirements of Government Code Section 8355 listed above and will publish a statement notifying employees concerning (a) the prohibition of controlled substance at the workplace, (b) establishing a drug-free awareness program, and (c) requiring that each employee engaged in the performance of the contract be given a copy of the statement required by Section 8355(a) and requiring that the employee agree to abide by the terms of that statement.

I also understand that if the DISTRICT determines that I have either (a) made a false certification herein, or (b) violated this certification by failing to carry out the requirements of Section 8355,
that the contract awarded herein is subject to suspension of payments, termination, or both. I further understand that, should I violate the terms of the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1990, I may be subject to debarment in accordance with the requirements of Section 8350, et seq.

I acknowledge that I am aware of the provisions of Government Code Section 8350, et seq. and hereby certify that I will adhere to the requirements of the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1990.

____________________________________
NAME OF CONTRACTOR

______________________________
Signature

______________________________
Print Name

______________________________
Title

______________________________
Date
“4.4.5 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce significant impacts to recorded historical resources, recorded archaeological resources, unrecorded subsurface archaeological resources, and unrecorded human remains within the project area.

**MM-CUL-1** A Historic Structures Report shall be prepared prior to any alteration, relocation, or demolition of any contributing buildings, structures, objects, features, or landscape elements located within the identified OCC Historic District. The work shall be completed by a qualified historic preservation professional who meets the requirements of the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications for history, architectural history, or historic architecture. The report shall be prepared in a manner consistent with the recommended approaches outlined in the National Park Service *Preservation Brief 43: The Preparation and Use of Historic Structures Reports*. The report shall document the significance and physical condition of all contributing buildings, structures, objects, features, and landscape elements with photographs, text narrative, and existing drawings. This documentation shall include at a minimum:

- A written historic and descriptive report completed in narrative format, including an architectural data form for each contributing resource.
- A site plan showing the location of each building. This site plan shall include a photo key.
- A sketch floor plan shall accompany each architectural data form.
- Large format (4-inch x 5-inch or larger negative) photographs in accordance with Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) guidelines and standards. Views shall include contextual views, all exterior elevations, details views of significant exterior architectural features, and interior views of significant historical architectural features or spaces.
- Field photographs (digital) based on HABS guidelines to ensure full documentation of the site. Views should correspond to and augment those in the large format photographs. Such photographs shall be logged, tagged, and collected onto a media storage device for safe archiving.
- Available historic photographs and historic and/or current as-built plans of the site and its contributing resources shall be reproduced digitally or photographically and included in the recordation document. One original copy of the documentation as specified above shall be assembled and offered, and archived if accepted, to each of the following entities: Southern California Information Center at California State University, Fullerton; Los Angeles Conservancy; University of California, Irvine; City of Costa Mesa Public Library; The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens; Neutra Institute for Survival Through Design; Orange County Archives; and the Costa Mesa Historical Society.

**MM-CUL-2** Prior to demolition of any contributing resources, including landscape elements, within the OCC Historic District, an inventory of significant exterior character defining features, distinctive architectural elements, and materials shall be made by a qualified historic preservation professional who satisfies the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications for history, architectural history, or historic architecture. Where feasible these features shall be itemized, photographed, salvaged, and incorporated into the new design of the campus pursuant to the
Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan. To the extent salvageable materials exceed onsite reuse needs, they may be sold, donated, or exchanged for use elsewhere in the community. Unsound, decayed, or toxic materials (e.g., asbestos, etc.) need not be included in the salvage process. Some materials shall also be incorporated into an educational interpretive program as discussed as part of the following mitigation measure. Salvage efforts shall be documented by summarizing all measures taken to encourage receipt of salvaged materials by the public.”
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1. INTRODUCTION

A. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This technical report documents and evaluates potential historic resources that may be affected by the implementation of the Orange Coast College Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan (the proposed project). Orange Coast College (OCC) is one of three campuses operated by the Coast Community College District (District) within the county of Orange. This report is prepared to facilitate environmental compliance of the proposed project under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The survey assessment includes a discussion of survey methods utilized, the jurisdictional framework for historical resources, a description of the subject property's environmental setting, a brief contextual history of the survey study area, an evaluation assessment of the property for historical significance, an analysis of potential project impacts on identified resources, and recommended mitigation measures for any potential adverse impacts to those resources identified as historically significant.

B. PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed project is located on the existing OCC campus in the City of Costa Mesa, California, within the central portion of Orange County (Figure 1-1, Regional Map). Primary freeway access to the campus is via Interstate 405 and State Routes 55 and 73, which are within minutes of the campus. OCC is bounded by Adams Avenue to the north, Fairview Road to the east, Merrimac Way to the south, and Harbor Boulevard to the west (Figure 1-2, Local Vicinity).

C. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

The District is updating its Facilities Master Plan for all three of its Orange County campuses: Orange Coast College, Golden West College, and Coastline Community College. The Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan provides an analysis of the evolving student body and makes planning recommendations based on their educational needs. The District is undertaking a comprehensive improvement and building program to meet increasing enrollment and to make the upgrades and repairs of existing buildings as well as to construct new facilities to improve the safety and educational experience of those attending the colleges in accordance with Measure M. Measure M was passed in November 2012 and issued $398 million in bonds to fund the expansion of courses and academic buildings in engineering, math, science, and technology, as well as to upgrade technologies, construct and repair facilities, and improve resources for active military personnel and veterans at all three District campuses.
OCC is proposing to implement the proposed project to more effectively meet the space needs of the projected on-campus enrollment through the year 2020 and beyond while constructing and renovating facilities in order to meet the District’s instructional needs. The construction of on-campus housing facilities, parking lot improvements, and construction of a parking structure would accommodate the projected increase in out-of-District students. Improved circulation in and around campus would increase accessibility to existing and new development, improve pedestrian and bicycle safety, and enhance the overall connectivity of campus uses. By pursuing joint venture and entrepreneurial opportunities, the District could generate revenue and support the academic needs and mission of the campus.

The overall goal of the proposed project is to provide the optimal physical settings to support the District’s academic mission. The Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan proposes the development of modern teaching and learning facilities that would attract students to OCC while providing the physical resources necessary to support the educational process.

D. HISTORIC RESOURCES ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

In order to identify and assess historic resources, a multi-step methodology was utilized. A record search to identify previously documented historic resources was conducted. This search included a review of the National Register and its annual updates, determinations of eligibility for National Register listings, and the California Historical Resources Inventory database maintained by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP).

Site inspections of the project site were made to assess existing conditions, define the historic resources survey study area, document potential significant properties, and identify character-defining features of those properties evaluated as historically significant. A survey of the study area, including photography and the collection of archival background data, was then made. Additional background and site-specific research was conducted in order to evaluate potential historic resources within their proper historic context.

Criteria of the National Register, California Register, and the City of Costa Mesa were employed to assess the significance of the property. In addition, the survey methodology of the OHP was utilized. More specifically, in conducting the identification and evaluation of historic resources located within the study area, the following tasks were performed:

- Searched archival records of the National Register, California Historical Resources Inventory (HRI), and the City of Costa Mesa.
- Conducted field inspections of the study area and photographed the site and its features.
Collected and reviewed relevant historic images and archives including, but not limited to those at Orange Coast College, the Regional History Center at the University of Southern California, the Los Angeles Public Library, the County of Orange archives, and the University of California, Los Angeles.

- Conducted site-specific research on historic resources including a review of relevant architectural plans, building permits, tax assessor records, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, and other archival documents.

- Reviewed and analyzed previous documentation, ordinances, statutes, regulations, bulletins, and technical materials relating to federal, state, and local historic preservation, designation assessment processes, and related programs.

This historic resources survey assessment was conducted and prepared by Jan Ostashay, Principal, Ostashay & Associates Consulting, who satisfies the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in history and architectural history.
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2. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Historic resources fall within the jurisdiction of several levels of government. Federal laws provide the framework for the identification, and in certain instances, protection of historic resources. Additionally, states and local jurisdictions play active roles in the identification, documentation, and protection of such resources within their communities.

Numerous laws and regulations require federal, state, and local agencies to consider the effects of a proposed project on historic resources. These laws and regulations stipulate a process for compliance, define the responsibilities of the various agencies proposing or overseeing the action, and prescribe the relationship among other involved agencies (e.g., State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation). The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended; the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the California Register of Historical Resources; Public Resources Code (PRC) 5024; and the City of Costa Mesa (Municipal Code, Title 13, Chapter IX, Article 14, Section 13-200.6-200.59) are the primary federal, state, and local laws governing and affecting preservation of historic resources of national, state, and local significance. A description of these laws and regulations is provided in the following paragraphs.

A. FEDERAL LEVEL

1. NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

First authorized by the Historic Sites Act of 1935, the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) was established by the NHPA, as “an authoritative guide to be used by Federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.”\(^1\) The National Register recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state and local levels. Further discussion of National Register criteria and guidelines is provided in Section 3, Environmental Setting, of this document.

B. STATE LEVEL

The California Office of Historic Preservation, as an office of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, implements the policies of the NHPA on a state-wide level. The OHP also carries out the duties as set forth in the Public Resources Code (PRC) and maintains the California

\(^1\) Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 36 Section 60.2.
Historic Resources Inventory. The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) is an appointed official who implements historic preservation programs within the state's jurisdictions. Also implemented at the state level, CEQA requires projects to identify any substantial adverse impacts which may affect the significance of identified historical resources. Further discussion of OHP survey methodology and specific criteria to determine the significance of a resource are also provided in Section 3, Environmental Setting, of this document.

1. California Register of Historical Resources

Created by Assembly Bill 2881, which was signed into law on September 27, 1992, the California Register is "an authoritative listing and guide to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the state and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change." The criteria for eligibility for the California Register are based upon National Register criteria. Certain resources are determined by the statute to be automatically included in the California Register, including California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places.

The California Register consists of resources that are listed automatically and those that must be nominated through an application and public hearing process. The California Register automatically includes the following:

- California properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and those formally Determined Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places;
- California Registered Historical Landmarks from No. 770 onward;
- Those California Points of Historical Interest that have been evaluated by the OHP and have been recommended to the State Historical Commission for inclusion on the California Register.

Other resources which may be nominated to the California Register include:

- Individual historical resources;
- Historical resources contributing to historic districts;

---

7 California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(a).
8 California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(b).
9 California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c).
10 California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(d).
- Historical resources identified as significant in historical resources surveys with significance ratings of Category 1 through 5;

- Historical resources designated or listed as local landmarks, or designated under any local ordinance, such as a historic preservation overlay zone.

2. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

Under CEQA, a "project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." This statutory standard involves a two-part inquiry. The first involves a determination of whether the project involves a historical resource. If so, then the second part involves determining whether the project may involve a "substantial adverse change in the significance" of the historical resource. To address these issues, guidelines that implement the 1992 statutory amendments relating to historical resources were adopted in final form on October 26, 1998 with the addition of State CEQA Guideline Section 15064.5. The State CEQA Guidelines provide that for the purposes of CEQA compliance, the term "historical resources" shall include the following:

- "A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.

- A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

- Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, including the following:

---

6 California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(a).
7 California Public Resources Code Section 21084.1 – Added in 1992 by AB 2881.
8 State CEQA Guidelines, 14 CCR Section 15064.5(a).
a. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

b. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

c. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

d. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

- The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.”

C. LOCAL LEVEL

1. CITY OF COSTA MESA

The City of Costa Mesa enacted its historic preservation ordinance (Article 14, Chapter IX of Title 13 in the City’s Municipal Code) in October 1999. The City’s preservation ordinance is the primary body of local laws relating to historic preservation. The ordinance allows the City to establish a Local Register of Historic Places, which is a list of all designated cultural resources, landmarks, and historic districts within the community. According to the ordinance, Local Register designation may include any building, structure, site, object, district, improvement, or natural feature that is over fifty (50) years old or, in special circumstances under fifty years of age, if it meets the significance criteria of the National Register or exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, social, economic, or architectural history of the City; is identified with important personages or historical events; embodies distinctive architectural characteristics; or represents the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect. The preservation ordinance also recognizes and considers the significance of cultural and archaeological resources.
3. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A. HISTORIC CONTEXT

1. CITY OF COSTA MESA

EARLY HISTORY

The first Europeans to see what would become Orange County were members of the 1542 expedition of Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo. Cabrillo sailed along the coast but did not explore inland. Europeans did not return to the Orange County area until the summer of A.D. 1769, when Don Gaspar de Portola aided by Father Junipero Serra led an overland expedition north from Mexico in search of Monterey Bay. The first permanent Euro-American settlement in Orange County was established when a spot along the El Camino Real, where it crossed San Juan Creek, was selected as the site for a Franciscan religious mission in the spring of 1775. The new San Juan Capistrano Mission did not become fully operational until November 1776 and was eventually relocated to slightly higher ground 3.5 miles southwest to its present site in 1778.

Large tracts of land fell under Mission San Juan Capistrano’s authority under Spanish law. The area was once grazing grounds for cattle belonging to Mission San Juan Capistrano. Just after the turn of the 19th century, as a means to encourage effective occupation, the Spanish Crown issued large land grants. On July 1, 1810 Governor Jose Joaquin Arrillaga awarded the Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana to Jose Arrillaga Yorba and his nephew Juan Pablo Peralta. This land grant contained approximately 62,500 acres. Costa Mesa is situated on a portion of this old Spanish land grant.

EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF COSTA MESA

The history of Costa Mesa is the story of three communities of the past that included an old boomtown called Fairview; the Boston farming colony of Paularino (Polloreno); and the village of Harper that all once thrived within Costa Mesa’s city limits.

By the 1880s, settlers had begun buying portions of the ranchc land from Yorba’s heirs and in the same decade established the town of Fairview. The town was centered around the present day intersection of Adams Avenue and Harbor Boulevard. Over the next few years

development of Fairview grew at a rapid pace with a post office, school house, church, and corner drug store constructed. A narrow gauge train line, the Santa Ana, Fairview & Pacific Railroad, was brought in from the county seat, Santa Ana to provide visitors access to the nearby hot sulfur springs. Despite attempts to promote the continuing development of Fairview, by the spring of 1889 the little town began to collapse. After a storm washed out the railroad in mid-March many of the residents began to leave and the once successful business establishments were closed. Much of the area eventually reverted to farming and agriculture.

Another little town was founded on Costa Mesa land in the late 1800s by Eduardo Polloreno (Paularino), who came into possession of the land when the Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana was partitioned. The first settlers came from Boston, Massachusetts to Polloreno in the spring of 1886. This settlement contained roughly 800 acres and was bounded by today’s Fairview Road on the west, Newport Boulevard on the east, the San Diego Freeway on the north, and by a line about 1.5 miles south of Baker Street. Much of the land was split up for small farms and the growing of various crops. Unfortunately, without a business center the community could not thrive and develop. The static growth of Polloreno eventually led to its demise. Only the Paularino street signs are left as a reminder of this small agricultural settlement.

Just early into the 20th century the little town of Harper, named after rancher Gregory Harper, Jr., was founded to the south after the discovery of oil promoted further settlement and development. Near the close of 1908, a large two-story structure with a general store and post office was constructed on the northeast corner of 18th Street and Newport Boulevard. Most of the population was centered between Newport Boulevard on the west, Orange Avenue on the east, 17th Street on the south, and 19th Street on the north. The Harper Methodist Episcopal Church, considered a permanent church facility, was constructed in 1915 at the southwest corner of Center Street and Newport Boulevard. Further tract development, an available water supply, the expansion of road construction and auto facilities, and the broadening of farm goods all added to the permanence of this town. The farming community of Harper was renamed in 1920 to Costa Mesa, the Spanish equivalent of “coastal tableland.” This is a reference to the city’s geographic location as being on a plateau by the coast.

Between 1920 and 1940, the population of Costa Mesa grew from 200 to 4,692. With the increase in population the development of commercial activity and construction also increased. Many stores, markets, garages, banks and other industries were constructed along the busy thoroughfare of Newport Boulevard. The Costa Mesa Grammar School was constructed on a five-acre plot at the northwest corner of 19th Street and Newport Boulevard in 1923. The previous year the town’s Chamber of Commerce formed.
With the onset of the Great Depression a number of public schools managed to be constructed. The Monte Vista School at the corner of Center and Placentia avenues was erected in 1930 and the Lindbergh Grammar School in 1931. Unfortunately, the economics of the time caught up and the Costa Mesa branch of the Bank of Balboa was closed in 1932 and the rail line of the Southern Pacific Railroad, which ran from Santa Ana to Newport Beach along Newport Boulevard, was abandoned. The Long Beach earthquake of 1933 also damaged many buildings, businesses, and school facilities. Most of these improvements were re-built and continued operation.

World War II brought thousands of people to the area for training at the Santa Ana Army Air Base (SAAAB). When the war ended many of these men and women returned to their families and the base was eventually decommissioned; a portion of which was converted for use as a junior college that became Orange Coast College. On June 29, 1953, Costa Mesa was formally incorporated with a population of 16,840 covering an area of 3.5 square miles. Within three decades the city’s population had nearly quintupled.

Residential tract building in Costa Mesa began in earnest following World War II with builders constructing contemporary ranch homes in styles popular of the time. Large-scale residential developments included the huge “Newport Vista” home project better known as “The Freedom Homes” tract that began in 1953; the Sunshine Homes development in 1955; the Halecrest Tract in 1955; the College Park Homes just south of OCC in 1956; the Cinderella Homes (Costa Mesa Estates) in 1956; among others.

New public facilities including the Police Department structure, fire station, public library, post office, and City Hall were built in the 1960s. From 1966 to 1970 other types of commercial, financial, and industrial facilities were constructed within the City. Acres of bean fields along Bristol Street and adjacent to the 405 San Diego Freeway became South Coast Plaza, one of the largest shopping centers in southern California. Construction of the financial center of South Coast Town Center, located on the east side of Bristol Street across from the South Coast Plaza, was also constructed in 1967.

Over the past forty years new construction and redevelopment of many areas within the city have occurred and continues to date. The community’s history is evident in its built environment and architecture.

2. SANTA ANA ARMY AIR BASE

Despite its growth over the many years, prior to World War II Costa Mesa continued to reflect a small town atmosphere. Though with the onset of the war the growth of the community was about to be accelerated. As world tensions mounted, additional military
installations were planned throughout the nation. Formal ground breaking ceremonies for the United States Air Corps Replacement Training Center took place on October 23, 1941. The first aviation cadets arrived in February of 1942. A few months later the base was renamed the Santa Ana Army Air Base (SAAAB). It consisted of three schools: the Air Force Classification Center; the Air Force Pre-Flight School for pilots; and the Air Force Pre-Flight School for bombardiers and navigators. The base eventually reached the size of 1,283 acres and included the territory west from Newport Boulevard to Harbor Boulevard, south from Warehouse Road to the present Southern California College. The main gate was located on Newport Boulevard. What is now the Orange County Fairgrounds, Orange Coast College, and the City's Civic Center were all areas that comprised portions of the SAAAB. On base were a main post office and five branches, a post exchange with five branches, three movie theaters, a service club, a library, four chapels, and a 1,500-bed hospital.

From 1942 through 1945, the war and the training activities at the SAAAB dominated Costa Mesa life. After the war, SAAAB housed German prisoners of war. They were placed in barracks near the northeast corner of the facility. With an oversupply of military training facilities created during World War II the War Department had to reduce its base structure. Many of the bases throughout the country were either realigned or decommissioned. On March 31, 1946, the base officially became inactive. A skeleton crew of some 300 civilian and military personnel was retained to protect property until its final disposal. The War Assets Administration took over control of the SAAAB from the Army on June 24, 1947. They in turn began advertising the site for sale to various Federal agencies, state and municipal governments, educational institutions, and finally private purchasers.

3. Orange Coast College

In late September of 1947, the Orange Coast College District bid on land and buildings at the inactive SAAAB for its new junior college campus. During the latter part of January, 1948, title to roughly 243 acres of land on the northern section of the old base was turned over to Orange Coast College from the War Assets Administration. The deal included seventy-one buildings that contained 285,000 square feet. Four of the barracks were remodeled as living quarters for student veterans and their families. Two were remodeled and used for dormitories and two for apartments. In addition, the base theater was converted into a school auditorium, the service club into a gymnasium, a mess hall into a cafeteria, a chapel was renamed "Veteran's Memorial Chapel," and the other former barracks buildings became classrooms. The college held an open house on September 10, 1948, with classes started three days later.

At the authorization by the Orange Coast Junior College District Board of Trustees (Board), the initial master plan for the campus was created by Los Angeles architect and
planner Robert E. Alexander who also designed the first few buildings on site. He was assisted by local Corona del Mar architect Richard Pleger who worked as associate architect on the project. With the partnership of Richard Neutra and Alexander cont-acted in 1952, the two architects worked on the planning and architecture of the new OCC campus and furthered the seven year master plan to realization. The agreed upon scope for the Neutra and Alexander work was that each would make basic conceptual idea/design contributions with Neutra taking chief responsibility for the architectural design and Alexander assuming control of planning, organization, public relations, and logistics. Neutra provided design ideas for a business education building (complex), a science building (complex), an athletic facility, and a speech arts and music center with a large theatre. All the while, the architects were assisted by associate architect Richard Pleger who was hired on to help coordinate the projects locally; act as liaison between the architects, the Board, and contractors; and provide general assistance. The OCC campus developed incrementally over a period of several years. The master plan, simple with minimal new improvements in the beginning, grew and expanded as the student population increased and the demand for more classroom space for varied curriculum was needed. Neutra and Alexander’s work at the campus occurred throughout much of the 1950s. The partnership of Neutra and Alexander; however, eventually dissolved in the late 1950s and their work with the District ceased after completion of the seven year master plan.

At the same time the campus was being initially developed with new construction through much of the 1950s, Neutra and Alexander collaborated with noted landscape architect Garrett Eckbo to assist them in creating a landscape that complemented the Modernist architectural features of the campus and which would help to further unify the campus physically and visually. Eckbo introduced tall trees, including pine, palm, and eucalyptus, within the campus and along its perimeter of the campus site to act as wind screens from the persistent southwest breezes that fanned the campus. He also included softscape elements around each of the classroom buildings, within the various open patios areas, and between each of the well-designed brick “privacy” walls that lined some of the walkways. He designed an interesting cross hatch of paved walkways to physically and aesthetically connect the buildings together. Collectively, the architecture and landscaping created a rather modernistic educational facility reflective of its time and period, and which allowed for the merging of the indoor and outdoor environs. The consideration of orientation, material choice, scale and design, the immediate indoor and outdoor environs utilized in the planning and design of the OCC campus are planning techniques that have since come to be known as environmental design, a trend advocated and promoted by Neutra for years.

The second phase of campus development occurred when Richard Pleger teamed with local master architect William E. Blurock as well as with architect Rumon W. Hougan (and later with Philmer Ellerbroek) to form Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroeck. Under their guard the
architects completed the Homes Economics complex in 1958, designed the new Modern style gymnasium and associated men’s and women’s locker rooms in 1961-1962, designed the stylistically Modern Forum building in 1960, and the complementary Science Hall in 1964, among other smaller projects on the school grounds.

The campus continued to expand and develop with the construction of a new library, the Norman E. Watson Library, in the late 1960s. In the 1970s the third major building phase took place when William Blurock was called upon again to design new classrooms, offices, and other educational facilities on the campus. More recent development on campus has occurred including the construction of a new art center by Steven Ehrich in 2002 and the ABC Building by LPA, Inc. in 2011.


Robert Evan Alexander was a distinguished architect and urban planner whose work primarily included large-scale commercial buildings, military housing, college campuses, churches, and other public projects. Born in 1907, Alexander graduated from Cornell University with a degree in architecture in 1930, and in the following years studied at the Academie Beaux Kinds in Paris as well as in Italy and Spain. He came to California in 1932 and for the next ten years held various positions with different architectural firms until he went to work for Lockheed Aircraft in Burbank in 1942. Between 1946 and 1949 Alexander practiced as an independent architect. His innovative ideas for affordable housing produced the nationally prominent Baldwin Hills Village in southwest Los Angeles. Only a few years after operating his own design studio he went into partnership with noted architect Richard J. Neutra to form the firm Neutra and Alexander. The partnership eventually dissolved in the late 1950s due to personal differences, but not before they collaborated on a number of large-scale public projects, including the campus design of Orange Coast College in Costa Mesa. With Neutra he also designed the visitor centers, museum and cyclorama at the Gettysburg National Historic Park; the Petrified Forest visitor center in Arizona; the Los Angeles County Hall of Records; and the American Embassy in Karachi, Pakistan. Other projects included buildings at UCLA, USC, and Cal Tech. In 1959, the accomplished architect founded his own architectural practice, Robert E. Alexander & Associates, following the resolution of the Neutra and Alexander partnership. Locales of his yet other projects ranged from Juarez, Mexico to Anchorage, Alaska. He died in 1992 from cancer in Berkeley at the age of 84.

5. Richard J. Neutra, Architect

Richard Joseph Neutra was a prominent and widely influential Modern architect who practiced globally for over fifty years. Neutra was born in Vienna, Austria in 1892. He studied
architectural engineering at the Institute of Technology and graduated in 1918. He attended the University of Zurich in Switzerland for his post-graduate studies until 1919. After World War I, Neutra worked in Germany briefly with architect Erich Mendelsohn before immigrating to the United States in 1923. After a brief stay in New York, he arrived in the Chicago area where he worked briefly with both Frank Lloyd Wright and Holabird & Roche. In 1925, Neutra settled in California, where he worked for the remainder of his career. He immediately joined the firm of fellow Vienna native, Rudolph Schindler. In 1949, Neutra and fellow architect Robert E. Alexander established a partnership dedicated to project planning and of public and commercial architecture. Together they were responsible for planning and designing many high-profile projects throughout California. The partnership ended in 1960 due to personal differences. Neutra then established a new firm – Neutra and Associates – with his son Dion Neutra, who continued the practice after his father’s death in 1970.

Richard Neutra’s architectural style was distinctly Modern, but with an emphasis on organic lines, natural materials, and integration of the outdoors. Neutra coined his philosophy of architecture “Biorealism” because of his insistence that Modern architecture be humanistic and recognized the client’s needs for comfort and aesthetic pleasure. His later work evolved to project a warmer and more relaxed character compared to his earlier projects that were the embodiment of the International Style. His focus on the concept of transparency, distortion of visual indoor and outdoor spatial relationships, and the refinement of his trademark “spider leg” out riggings were well incorporated into many of his later works.

Richard Neutra’s signature works include Modern residences in California, such as the Lovell House built in Los Angeles from 1927 to 1929; housing projects designed for the Federal Housing Authority from 1945; and several Case Study Houses designed and built from 1945 to 1948 in partnership with Arts and Architectural magazine in an effort that included other notable Modern architects such as Charles and Ray Eames and Eero Saarinen. In addition to homes, Neutra, some in partnership with Alexander, designed many distinguished public buildings, including the Channel Heights housing project in San Pedro, 1932; the Los Angeles Hall of Records, 1961-1962; the U.S. Embassy in Karachi, Pakistan, 1961; and many educational facilities such as Emerson Jr. High School in West Los Angeles, 1938; Palos Verdes High School in California, 1961; the Fine Arts Building at Cal State Northridge, 1961; the Kester-Avenue Elementary School in Los Angeles, 1951; the Richard J. Neutra Elementary School in Lemoore, 1961; and the Orange Coast College campus from the 1950s to the early 1960s.

Neutra influenced numerous young architects through his role as an educator at Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Illinois Institute of Technology, and other colleges and universities. Additionally, through the course of his career Neutra published many books including Architecture of Social Concern, 1948; Mystery and

Richard J. Neutra is considered one of the world’s most influential modern architects. His innovative and open plan designs express the freedom from conventions that many find in southern California. In 1949 he was featured on the cover of Time magazine and hailed for having humanized modern architecture. In 1955, the Richard Neutra archive was established at the University of California, Los Angeles. In 1977 he was posthumously awarded the AIA’s highest honor, the Gold Medal.

Those buildings at the Orange Coast College campus that were designed by Neutra are indicative of his “Biorealism” architectural philosophy and stylistic conventions for modern educational facilities at the time. This collection of buildings is the oldest physical manifestation of his small portfolio work within the Orange County region. Neutra’s other works in the area include the Garden Grove Community Church, 1961; the Mariners Medical Arts Building in Newport Beach, 1963; and the Huntington Beach Central Library, 1975.

6. Garrett Eckbo, Landscape Architect

Garrett Eckbo is recognized as one of the central figures in American modern landscape architecture whose career spanned five decades. Eckbo worked to change the typical formal Beaux-Arts system of landscape design as his work demonstrated innovative design ideas in a social and economic setting. He was known for thinking of the “broad landscape and society first, before focusing on the garden,” a notion that was reflected in the types of work he was commissioned for during his career. His designs were centered on the garden, which he believed was the prototype for all landscape design. His work was influenced by modernist European architecture, modern art, and vernacular landscape traditions.

Born in Cooperstown, New York in 1910, he relocated with his family to Alameda, east of San Francisco, after his mother and father divorced in 1912. A graduate of the University of California at Berkeley, Eckbo went to do graduate work at the Harvard School of Design. Even before he graduated, Eckbo published the first of a long line of studies and books on landscape architecture, entitled “Small Gardens.” The study focused on how creative gardens could be designed for increasingly small lots. After graduating, he went on to form numerous architecture and planning partnerships, designing gardens and working on plans for camps and recreational facilities for the New Deal’s Farm Security Administration. From 1942 to 1945, he participated in the World War II effort by contributing landscape designs for defense housing in the San Francisco region. In the post-war years he founded a firm with Robert Royston and Edward Williams that focused primarily on suburban parks and planned communities. He
headed south to Los Angeles in 1946 to establish an extension of the firm with Francis Dean. In the years that followed, the firm’s projects included a multitude of garden designs and collaborations with Modernist architects, such as architects Robert Alexander and Richard Neutra, on several large-scale planning and development ventures. As Alexander worked on the basic site for the new modern Orange Coast College he brought Eckbo in to help integrate a landscape plan that was both functional and aesthetically pleasing.

During the 1960s, Eckbo was commissioned with the strategic open space plan for the entire state of California. Eckbo was an accomplished designer of campus landscapes. Among his best-known commissions are studies and designs for several University of California campuses, Loyola University in Los Angeles, Ambassador College, the University of New Mexico, and Orange Coast College. Several lesser-known campuses include all of the schools in the Whittier Public School District and many of school campuses in the Long Beach Public School District.

In 1964, Eckbo went on to form EDAW with Dean, Austin, and Williams. During the 1960s Eckbo, working with EDAW, designed the landscape for the Ambassador College in Pasadena. EDAW become one of the foremost private planning and landscape architecture firms in the world. They were later purchased by AECOM in 2009, but remain involved with large-scale urban projects.

7. **Pleger, Blurock, Hougan, and Ellerbrock, Architects**

Richard H. Pleger (1908-2010) had worked with Robert Alexander early-on and later with both Neutra and Alexander at the OCC campus. By the mid-1950s the Board had authorized his work to design the entrances to the campus off Harbor Boulevard and later along Fairview Road. Although originally from Kansas, he studied at the University of Southern California from 1926 to 1929 earning an architectural degree. Professionally, little is known about Pleger as the 1956 *American Architects Directory* lists only his name and business address. Both the 1962 and 1970 *American Architects Directory* lists his previous firm as Pleger, Blurock, Hougan, and Ellerbrock and at that time he was practicing architecture under his name part-time (as he was listed as semi-retired in Corona del Mar).

William H. Blurock, FAIA (1922-2012) was a Newport Beach architect whose work from the 1950s through the 1970s was considered visionary in the burgeoning field of modern educational design. Over his long career, Blurock guided the planning and design of buildings on 32 California college campuses, and scores of other educational facilities throughout the state, including Orange Coast College and the University of California, Irvine. A Los Angeles native, Blurock was a 1947 graduate of the University of Southern California, School of Architecture. In 1993, he was honored as the Distinguished Alumnus of the architecture school and was elected
an AIA Fellow in 1968 for outstanding contributions to the design and science of construction. By 1970, Blurock's architectural practice was listed as William Blurock & Parnters, a successor to William H. Blurock & Associates. He served on the local AIA Orange County chapter as president and as an AIA national director in the late 1970s. He was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to the California State Board of Architectural Examiners for which he served 13 years.

Architect Rumont W. Hougan (1912-2005) was an architect who had worked as a draftsman for noted architect Myron Hunt and H.L. Chambers in the late 1930s and later for master architect Gordon B. Kaufman. Born in Rock Valley, Iowa he studied architecture at the University of Nebraska from 1931 to 1933. He joined Richard Plesger's office in Corona del Mar in 1947, partnered in 1952, and later became part of the Plesger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek design team. The American Architects Directory (1956, 1962, 1970) lists Hougan as a practicing architect in Corona del Mar without any projects credited to his name. He had his own architectural practice from 1960 to 1970 and joined the firm of Rolly Pulaski, a Newport Beach architect, in 1970. He was also a member of the local AIA Orange County chapter and a member of their historic preservation committee.

Philmer J. Ellerbroek (1905-1969) from Sioux City, Iowa also studied at the University of Southern California graduating in 1928. He was a member of the AIA Orange County chapter having served as president in 1954 and was later elected as an AIA Fellow in 1967. He established his own practice in 1946 and later became a partner in Plesger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek in the late 1950s. He served on the Newport Beach Planning Commission from 1940 to 1950. In reviewing the American Architects Directory (1956, 1962) besides his work with the firm herein at the OCC campus, other representative examples of his work include the design of a department store in Corona (1952), a number of elementary schools in Newport Beach (1955), and an office building in Newport Beach (1964). He went on to join William H. Blurock in the 1960s to establish Blurock Ellerbroek & Associates and later established his own private practice.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS

The OCC campus occupies an approximately 160-acre site in the City of Costa Mesa in central Orange County. The project site is surrounded by the cities of Santa Ana to the north, Fountain Valley and Huntington Beach to the west, Newport Beach to the south, and Irvine to the east. OCC, like most of Costa Mesa, is located on flat terrain. The Santa Ana River passes 1.5 miles west of the campus and drains into the Pacific Ocean located 4 miles southwest of the campus. The campus is within the vicinity of John Wayne International Airport located 2 miles east from OCC.
The campus is situated in an urbanized setting. North of the campus, across Adams Avenue, are high-density residential developments (multi-family residences), and low-density residential developments (single-family dwellings) are south of Merrimac Way. Costa Mesa High School and the Orange County Fair and Event Center (OC Fairgrounds) are located to the east across Fairview Road, and commercial and residential development is located to the west of the campus along Harbor Boulevard. The District headquarters is situated along the north side of Adams Avenue just west of the Adams Avenue campus entry into the OCC campus. OCC is accessible from the surrounding areas by three primary access points: Pirate Way, Monitor Way, and S Street.

The OCC campus is one of three colleges of the District. Occupying land that was once part of the Santa Ana Army Air Base developed during World War II, OCC still remains under government ownership and is designated as Public/Institutional Land. Currently, the OCC campus contains more than 80 buildings and multiple recreational fields that occupy 647,603 assignable square feet of space. In addition, there is 4,348 square feet of inactive space.

The northwest corner of the site currently contains undeveloped land, some of which is used for parking. Classrooms and academic buildings are predominately in the center to the south end of the campus. Athletic buildings and fields make up the majority of the northeast corner of the campus grounds. Parking lots are located all throughout the campus, but are mainly found along the perimeter. The OC Fairgrounds parking lot across Fairview Road to the east serves as additional off-site parking for students. An additional feature to this campus is a recycling center on the north side of the campus, which provides additional revenue to OCC.

C. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

In assessing the historic significance of properties located within the study area, various criteria for designation under federal, state, and local landmark programs were considered and applied. The California Office of Historic Preservation survey methodology and instructions were used to evaluate the relative significance of properties.

1. NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES CRITERIA

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of potential significance must also possess integrity of location, design,
setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. For National Register consideration four criteria have been established to determine the historical significance of a resource: ¹⁰

**CRITERIA**

A property of potential significance must meet one or more of the following four established criteria:

A. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

B. It is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

C. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;

D. It yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

A property eligible for the National Register must meet one or more of the above criteria. In addition, unless the property possesses exceptional significance, it must be at least fifty years old to be eligible for National Register listing.

**INTEGRITY**

In addition to meeting the criteria of significance, a property must have integrity. "Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance." ¹¹ According to *National Register Bulletin 15*, the National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of these seven aspects. Thus, the retention of the specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. ¹² The seven factors that define integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. The following is excerpted from *National Register Bulletin 15*, which provides guidance on the interpretation and application of these factors:

---


¹¹ *National Register Bulletin 15, p. 44.*

¹² Ibid.
• Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.\(^{13}\)

• Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.\(^{14}\)

• Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.\(^{15}\)

• Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.\(^{16}\)

• Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.\(^{17}\)

• Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.\(^{18}\)

• Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.\(^{19}\)

\(^{13}\) "The relationship between the property and its location is often important to understanding why the property was created or why something happened. The actual location of a historic property, complemented by its setting is particularly important in recapturing the sense of historic events and persons. Except in rare cases, the relationship between a property and its historic associations is destroyed if the property is moved." Ibid.

\(^{14}\) "A property's design reflects historic functions and technologies as well as aesthetics. It includes such considerations as the structural system; massing; arrangement of spaces; pattern of fenestration; textures and colors of surface materials; type, amount, and style of ornamental detailing; and arrangement and type of plantings in a designed landscape." Ibid.

\(^{15}\) Ibid, p.45.

\(^{16}\) "The choice and combination of materials reveals the preferences of those who created the property and indicated the availability of particular types of materials and technologies. Indigenous materials are often the focus of regional building traditions and thereby help define an area's sense of time and place." Ibid.

\(^{17}\) "Workmanship can apply to the property as a whole or to its individual components. It can be expressed in vernacular methods of construction and plain finishes or in highly sophisticated configurations and ornamental detailing. It can be based on common traditions or innovative period techniques." Ibid.

\(^{18}\) "It results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property's historic character." Ibid.

\(^{19}\) "A property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer. Like feeling, association requires the presence of physical features that convey a property's historic character. . . Because feeling and association depend on individual perceptions, their retention alone is never sufficient to support eligibility of a property for the National Register." Ibid.
In assessing a property's integrity, the National Register criteria recognize that properties change over time, therefore, it is not necessary for a property to retain all its historic physical features or characteristics. The property must retain, however, the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity.\(^{20}\)

For properties which are considered significant under National Register Criteria A and B, *National Register Bulletin 15* states that a property that is significant for its historic association is eligible if it retains the essential physical features that made up its character or appearance during the period of its association with the important event, historical pattern, or person(s).\(^{21}\)

In assessing the integrity of properties which are considered significant under National Register Criterion C, *National Register Bulletin 15* provides that a property important for illustrating a particular architectural style or construction technique must retain most of the physical features that constitute that style or technique.\(^{22}\)

**Context**

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must also be significant within a historic context. *National Register Bulletin 15* states that the significance of a historic property can be judged only when it is evaluated within its historic context.\(^{23}\) Historic contexts are "those patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific property or site is understood and its meaning...is made clear." A property must represent an important aspect of the area's history or prehistory and possess the requisite integrity for the National Register.

**Cultural Landscapes**

The National Park Service recognizes landscape features as a type of resource that can contribute to the significance of a historic district. To further understand and assess the contribution of significant landscape features the concept of a *cultural landscape* is useful as a framework for evaluation.


\(^{20}\) Ibid, 15, p. 46.

\(^{21}\) Ibid.

\(^{22}\) "A property that has lost some historic materials or details can be eligible if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its style in terms of the massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows and doors, texture of materials, and ornamentation. The property is not eligible, however, if it retains some basic features conveying massing but has lost the majority of the features that once characterized its style." Ibid.

\(^{23}\) Ibid, p.7.
Landscapes (NPS 1994) provide the guidance for considering and evaluating cultural landscapes within the National Register criteria, and the terminology described in these technical references is generally used at the federal, state, and local levels to document, describe, and analyze cultural landscapes.

Important cultural landscapes may be composed of a number of character-defining features which individually or collectively contribute to the landscape’s physical appearance as they have evolved over time and within the property’s period of significance. These landscapes may include a grouping of features such as topography, vegetation, water elements (pools, fountains, ponds, streams, etc.), circulation elements (roads, paths, steps, walls, etc.), buildings and furnishings (fences, benches, light fixtures, gates, sculptural objects).

NPS also states that each situation may vary, and some features may often be more important than others. According to the NPS guidelines, “it is the arrangement and the interrelationship of these character-defining features as they existed during the period of significance that is most critical...” As such, spatial organization and land patterns are of primary concern when defining and evaluating a cultural landscape.

2. CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES CRITERIA

To be eligible for the California Register, a historic resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following four criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;

2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; and/or

4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Additionally, a historic resource eligible for listing in the California Register must meet one or more of the criteria of significance described above and retain enough of its historic character or appearance (integrity) to be recognizable as a historic resource and to convey the
reasons for its significance. Historical resources that have been rehabilitated or restored may be considered and evaluated for California Register listing.\textsuperscript{24}

Integrity, as considered for the California Register, is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The resource must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which it is proposed for eligibility. It is possible that a historic resource may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but it may still be eligible for listing in the California Register.\textsuperscript{25}

3. **California Office of Historic Preservation Survey Methodology**

The evaluation instructions and classification system prescribed by the OHP in its *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources* provide a three digit evaluation code for use in classifying potential historic resources. The first digit indicates one of the following general evaluation categories.

1. Listed in the National Register or the California Register;
2. Determined eligible for listing in the National Register or the California Register;
3. Appears eligible for the National Register or the California Register through survey evaluation;
4. Appears eligible for the National Register or the California Register through other evaluation;
5. Recognized as Historically Significant by Local Government;
6. Not eligible for any Listing or Designation; and
7. Not evaluated for the National Register or California Register or needs re-evaluation.

The second digit is a letter code to indicate whether the resource is separately eligible (S), eligible as part of a district (D), or both (B). The third digit is a number, which is used to further specify significance and refine the relationship of the property to the National Register and California Register. Under this system categories 1 through 4 pertain to various levels of National Register or California Register eligibility. Category 5 pertains to properties that are

\textsuperscript{24} *California Code of Regulations, California Register of Historical Resources* (Title 14, Chapter 11.5), Section 4852(c).
\textsuperscript{25} *Ibid.*
ineligible for National Register or California Register listing, but are recognized as historically significant by local government. In addition, properties not eligible for listing or designation in the National Register, California Register, or at the local level, but perhaps are of local interest in the planning process are given an evaluation status code of 6.

4. CITY OF COSTA MESA CRITERIA

The Costa Mesa Historic Preservation Ordinance establishes criteria for designating local historic resources and/or historic districts and listing them on the City’s Local Register. These properties must be over fifty years of age, unless they possess exceptional significance, and meet the significance criteria for listing in the National Register or one of the following designation criteria:

- Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city’s cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history; or

- Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history; or

- Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction; or

- Is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship; or

- Represents the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect; or

- Contributes to the significance of an historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties or thematically related grouping of properties which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development; or

- Has a unique location or singular physical characteristics or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature or a neighborhood, community or of the city; or

- Embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation; or

- Is similar to other distinctive properties, sites, areas, or objects based on historic, cultural, or architectural motif; or
• Is a type of building or is associated with a business or use which was once common but is now rare; or

• Yields or may yield, information important in prehistory or history, and retains the integrity of those characteristics necessary to convey its significance.

5. Evaluation of Resources Less Than Fifty Years Old

A property is usually considered for its historic significance after it reaches the age of fifty (50) years. This threshold is not concrete, but was chosen as a reasonable span of time to develop historical perspective and evaluate significance adequately. Both the California Register and the City of Costa Mesa historic preservation ordinance reflect the lead of the National Register when assessing properties less than fifty years old for historical significance and utilize the fifty-year threshold.

The National Register guidelines indicate that any building less than fifty years of age must be considered under Criteria Consideration G, which states that “a property achieving significance within the last fifty years is eligible if it is of exceptional importance.” Properties that are less than fifty years old must meet Criteria Consideration G, as must “a property that continues to achieve significance into a period less than fifty years before the nomination.”

D. Survey Study Area Defined

The study area was identified based on the anticipated direct and indirect effects of the proposed project on potential historic resources. The study area was defined as the project site itself, which is the OCC campus (2701 Fairview Road). A map of the survey study area and existing conditions of the campus is illustrated in Figure 3-1, Survey Study Area/Existing Conditions.

E. Evaluation of Historic Resources Within Study Area

A review of relevant historical records, including the California Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) and files at the City of Costa Mesa indicates that: the OCC campus was previously documented and evaluated for historical significance as part of the City’s city-wide historic resources survey conducted in 1999. At that time, the central core campus comprised of a grouping of linear configured, small-scale buildings that date from the 1950s that were built during the first phase of planning the school, many of which were planned and designed by Richard Neutra and Robert Alexander along with the associated landscaping elements of the

76 How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, National Register Bulletin, p.41.
77 Ibid.
core campus that were designed by landscape architect Garrett Eckbo, were found to be historically significant and eligible for local landmark designation as a potential historic district.\textsuperscript{28} This significance for this prior evaluation was based on significance of architectural style and association with master architects Richard Neutra and Robert E. Alexander.

For the purposes of this current assessment, the subject property has been re-assessed for historical significance in order to identify any potential historic resources on the campus, as defined by the CEQA Guidelines.\textsuperscript{29}

1. ORANGE COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE, 2701 FAIRVIEW ROAD

CAMPUS CONSTRUCTION

The Orange Coast College campus was built on the site of the former Santa Ana Army Air Base and was founded in 1947. At the end of 1948, the Orange Coast Junior College District Board of Trustees appointed noted architect and planner Robert E. Alexander of Los Angeles and local architect Richard Pleger to prepare a multi-year master plan for the new campus. The former service buildings though being used as classrooms and dormitories after the school opened in 1948 were found not to conform to state requirements for a community college educational facility and needed to be replaced. The contract with the Board was directly with Alexander while Pleger was assigned as associate architect to assist in obtaining information locally for Alexander and to act as the on-site project manager in providing general assistance. The school master plan was to cover a seven year period with voters approving a special tax levy in May 1949.

With Robert E. Alexander enlisted to draft the new campus plan, and beginning with the Trades and Industry Building (Technology) in 1949 (now demolished), the campus building boom began to take root in the center of the college site. Alexander's initial plan retained some of the existing military structures and remodeled them for use as a gymnasium, administration offices, student center, and home economics, but also included new classroom structures for agricultural, arts and crafts, business education, and science studies. In addition, the modest master plan called for a library, theatre for the speech arts, baseball field, football field, tennis courts, and parking lots.

The new college improvements were set at a distinct 45 degree angle from the north-south orientation of the old base configuration and that of the city grid. Their placement was

\textsuperscript{28} Note that the city-wide survey only evaluated properties for local significance under the City's designation criteria.

\textsuperscript{29} State CEQA Guidelines, \textit{14 CCR Section 15064.5(a)}. 
designed to take advantage of the prevailing southwest breezes that helped to cool the interior spaces of the buildings. Much of the landscape was like-wise set at an angle to complement the orientation of the classrooms. Alexander’s plan for the OCC campus and the contemporary architectural style of the initial buildings constructed on the site brought the campus into the age of modern campus planning.

The core group of buildings set within the center of campus played an integral role in the early development of the college. Their design conveyed their part in the development of a modern community college, an educational system that came to fruition following World War II, and which reflected the Modern era and growth of the City and County. The goals of Alexander’s plan included the determination of the desirable physical size of the campus based on economics and location, the development of a vision for the relationship between existing and future buildings, and the determination of a proper area of college influence within the context of the surrounding community.

The first permanent structure to be built on the OCC campus was the Technology Building. Ground was broken at the end of 1949 and the building was completed eleven months later with the dedication taking place on November 15, 1950. Designed by Robert Alexander with the assistance of Richard Pleger, the Tech Building was a one-story structure that consisted of three saw tooth roof shop wings extending off a long linear flat roof classroom wing. Constructed at a cost of approximately $393,983, the structure stood for over 44 years until it was demolished in the 1990s after the Technology Center opened on OCC’s western perimeter. The Doyle Arts Pavilion and new Library occupy the site where the original Technology Building once stood.

Design of the library, the second building on the new campus, was authorized by the Board in November 1949. Alexander along with the school’s faculty, students, and associate architect Pleger crafted plans for the library in the following months. In January of 1950, the Board, on Alexander’s recommendation, authorized the hiring of landscape architect Garrett Eckbo to design a landscape plan for the entire campus and for the areas adjoining the new buildings. It was also at this time that Alexander proposed to the Board the incorporation of a visually prominent clock tower as an addition to the library, which they also approved.

South Coast Construction Company was the contractor who built the second library on campus in the fall of 1950. Oversight of the project on behalf of the design architect Robert E. Alexander was Richard Pleger. The very first library was located in a converted SAAAB barracks building and operated from 1948 to 1951. The bid for the new 11,000 square foot reference repository was roughly $117,346. The one-story Modern style facility opened in the fall of 1951 and served as the Library until 1968. When the Library was relocated to Watson Hall (originally called the Norman E. Watson Library) the existing structure became the Counseling and
Admissions Building. Located in the quad, the former library is identified by the distinctive tall
framed clock tower. Additions were made to this building in the form of what are now classrooms
and laboratories (Buildings 8 and 9) by Neutra and Alexander a few years after its completion.

Eckbo initially developed a landscape plan that complemented the master plan of the
campus. To act as windbreaks, Eckbo established tree patterns using eucalyptus, palm, and pine
trees set throughout and around the campus. He also proposed landscaping around the
Technology Building and Library.

The next new building proposed for the campus was the Fine Arts and Crafts Building in
1951. The structure designed by Alexander with Pleger was to contain roughly 14,000 square
feet of space with room for an art studio, painting studio, art gallery, photo lab, and ceramics
lab. Construction began in October 1951 with the building completed in January 1952. It was
demolished 48 years later to make room for the new Arts Center that opened in 2002.

The building program for the early 1940s and late 1950s not only included the
construction of the new Technology Building, Arts Center Building, and Library, but also the
remodeling of the existing gymnasium, administration building, home economics classroom and
some ancillary structures for use by staff and students. Because of design and construction
faults with the Technology Building and Library, in early 1952 the Board considered
replacement of Alexander with another architect. However, Alexander had just formed a
business partnership with renowned architect Richard J. Neutra and asked the Board to
reconsider his contract under the circumstances. Alexander stressed to the board that Neutra
would take the design lead on all future building plans associated with the master plan. Richard
Pleger would also remain on Alexander’s contract as associate architect. The Board, requesting
that Neutra take the lead role in the development of project plans, authorized an extended
contract with Alexander and Neutra.

The first building stemming from this new design partnership of Neutra and Alexander
was the Business Education Building. This classroom facility is a complex comprised of three
long, linear horizontal buildings (Buildings 12, 13, and 14) that were completed in 1953 under
the guidance of associate architect Richard Pleger. These Modern style one-story buildings are
sheathed in red brick and stucco and feature flat roofs; covered open walkways; ribbons of
fixed and louvered fenestration; short brick “privacy” walls set at angle along the walkways for
privacy, air circulation, and sun control; wooden louvered overhangs; and an outdoor seating
area. These buildings originally contained classrooms and laboratories for secretarial,
accounting, and office training services programs. In mid-1952, the Board authorized Eckbo to
draft landscape plans for the building complex.
In September 1952, Neutra and Alexander were authorized to prepare plans for a new swimming pool stadium and Speech Arts Building. Two pools (a large, deeper pool for competition, water polo, and a smaller pool for practice and beginners), deck, diving board, and bleachers were designed for the area north of the existing, remodeled gymnasium just west of Fairview Road in the northeast corner of the campus. The pool facility was completed a year later only to have problems with the surfacing of the pool walls. This problem was ultimately resolved, however, and operation of the pool by staff and students began later that year.

Neutra and Alexander with associate architect Richard Pleger also worked on the design of the Student Center, which opened in April 1953. This structure replaced the former Army PX building that had served as the Student Center for five years. The PX building had been located where the Business Education Building is located today. The Student Center from 1953 is still used today; however, it has been extensively remodeled and expanded several times. The building underwent a massive overhaul in 1992-1993.

On March 30, 1955, the $650,000 Speech Arts Building (now the Robert B. Moore Theatre) officially opened to the public. The auditorium that the college used prior to the new Speech Arts Building was a converted SAAAB movie theater that was located at the corner of Fairview Road and Monitor Way. That structure was removed in 1960. Planned by Alexander and designed by Richard Neutra the Speech Arts Building, constructed in 1954, includes the grand “aula” or auditorium, which occupies a prominent location at the hub of the campus, as well as ancillary stage production areas, choral and instrumental practice classrooms, and dressing areas. In plan the minimalist auditorium is a semi-rounded and clipped ellipse, its footprint was shaped specifically to allow “theatre-in-the-round” productions and “audience-in-the-round” techniques. The theatre also accommodates a detached ticket booth office that is connected to the auditorium by covered walkways. The acoustic design and sound insulation of the theatre were supervised by noted acoustic engineer, Dr. Vern D. Knudsen, a professor at UCLA, who acted as sound consultant on the design of the theatre.

As the master plan came to fruition over the years, the landscape plan for the campus evolved in development to fully complement and integrate the new buildings. The central quad pattern of paving, grass, water, shrubs, and trees were planted adjacent to the buildings and within the brick screen walls of each classroom wing for privacy, intimacy, and warmth. Their spatial relationships purposely interconnected with the built environment.

Part of the building program for the OCC campus in the mid-1950s was the construction of a new, larger more modern football stadium with a field house and bleacher seating. According to the Board minutes, the preliminary plans drafted by Neutra and Alexander did not include space for the yell and song leaders or slight lines of the spectators. Final plans were
approved in June 1954 by the Board that included as a cost-saving measure the omission of interior build-out space for concession booths and visiting team room in the field house, omission of 1,000 stadium seats, and the exclusion of an outside concession booth and toilets at the west end of the stadium. Landscaping of the stadium grounds was designed by Garrett Eckbo. The football stadium was initially opened on campus for the 1955 football season, and was dubbed Pirate Stadium. The football stadium and associated facilities like the field house, embankment bleachers, and announcer box reflect elements of the Modern idiom in their design, scale, and materials. It was built to accommodate 7,600 fans. Dirt was excavated from the site of the field and piled high on the sidelines to form the underpinnings for the grandstands. The first graduation ceremonies took place on the field in June 1956. The stadium was renamed the Harry R. LeBard Stadium in 1967. The facility was remodeled and substantially upgraded (seats, lighting, ADA access, etc.) in 2004. Despite the upgrade to the stadium its basic design, form, configuration, and components are still visually and physically evident from when it was initially constructed in 1955. The exterior of the field house has undergone only minor alterations since it was erected.

By late 1954, there was continued questioning by the Board regarding Neutra and Alexander’s capability and prolific absence at Board meetings and on campus during construction of improvements. The design and construction of the Science Building was one of the last larger projects remaining in the initial multi-year master plan. Though consideration of a new architect was discussed at their October 11, 1954 board meeting no action was taken to hire a designer to oversee the project. A month later, the Board requested direct personal service from both Neutra and Alexander in exchange for renewing their contract for the design of the Science Building. They also requested Richard Pleger be hired-on by Neutra and Alexander as associate architect.

The Science Building was completed in 1956 and dedicated on April 2, 1957. Similar in configuration and design to the Business Education Building complex, the Science Building is a linear grouping of two buildings with an offset structure that houses a small planetarium. These Modern style buildings are clad in red brick and stucco and feature flat roofs; covered open walkways; ribbons of fixed and louvered fenestration; short brick “privacy” wind break walls set at angle along the walkways for intimacy, air circulation, and sun control; and wooden louvered overhangs. The circular shape planetarium building is a distinctive separate feature as it is sheathed in similar vertical board siding as the theatre auditorium (Robert B. Moore Theatre), has a round floor plan and is capped by a dome shaped standing seam patina copper roof. This structure originally included a small shallow pool at its western base that followed the shape of the curved exterior wall; however, this feature has since been removed and paved. As a complemental art piece to the study of science an armillary sphere designed by noted Laguna Beach artist Peterpaul Ott was installed at the south end of the building complex. This piece
cost roughly $5,000 and weighs 1,000 pounds with a concrete foundation sunk six feet underground. Of course, landscaping around the Science Building was planned and designed by Eckbo upon approval by the Board. The landscape plan called for 140 trees, 500 shrubs, and 900 small ground plants keeping the existing trees.

After almost ten years of service, Neutra and Alexander’s contract was not renewed by the Board. Rather the Board considered a new set of architects to finish the initial master plan programming and author in a second phase of development and expansion for the campus. It was also at this time that the partnership of Neutra and Alexander began to strain and was ultimately dissolved in 1958. They both went on to manage their own architectural practices.

In November 1956, the Board authorized the architectural firm of Pleger, Blurock and Hougan (later changed to Pleger, Blurock, Hougan, and Ellerbroek) to prepare plans and specifications for the design of a Home Economics Building. The design of the new complex was to be as specified in Alexander’s master plan and as designed by Neutra, which called for two parts a general classroom wing and a main wing for home economics facilities. The two-part Home Economics Building was constructed by A.D. Penhall, general contractor, and completed in June 1958. The building originally was designed with a craft and supplementary clothes laboratory, a complete clothing laboratory, a laundry area and a foods laboratory. Also included were a living room classroom, six separate classrooms, and a clothing workroom and food workroom. The grounds about the complex were designed by landscape architect Frederick M. Lang. On campus today, these facilities are now referred to and used as the Journalism Building and Writers Row.

A large lecture hall, referred to as the Forum, was authorized by the Board in 1958 with plans drafted by Pleger, Blurock, Hougan, and Ellerbroek. The semi-circular shape building and curving covered walks included roughly 8,995 square feet of space to accommodate a 400 seat lecture hall with closed circuit television, instructors’ offices, work rooms, and restrooms. The Modernistic building was designed after the style, form, materials, and features of the Speech Arts auditorium (Robert B. Moore Theatre). The Forum was completed in 1960 and has been utilized for classroom lectures and evening programs. Landscaping plans for the grounds of the new lecture hall were completed by Frederick M. Lang. The Forum was rechristened the Dr. Giles T. Brown Forum in the spring of 2007.

The two-story OCC gymnasium was completed in December 1961 and christened the Peterson Gymnasium after the founding president Basil H. Peterson in 1962. Designed by Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek to complement the Modernistic style of the improvements throughout the campus, this complex includes a large indoor gymnasium with formal lobby, classrooms, toilets, storage, weight room, dance room, and wrestling area. It also
includes a separate men's locker room wing, a separate women's locker room wing, and covered walk and brick wall that interconnects the locker rooms, pool stadium, and gymnasium together. The minimalist larger gymnasium features a multi-plane flat roof, minimal ornamentation, ribbons of clerestory windows, cantilevered canopies over pedestrian walkways, and a large glazed entry court that fronts south onto the parking lot. The one-story men's and women's locker rooms as well as the pool stadium are situated to the east of the gymnasium and are separated by a covered walkway. The locker rooms are similar in design features and basic form as the gymnasium, though on a smaller scale.

Plans for a science lecture hall addition was initially reviewed and approved by the Board in June 1959. After several iterations of preliminary plans and oversight of construction problems the building was finally completed in 1964. The architects Pleger, Blurock, Hugan, and Ellerbroek designed the large lecture hall after the shape and style of the Moore Theatre (Speech Arts Building auditorium) and the later Forum building. With 374 seats the Science Hall was built on campus at a 70-degree angle as opposed to the Forum's 90-degree angle. This arrangement of the two lecture halls added further uniqueness to the campus and complemented the Modernistic trends of the Forum and the Robert B. Moore Theatre. The adjacent Science Lecture Hall classrooms opened in the fall of 1971.

Expansion and improvement of the campus through much of the 1960s was slow with little new construction occurring. A third master plan phase was developed in the 1970s when many new buildings were designed in the Post-Modern style and erected on the perimeter of the central campus quad. Additional building programs followed in the 1990s and 2000s.

**SIGNIFICANCE EVALUATION**

The OCC campus today comprises a wide variety of buildings and landscape elements representing evolving ideas in community college planning and architecture. As indicated above, the first major phase of development occurred with the initial planning of the campus and drafting of the master plan by Robert E. Alexander. Representative of prevailing campus planning trends at the time the stylistic design of the early buildings set the precedence for future building.

The basic design of the campus and classrooms were consistent with the building traditions of the time as well. Unlike the design of most earlier classroom buildings, postwar campuses exploited steel framing, plate glass, and low-rise horizontal massing. The standardized plans of multi-story, pre-war school structures were rejected by modernist architects of the day. The desire for flexibility, a key term of postwar building, enhanced the popularity of new materials and configurations of plan design for both lower and higher
educational facilities. Flexibility was both a desirable quality for the structural aspects of a building, embodied in open corridors, non-load-bearing partitions, and zoned ventilation and heating systems, but also included provisions for re-arranging interior features and spaces.

As mentioned, the Orange Coast College campus was planned in incremental stages over a period of years. The central core of the campus physically and visually reflects the unity and cohesiveness that Alexander planned for and Neutra envisioned by design. This early master planning of the campus was further integrated and complemented by the landscape program designed and executed by landscape architect Garrett Eckbo. The interrelationship between the buildings and landscape is still physically and visually evocent by the arrangement and configuration of the buildings to the walkways, plantings, signage, and other associated accessory features.

Collectively, the buildings' combination of relaxed informality and restrained compositional style along with the distinctive landscape features defines the core campus as a Neutra and Alexander inspired design. The detached, one-story linear classroom wings of brick, stucco, wood, and glass, and a more explicit interaction with the outdoor plantings and hardscape features help to achieve this more informal effect. The long sleek band of ribbon windows, stucco sheathing with brick treatment, spider leg outriggings, louvered wall screens and louvered shade canopies, and immaculate detailing help to connect the buildings and their design with Richard Neutra's earlier work elsewhere.

The later work of the 1950s by Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek, also complements Alexander's initial improvements on the campus as well as Neutra and Alexander's collective designs for the college. Those subsequent design efforts that were directed by the Board also included the work of noted Orange County architect William Blurock.

Because the central core of the campus possesses a significant concentration, linkage, and continuity of buildings, structures, landscape features, and objects that are united historically, architecturally, and aesthetically by plan and physical development this area is identified as a potential historic district. The district derives its importance from being a unified entity that visually conveys a sense of the overall historic environment and shares an interrelationship by arrangement, function, and plan. This collection of improvements, including its buildings, structures, landscape, and accessory objects is also historically significant as they embody the distinctive characteristics of a particular property type, period of construction, and architectural expression. This district is also the collective work involving master planner and architect, Robert E. Alexander; master architect, Richard J. Neutra; master landscape architect Garrett Eckbo, and local master architect William E. Blurock. The period of significance for the historic district is 1948 to 1964. This span of time captures the initial master
planning and design of the community college by Robert E. Alexander; the design and planning work of Neutra and Alexander; as well as the early phase two master plan work of William E. Blerock under the partnership of Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek.

Contributors to the district represent the significant property types that comprise a historic community college educational institution. These include the classroom facilities; laboratory facilities; student/faculty support facilities; lecture auditoriums and theater; physical education facilities; and lecture halls. Landscape features of the district include paved walkways and their material, location, configuration, and design; mature plantings set around classroom buildings and within screen walls, patio areas, and open sitting areas; flagpole, clock tower, distinct planter boxes, signage, and other similar objects within the core campus grounds; and many of the mature plantings and tall trees set within the campus grounds.

The historic district has been evaluated as eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 for its early master planning concepts of a community college located within Orange County and under Criterion 3, for its distinctive architectural and design qualities as interpreted in an educational facility and for its direct association with master planner and architect Robert E. Alexander; master architect Richard Neutra; landscape architect Garrett Eckbo; and Orange County architect William E. Blurock. The property also satisfies the local City of Costa Mesa criteria for architecture and educational development. As such, the subject property as defined above is considered a historic resource pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines.

The Robert B. Moore Theatre building is also individually historically significant for its unique and distinctive architectural styling and direct association with master designers: architect Richard Neutra; landscape architect Garrett Eckbo; and acoustical engineer Dr. Vern Knudsen. Therefore, this property is also considered a historic resource pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines on its own merit.

---

30 A contributing property is defined as any building, structure, or object located within a historic district that adds to the historical integrity or architectural qualities that make the district significant. Contributors to historic districts are considered historic resources under CEQA.

31 State CEQA Guidelines, 14 CCR Section 15064.5(a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID NO</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Architect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stadium (105) and Field House (110)</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>Business Education Wing (12)</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>Business Education Wing (13)</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>Business Education Wing (14)</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>Classroom &amp; Lab (8) (with library extension)</td>
<td>1950/1955</td>
<td>Alexander with Pleger/Neutra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>Classroom &amp; Lab (9)</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td>Counseling Admission (Student Success Ctr) (7)</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pool Stadium (93)</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gymnasium (91)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Women's Locker Room Wing (92)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Men's Locker Room Wing (96)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Theatre (Auditorium)/Drama Lab/Studio (2)</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Science Hall (40)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>Math Wing (Science) (35)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>Math Wing (Science) (36)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25b</td>
<td>Reprographics Center (Science) (37)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>Science (38)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Planetarium (Science) (39)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Journalism (72) (orig Home Economics)</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Computing Center (73)</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Music Wing (4)</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander with Pleger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences Forum (81)</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Writer's Row (71) (orig Home Economics)</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Pleger, Blurock, Hougan and Ellerbroek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Science Building Art Piece: Armillary Sphere</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Peterpaul Ott w/Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>Landscape Elements: main quad area walkways, maritime flagpole, planters, mature trees, shrubs, and plantings</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>Alexander, Eckbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID NO</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Historic District Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Watson Hall (87)</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Student Health Center (89)</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Administration (1)</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b</td>
<td>Faculty House (11)</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17c</td>
<td>Special Services (10)</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Math Lecture Halls 1 &amp; 2 (41)</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29a</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences (80)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29b</td>
<td>Bookstore (83)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bursar’s Office (149)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Classroom &amp; Lab (150)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Student Center (86)</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Handball Courts (97)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Track &amp; Field (103)</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **ANALYSIS OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

**A. THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE/Criteria For Adverse Impacts**

1. **CEQA Guidelines**

   The CEQA Guidelines state that a project involves a "substantial adverse change" when one or more of the following occurs:

   - Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.\(^{32}\)
   
   - The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project:\(^{33}\)
     
     a. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or

     b. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

     c. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

   As such, substantial adverse effects may include, but are not limited to, physical destruction or damage to all or part of a historic property caused by vibration and/or sound;

---

\(^{32}\) State CEQA Guidelines, 14 CCR Section 15064.5(b)(1).

\(^{33}\) State CEQA Guidelines, 14 CCR Section 15064.5(b)(2).
removal of the property from its historic location; isolation from or change of features within the property’s historic setting; visual, atmospheric or audible intrusions; foreseeable effects that may occur later in time or farther removed in distance; and cumulative effects.

To be eligible for listing in the National Register and California Register, and as applied at the local level, a property must not only be shown to be historically significant under the applicable criteria (federal, state and local), but it must also have integrity. Integrity is defined as the ability of a property to convey its significance. Pursuant to CEQA, projects that may compromise the integrity of a property, and therefore, compromise its historical significance may be adverse.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (SOI Standards) are codified at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 67.7. The SOI Standards are designed to ensure that rehabilitation does not impair the significance of a historic property. In most circumstances, the SOI Standards are relevant in assessing whether there is a substantial adverse change under CEQA. Section 15064.5b(3) of the CEQA Guidelines states in part that “…a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historic resource.”

2. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

As stated above, projects that may affect historic resources are considered to be mitigated to a level of less than significant, if they conform to the SOI Standards. Projects with no other potential environmental impacts qualify for a Class 31 exemption under CEQA if they meet the SOI Standards.34

The definition of “rehabilitation” assumes that at least some repair or alteration of a historic property will be needed in order to provide for an efficient contemporary use or maintain its historic use. However, these repairs and alterations must not damage or destroy materials, features, or finishes that are important in defining a property’s historic character and significance.

34 14 CCR Section 155331.
The ten standards for rehabilitation are as follows:

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive historic feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterized the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and mass to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The SOI Standards were developed by the NPS to assist property owners and managers in rehabilitating their historic properties. The SOI Standards contain a specific hierarchy for decision-making in assessing the rehabilitation of any historic building. First, the significant materials and features of a property must be identified. Then a method for their retention and preservation must be found. If the physical condition of character-defining materials warrants additional work, repair is recommended. If deterioration or damage precludes repair, then replacement can be considered.

In addition to the rehabilitation of character-defining features, the SOI Standards also address alterations and additions to historic properties, as well as retrofitting properties for health and safety requirements. Some alterations to a historic property may be needed to assure its continued use; however, these modifications should not obscure or destroy important character-defining features of the property or jeopardize those qualities that justify or convey the property’s historical significance.

B. PROPOSED PROJECT

In order to achieve the goals and objectives of the Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan, the proposed project would involve the demolition of certain existing buildings; the renovation of existing buildings; and the construction and eventual operation of new buildings and campus facilities as illustrated in Figures 4-1 through 4-5. The proposed project would also involve improvements to the existing pedestrian circulation network in and around the campus and the enhancement of open space areas through landscape and pedestrian plaza improvements. Construction of the proposed project would result in the reconfiguration of existing parking lots and vehicular entryways, and the addition of a parking structure on an existing OC Fairgrounds lot.

Specific program- and project-level components include buildings and facilities and site improvements for the OCC campus (see Figures 4-1 and 4-2). Based on the information contained in the Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan, some elements would be assessed for CEQA compliance at the program level because specific project details are not known at this time. A few of these elements are dependent upon a future joint-venture partnership between the District and a developer yet to be identified. Project-specific plans would be developed after the joint venture is initiated. Other proposed project elements have detailed information available and would receive project-level assessment.

Project Level

The project-level buildings and facilities proposed for new construction as a component of the project includes five improvements:


OC Fairgrounds Parking Structure. The District, in partnership with the State of California, to construct up to a four-level parking structure for 2,000 vehicles on an existing OC Fairgrounds lot at the corner of Fairview Road and Arlington Avenue.

New Multidisciplinary Building. A new Multidisciplinary Building is proposed south of the Adams Lot and west of the new Business, Math, and Computing Center. The new building would house a variety of programs, including business, math, computing, language arts, and social sciences.

New Language Arts and Social Science Building. A new Language Arts and Social Science Building is proposed in the center of the campus, just south of Le Bard Stadium and north of the central quad to the east of the proposed new Business, Math, and Computing Center.

New Adaptive PE Facilities, Men’s and Women’s Locker Rooms, Pools, and Fitness Facilities. New adaptive PE and fitness facilities, men’s and women’s locker rooms, and swimming/dive pools are proposed north of the existing Locker Room and Gymnasium Facilities and northeast of the Track and Field arena. These building may include remodelling the existing facilities or construction of new buildings and structures.

Program Level

The program-level buildings and facilities proposed for new construction as a component of the project includes five improvements:

Administration Building. A new Administration Building would be constructed to house the Campus Administration offices, which include the offices of the OCC president, vice president, foundation, and public information. In addition, the public safety office, bursar’s office, and classrooms would occupy the new Administration Building.

Planetarium. This proposed 9,300 square foot facility would be used by the college and the community and would be sited to allow for public access from the Merrimac parking lot.
**Student Union/Bookstore/Culinary Arts/Student Success Center.** This project element is planned to be developed slightly north of the corner at Fairview Road and Merrimac Way.

**Student Housing Project.** This project component would include approximately 200,000 square feet of space and would be supported by a private partner. Construction would occur at the corner of Adams Avenue and the campus entry.

**Mixed-Use Development.** This project component would consist of commercial/retail uses on the street level and a hotel on the upper levels. Commercial uses would include a conferencing center, while the retail space would include a fast-casual restaurant, bookstore, coffee shop, and other retail amenities.

2. **Buildings and Facilities (Renovation)**

**Project Level**

The program-level buildings and facilities proposed for new construction as a component of the project includes five improvements:

**Recycling Center Expansion and Circulation/Parking Improvements.** The District proposes to expand the existing recycling center for the purposes of accommodating recycling demand in the City of Costa Mesa. The expansion would primarily enhance pedestrian and vehicular safety on approach to and within the recycling center. It would also provide greater on-site space for visitors to drop sorted recyclable materials at designated areas; landscaped frontage along Adams Avenue; an area for composting; raised planter beds; outdoor instructional space; a 2,500 square foot covered storage area for trucks, forklifts, and equipment; and large modular spaces for storage. A 54-foot truck turnaround area would be provided for vehicles transporting recyclable materials off campus. The expansion of the site would also involve increasing the number of parking spaces from approximately 8 to 45 dedicated spaces. Expansions would be able to accommodate triple the amount visitors that the Recycling Center it currently receives.

**Skill Center.** Renovations would occur at the existing Skill Center building in order to meet instructional needs.

**College Support Center.** The existing Literature and Languages Building would be renovated in order to provide centralized instructional support services.

**Chemistry Building.** The District proposes to remodel and expand the existing Chemistry Building. The Chemistry Building is located in the center of the campus, south of Adams Lot.
PROGRAM LEVEL

The program-level buildings and facilities proposed for new construction as a component of the project includes five improvements:

3. BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES (DEMOLITION)

Over a dozen buildings and facilities are proposed demolition under the Vision 2020 Facilities Master Plan. The table below summarizes those improvements proposed for demolition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Building/Area</th>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Student Center (86)</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Administration Building (1)</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>Haley Business Learning Center (10)</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b</td>
<td>Faculty House (11)</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>Classrooms and Laboratories (8)</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>Classrooms and Laboratories (9)</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td>Student Success Center (7)</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17c</td>
<td>Special Services (10)</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gymnasium/Locker Rooms (91)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gymnasium/Locker Rooms (92)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gymnasium/Locker Rooms (96)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gymnasium/Pool Stadium</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>Math Wing (35)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>Math Wing (36)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25b</td>
<td>George Hoag Family Foundation/Repro Ctr (37)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Planetarium (39)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Journalism (72)</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29a</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences (80)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29b</td>
<td>Bookstore (83)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bursar's Office (149)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>Building/Area</td>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>District Transportation Office</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outside of District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Writer’s Row (71)</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Campus Public Safety (147)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outside of District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>150 Annex (150)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Non-Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Quad Area Landscape/Hardscape Features</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>District Contributor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **SITE IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENTS**

Site improvements proposed include parking and vehicular entry, pedestrian circulation, and site infrastructure improvements.

**Parking/Vehicular Entry Improvements.** Parking Lot E, located in the southwestern corner of the campus would be reconfigured to provide a primary entry from Merrimac Way, as well as two secondary entries from Merrimac Way. Parking Lot E would serve as an alternative site for the OC Fairgrounds Parking Structure. In addition, entries from Fairview would be enhanced with the addition of formal gateways and marked pedestrian drop-off points.

**Pedestrian Circulation.** The proposed project builds on the existing pedestrian paved pathways, completing the pedestrian connectivity around the central quad. Pedestrian pathways would be paved and landscaped to signify that they are entryways into the campus.

**Infrastructure Improvements.** The construction of a 2 megawatt solar photovoltaic system is proposed in the Adams parking lot. Solar panels would be installed on top of carport structures.

5. **ANALYSIS OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

The proposed project anticipates the demolition of all most of the existing core campus improvements, including the majority of contributing properties and landscape features to the potentially eligible OCC Campus Historic District. The existing setting of the core campus area would be re-designed and re-configured in a manner that would destroy all semblance of the historic character of the site and those qualities that convey the district’s historical significance, period of significance, and eligibility to the California Register and local City of Costa Mesa landmark list. The demolition, re-configuration, and re-design of contributing resources as proposed by the current project would result in significant adverse impacts under CEQA. These impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are still required.
5. MITIGATION MEASURES

A. CEQA MITIGATION APPROACHES

According to CEQA, mitigation may include:

- Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
- Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation;
- Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment;
- Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action;
- Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments;\(^{15}\) and
- Utilizing the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards of Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.\(^{16}\)

B. CONSIDERATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES

CEQA requires the Lead Agency to examine and impose mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that would avoid or minimize any impacts or potential impacts to historic resources.

When identified historic resources are involved, avoidance or preservation in place is the preferable course of action. When total avoidance or preservation in place is not possible, a hierarchy of treatment approaches should be examined and assessed for feasibility. Such treatment approaches may include partial retention, relocation, or reconstruction. Demolition and recordation under CEQA are not considered acceptable treatment approaches as recordation does not address the adverse change resulting from the determination of the

\(^{15}\) CEQA Guidelines, Section 15370.

\(^{16}\) CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(b)(3).
physical characteristics that justify the inclusion of the resource in the California Register and/or local landmark register.

C. PROJECT MITIGATION MEASURES

Under the proposed project, the majority of contributors to the identified OCC Historic District would be removed for the development of an open landscaped quad area. The following mitigation measures shall be required to document the important history and architecture of the site and its overall historical association with the early development of the OCC campus. Note that even with the following mitigation measures, the identified adverse impacts caused by the implementation of the proposed project would not be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Recordation

A Historic Structures Report shall be prepared prior to any alteration, relocation, or demolition of any contributing buildings, structures, objects, features, or landscape elements located within the identified OCC Historic District. The work shall be completed by a qualified historic preservation professional who meets the requirements of the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications for history, architectural history, or historic architecture. The report shall be prepared in a manner consistent with the recommended approaches outlined in the National Park Service Preservation Brief 43: The Preparation and Use of Historic Structures Reports. The report shall document the significance and physical condition of all contributing buildings, structures, objects, features, and landscape elements with photographs, text narrative, and existing drawings. This documentation shall include at a minimum:

- A written historic and descriptive report completed in narrative format, including an architectural data form for each contributing resource.

- A site plan showing the location of each building. This site plan shall include a photo key.

- A sketch floor plan shall accompany each architectural data form.

- Large format (4” x 5” or larger negative) photographs in accordance with Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) guidelines and standards. Views shall include contextual views, all exterior elevations, details views of significant exterior architectural features, and interior views of significant historical architectural features or spaces.
• Field photographs (digital) based on HABS guidelines to ensure full documentation of the site. Views should correspond to and augment those in the large format photographs. Such photographs shall be logged, tagged, and collected onto a media storage device for safe archiving.

• Available historic photographs and historic and/or current as-built plans of the site and its contributing resources shall be reproduced digitally or photographically and included in the recordation document.

One original copy of the documentation as specified above shall be assembled and offered to each of the following entities:

• One set shall be sent to the Southern California Information Center at California State University, Fullerton.

• One set shall be offered to and, if accepted, deposited in the archives of the Los Angeles Conservancy.

• One set shall be offered to and, if accepted, deposited in the archives of the University of California, Irvine.

• One set shall be offered to and, if accepted, deposited in the archives of the City of Costa Mesa Public Library.

• One set shall be offered to and, if accepted, deposited in the archives of The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens.

• One set shall be offered to and, if accepted, deposited in the archives of the Neutra Institute for Survival Through Design.

• One set shall be offered to and, if accepted, deposited in the archives of the Los Angeles Conversancy.

• One set shall be offered to and, if accepted, deposited in the archives of the Orange County Archives.

• One set shall be offered to and, if accepted, deposited in the archives of the Costa Mesa Historical Society.
Salvage and Reuse of Key Features.

Prior to demolition of any contributing resources, including landscape elements, within the OCC Historic District, an inventory of significant exterior character-defining features, distinctive architectural elements, and materials shall be made by a qualified historic preservation professional who satisfies the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications for history, architectural history or historic architecture. Where feasible these features shall be itemized, photographed, salvaged, and incorporated into the new design of the campus pursuant to the 2020 Facilities Master Plan. To the extent salvageable materials exceed on-site reuse needs, they may be sold, donated, or exchanged for use elsewhere in the community. Unsound, decayed, or toxic materials (e.g. asbestos, etc.) need not be included in the salvage process. Some materials shall also be incorporated into an educational interpretive program as discussed as part of the following mitigation measure. Salvage efforts shall be documented by summarizing all measures taken to encourage receipt of salvaged materials by the public.

Interpretive Educational Program

To assist the students, faculty, parents, other interested parties in understanding the early history of OCC, an interpretive multi-media educational program and 3-D public art display shall be incorporated into the development of the reconfigured campus quad area and/or campus library. This interpretive program and public art work shall be developed with the assistance of a qualified architectural historian or historic preservation professional who satisfies the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications. Content and design of the interpretive program should be specific to OCC, specifically the architecture and historical development of the campus. The program/display may include but not be limited to: commemorative signage; plaques; enlarged and framed historic photographs; representative statues; salvaged materials; models; display of as-built plans and drawings; educational interactive CD software program; other relevant displays and exhibits; tours or events; and published information in the form of brochures, pamphlets, videos, electronic media, campus web site, etc.
6. LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Under CEQA, the mitigation measures required herein would reduce, but not eliminate the significant impacts of the proposed project to the identified historic district and its contributing resources. The substantial demolition of the buildings, structures, objects, features, and landscape elements that comprise the OCC Historic District would result in a substantial adverse change to the historic property (the historic district) and the environment. The impact to the OCC Historic District cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. Nevertheless, the measures outlined for documentation of the District, the salvage and reuse of significant character-defining features, and the development of an interpretative educational program(s) are important to assure that information regarding the historical development of the college campus, its association with master architect Richard Neutra, and its physical manifestation of Modern style educational facilities are documented, retained, archived, and promoted.
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PHOTO - 1: The initial master plan for the campus from 1949.
PHOTO - 2: Aerial view of the OCC campus during the initial expansion period, c.1953.

PHOTO - 3: Aerial view of the OCC campus, looking southeast, c.1957.
PHOTO - 4: Neutra rendering of the Science Building and Planetarium, north end.

PHOTO - 5: Neutra rendering of the Science Building and Planetarium, south end.

PHOTO - 6: Alexander rendering of the Library addition and clock tower.
PHOTO - 7: Auditorium (Moore Theatre), c.1960s.

PHOTO - 8: Library building and clock tower, looking northwest, c.1960s.


PHOTO - 12: Science Building south end with armillary sphere (right), 1956.


PHOTO - 17: Inner courtyard area of Counseling/Admission Office with clock tower, 2014.

PHOTO - 18: Classroom/labs (originally the library) with clock tower, looking northwest, 2014.


PHOTO - 22: Classroom wing with corridor and landscape details, looking northeast, 2014.
PHOTO - 23: Central quad area context with landscape features, looking southwest, 2014.

PHOTO - 24: Central quad area with landscape features, looking south, 2014.

PHOTO - 26: Gymnasium complex, looking northwest, 2014.


PHOTO - 31: Field House at Football Stadium, looking northwest, 2014.

PHOTO - 33: Campus landscape features, 2014.

PHOTO - 34: Campus landscape features, 2014.
PHOTO - 35: Campus corridor details, 2014.

PHOTO - 36: Classroom window and planting details, 2014.
PHOTO - 37: Classroom wing fenestration and canopy overhang details, 2014.

PHOTO - 38: Classroom wing fenestration and canopy overhang details, 2014.

PHOTO - 40: Monument sign along Fairview Road, 2014.
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D1. Historic Name: Orange Coast College  
D2. Common Name: OCC-Orange Coast College  
D3. Detailed Description (Discuss overall coherence of the district, its setting, visual characteristics, and minor features. List all elements of district.):  
The Orange Coast College District is located in the City of Costa Mesa, a developed community within the jurisdiction of Orange County. Composed of five buildings arranged on the campus of Orange Coast College, the district lies between Fairview Road on the east, Adams Avenue on the north, Merrimac Way on the south, and a residential area to the west (See Continuation Sheet 3 of 4).

D4. Boundary Description (Describe limits of district and attach map showing boundary and district elements.):  
The district is bounded on the north by Adams Avenue and on the west by a residential neighborhood. It is bounded on the south by Merrimac Way and on the east by Fairview Road.

D5. Boundary Justification:

D6. Significance: Theme Education  
Period of Significance Applicable Criteria  
Discussed district's importance in terms of its historical context as defined by themes, period of significance, and geographic scope. Also address the integrity of the district as a whole.  
Richard Neutra was renowned international style architect established a partnership with architect Robert Alexander during the 1950s. The agreed upon scope for the Neutra and Alexander work was confined to the "big" areas of planning and of public and commercial architecture, conducted in an office in Glendale. As a team, Neutra and Alexander were probably best on these planning projects of the early 1950s. In formulating the plans, each made basic conceptual contributions, with Neutra taking chief responsibility for architectural design and Alexander assuming control of planning, organization, and logistics. One of the ongoing commissions Alexander brought to the partnership was for the developing Campus of Orange Coast College (See Continuation Sheet 4 of 4).

D7. References (Give full citations including the names and addresses of any informants, where possible.):  
County Tax Assessors Records; Sanborn Maps; Building Permits; Costa Mesa Public Library; Los Angeles Public Library; Costa Mesa Historical Society

D8. Evaluator: Jan Ostashay  
Affiliation and Address: Jan Ostashay  
Date: 7/6/99
D. Detailed Description

The five resources are:

The Science Building (Building Nos. 35 and 36)

The Speech Arts and Theatre Building (Building No. 2)

The Business Education Building (Building Nos. 12 and 13)

The Football Stadium (Building No. 135)

The Swim Stadium and Gymnasium (Building Nos. 91, 93, and 94)
The Orange Coast College, a building complex developed over a period of years, comprises: Speech Arts and Music Center, Business Education, Stadium, Swimming pool, Science Group with planetarium.

The Speech Arts and Music Center with its grand "aula" or auditorium occupies a prominent location at the hub of the campus. The requirements for the Center were drawn up in close cooperation with the teaching staff concerned with the study of language, voice, dramatics, and instrumental music. Student representatives also took part in program deliberations since student participation in the preparation and performance of the theatrical events was of prime importance. These events were to vary from intimate and small-scale productions to those of larger scale and dramatic pageantry. The college was then particularly interested in exploring the "theatre-in-the-round" as well as the "audience-in-the-round" techniques. Provisions for these and for various types of musical production were considered in the design.

The "theatre-in-the-round" takes place right on the stage itself where strong tables of different heights are designed as removable and adjustable seat platforms, allowing several patterns for audience seating. A pair of revolving stages add to the flexibility of uses as do the two side stages which permit the dramatic action to extend around the audience. Huge motor-driven doors open the stage to the outdoor amphitheater.

Because it was planned in incremental stages over a period of years, the campus lacked a central unifying orientation that would have strengthened the aggregate of competent, though unspectacular architecture. However, even with this design flaw, Neutra's signature style - International is apparent in these campus buildings. A key element of this style includes: the Science Building; the Speech Arts and Theatre Building; the Business Education Building; the Football Stadium and the Swim Stadium and Gymnasium.
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