

Meeting Minutes

Mt. SAC Master Plan Steering Task Force Meeting #6

Date May 19, 2017
Project Mt. SAC 2018 Educational and Facilities Master Plan
HMC Job # 5018016.000
Present

Mt. SAC Master Plan Steering Task Force (MPSTF):

Madelyn Arballo, Dean, School of Continuing Education
Jeff Archibald, MPSTF Tri-chair and President, Academic Senate
Dalia Chavez, Faculty, Counseling, School of Continuing Education
Craig Deines, Faculty, Fine Arts
Francisco Dorame, Associate Dean, Counseling
Ruben Flores, Equipment Operator, Grounds, CSEA 651
Tamra Horton, Faculty, Humanities & Social Sciences
Jonathan Hymer, Faculty, Technology & Health
Mika Klein, Senior Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning & Management
Patty Leon-Encalade, Project Manager, Facilities Planning & Management
Mark Lowentroun, Associate Dean, Arts
Irene Malmgren, MPSTF Tri-chair and Vice President, Instruction
Tom Mauch, Dean, Counseling
Joumana McGowan, Associate Vice President, Instruction
Barbara McNeice-Stallard, MPSTF Resource and Director, Research & Institutional Effectiveness
Mark Ruh, Faculty, Kinesiology, Athletics, & Dance
Don Sachs, Special Assistant to the President
Lina Soto, Faculty, Counseling
Chisa Uyeki, Faculty, Library & Learning Resources
Audrey Yamagata-Noji, MPSTF Tri-chair and Vice President, Student Services

Master Plan Consultant Team:

Gerdo Aquino, SWA Group
Sandra (Sandy) Kate, HMC Architects
Ken Salyer, HMC Architects
Sheryl Sterry, HMC Architects
Emilie Waugh, HMC Architects
Jana Wehby, SWA Group
Alysen Weiland, Psomas

Purposes

- To review and discuss the Facilities Planning Objectives.
- To review and discuss proposals for campus site and facilities development and make recommendations to the Campus Master Plan Coordinating Team (CMPCT).

Items Discussed

6.1 Welcome and Updates

- A. Irene Malmgren welcomed everyone. She said that this is a critical juncture in the master planning process and that the Master Plan Steering Task Force must give the Master Plan Consultant Team very clear directions.
 - 1. Irene said the Educational Master Plan chapters are going out to the College for a final review. They have been reviewed and revised twice, and now must be reviewed one last time to make sure the data accurately reflects Mt. SAC's programs and services.
 - 2. The Educational Master Plan is the foundation for the work on the Facilities Master Plan. The feedback the Master Plan Consultant Team gets today will be critical because it will inform the work that will be produced over the summer.
- B. Sheryl Sterry welcomed everyone as well and reiterated that this will be the last time this group meets before the summer. The next MPSTF meeting will be held in early September when the draft master plan document will be presented. That meeting will kick off the review of the EFMP document as a whole,
- C. Sheryl announced updates in the EFMP process:
 - 1. Mt. SAC Student Life conducted a series of student focus group meetings in April and May to find out what is important to students and should be addressed in the Master Plan regarding campus facilities. Much good input was gathered and is being used to help craft proposed facilities planning options.
 - 2. CMPCT reviewed and approved the EFMP document template recently. It is now ready to be populated with the EMP and FMP content.
 - 3. Meetings were held with the leaderships of the School of Continuing Education and Student Services to discuss specific facilities proposals. These proposals are part of the options that will be presented today for the MPSTF's comment.
 - 4. A meeting was held with the Instructional Division administrative staff, who schedule classes in classrooms, to hear about the existing inventory of classrooms and how it might be improved.
 - 5. Mt. SAC's Sustainability Conference was held on May 12, 2017, and the Master Plan Consultant Team participated in discussions to further develop sustainability recommendations for Mt. SAC's Climate Action Plan and EFMP.

6.2 Review of Key Considerations Introduced at Previous Meetings

- A. Sandy Kate reviewed key considerations for the MPSTF to keep in mind during this meeting:
 - 1. It is important to view the Educational and Facilities Master Plan as a guide or roadmap for how Mt. SAC will develop its facilities over the long term. The EFMP is a

10-year plan, but the goal is to create a vision for the next 50 years. It is important to remember that we are planning at a high level—to plan where the neighborhoods/zones for certain land uses and functions will be. The goal of the plan is not to design buildings or determine the specific details of classrooms. This will be done after the EFMP is completed and during its implementation when the College will set design standards and sizes for spaces that will house specific functions. But for the present, the work on the EFMP is all about establishing a broad vision for the campus.

2. As an example, Mika Klein encouraged the MPSTF to think about the utilities infrastructure updates that will be happening soon. One reason for having a master plan is to establish a very clear campus framework to guide updates of systems like infrastructure. It will help to prevent placing systems where they will need to be dug up and moved down the road. The EFMP can serve to “reserve space” for land uses, such as buildings. A certain project may not be built until a later phase, but it is important to know what the project will be and where it will be built. The EFMP will help us to remember the College’s long-term needs and not compromise the ability to meet these needs by building only to satisfy short-term needs.
3. Sandy then emphasized that, as the MPSTF looks at options later in the meeting, they should keep in mind the concept for the total build-out of the campus. Not all the buildings shown in the options will be built immediately, but a place for each must be included in the plan.
4. Sandy also reviewed the role of the MPSTF, which is to make recommendations to CMPCT and Mt. SAC’s leadership. Ultimately, CMPCT’s recommendations will be submitted to the Board of Trustees. Sandy presented a diagram showing all the stakeholders involved in the master planning process, and how their input flows through to inform decision-making by the leadership of the College.

B. Sandy talked about the goals of this meeting:

1. To make a recommendation to CMPCT regarding the Facilities Planning Objectives of the EFMP.
2. To develop consensus regarding a preferred concept for campus facilities development that will be recommended to CMPCT.

6.3 Proposed Facilities Planning Objectives

- A. Sandy explained that Facilities Planning Objectives are a high-level list summarized from all the discussions with College stakeholders of what should be in the plan for the next 10-50 years. These objectives are important to ensure that the EFMP accomplishes what the College needs from it.
- B. Sandy explained that this list is compiled from input received to date, but asked the MPSTF to help validate the list by offering their input. This list has been compiled from the following.
 1. Discussions with College stakeholders, including the MPSTF, sustainability groups, student groups; as well as the EMP interviews with programs and services

2. Discussions with community members who attended the Community Facilities Plan Advisory Committee meetings and trustee-hosted community meetings
 3. Educational master plan data portfolio and recommendations
 4. Facilities master plan analysis of the physical conditions of the campus and its physical context
- C. The objectives are broken down into four areas.
1. Campus Site
 2. Indoor Spaces
 3. Outdoor Spaces
 4. Sustainability
- D. Irene said it is important to ensure that informed input carries the most weight. She expressed concern that steps in the process to show a direct connection from the Educational Plan Interview Themes to the Facilities Planning Objectives have not occurred yet. She recommended further discussion with the deans and other groups to validate and prioritize the Facilities Planning Objectives.
- E. Sandy encouraged the MPSTF to read the list of Proposed Facilities Planning Objectives and to offer their feedback. The MPSTF agreed to the following changes.
1. Prioritize for the ultimate goal, which is to advance students' experience and education.
 2. Ensure that prioritization of objectives about educational facilities is guided by the institution and how we see education evolving.
 3. Broaden the objectives to be more general and less specific.
 - a. For example, broaden the objective to provide adequate office space for adjunct faculty to provide adequate office space for faculty.
 - b. Provide large indoor assembly spaces, as well as large outdoor assembly spaces.
 4. "Blend" is not the best word to describe the desired relationship between Town and Gown land areas. Consider "transition" or another term.
 5. In addition to providing enough space, Mt. SAC must provide relevant space, such as space that is designed for community partners to be brought onto the campus.
 6. Aim for equitable access to the campus and clearly define for whom we mean to provide access. Do we go further to provide access to special populations?

7. Audrey Yamagata-Noji cited the facilities implications for Student Services facilities that are included in the EFMP.
 8. Universal Design should be an objective for planning indoor spaces, as well as outdoor spaces.
 9. A bigger picture and vision for facilities is needed that builds on Chapter 6 of the EFMP.
 10. How do we reconcile proposals to zone the campus by functions and programs with the desire to collaborate and build pathways?
- F. Due to the limited meeting time available, Sandy Kate asked the MPSTF for written edits on their copies of the Facilities Planning Objectives, which were collected at the end of the meeting. The process to review and edit the objectives will be continued.

6.4 Facilities Planning Assumptions Review

- A. Sheryl explained that Facilities Planning Assumptions are the conditions and parameters that affect facilities planning. They include:
1. Planned Construction projects
 2. Recommended demolition/removal of temporary facilities that will be replaced with permanent space
 3. Recommended demolition of aged facilities, based on the condition of buildings that are not feasible to renovate
- B. Sheryl also noted the recommendations that are being developed through the Parking and Circulation Master Plan. Based on its study of traffic circulation patterns and the distribution of parking demand throughout the campus, five locations are recommended to be reserved for parking structures.
1. Jeff Archibald voiced concern about two of the proposed parking structures locations near the residential neighbors to the north, who may take issue with those structures as they did with the parking structure that was previously planned for Lot A.
 2. Mika and Sheryl responded that Mt. SAC is planning for parking needs in a responsible manner.
 - a. Mt. SAC needs additional parking capacity for its students, faculty, and staff. It can no longer provide for their needs with surface parking lots alone.
 - b. By including the traffic study in the PCMP, Mt. SAC is doing their due diligence to the community and providing the research and data to show why these parking structure locations were selected.
 - c. The study demonstrates how the flow of traffic around the campus can be improved through a dispersed approach to parking that will distribute the capacity among multiple parking structures that are smaller than the structure

that was previously planned. Each structure will comply with the City of Walnut's building height restriction.

- i. The City's height restriction allows three levels above ground, but that levels can be added underground.
3. It was also noted that Mt. SAC has involved the community in the planning conversation and process. Plans are being shared with community groups, including its Community Facilities Plan Advisory Committee. Mt. SAC is also proposing to do joint design charrettes with the community this summer.
- C. Sheryl reviewed the need for more space to support the future level of enrollment that is being projected in the EFMP. In terms of Title 5 space standards, Mt. SAC can demonstrate a need for additional space.
- D. Irene told the planning team to make certain that the replacement of space in buildings to be demolished are accounted for in the plans for new buildings.

6.5 Campus Framework

- A. Gerdo Aquino and Jana Wehby of SWA reviewed and expanded on the vision for the Campus-wide Framework that was proposed in the April MPSTF meeting.
 1. The primary organizing elements of the framework include strengthening Miracle Mile; strengthening pedestrian corridors and providing universal access; creating a Healthy Living Loop that can be an amenity for the campus and the community; creating "complete streets" that are safe for bicyclists and pedestrians; establishing gateways on either end of Temple Avenue by extending the farm pasture on the east end to extend to Temple Avenue, and extending the Wildlife Sanctuary on the west side of campus to reach across Temple Avenue.
 2. The intent is to build on the notion of expanding the educational experience through an open space framework. Buildings may go away; new ones may come in; but the framework will continue to perform. It must be made clear that people can move through this campus and that there are interesting places for them to be throughout the campus.
 3. Miracle Mile should serve as a primary, strong, and robust pedestrian corridor. It should be unobstructed. It should be wider in some places and connect to secondary and tertiary gateways.
 - a. Jana talked about the responses received from the landscape survey. Looking at some of the survey images that proved to be most popular, the responses tended to support a modern aesthetic using mixed tree varieties on Miracle Mile, with mostly deciduous trees that provide summer shade.
 - b. To build upon the Miracle Mile concept, secondary and tertiary pedestrian corridors are proposed. There is a real opportunity to create unique spaces throughout the campus. Universal design should be used to make way finding clear and easily navigable. There should be many good options for moving through spaces, such as stairs, ramps, and elevator.

4. The Healthy Living Loop would comprise an outer loop of almost 3 miles and shorter loops of about 1 mile each. The Loop would encourage people to go outside and start exercising. And to connect with nature on this campus in a way that will be memorable.
 - a. Irene noted that open access to the farm could be a problem. Jana showed a solution where alternate routes could be taken when the farm needs to be closed off.
5. The vision for the campus provides for many wide pathways with greenery along the way and resting areas with seating. Where there is enough space, it is possible to offer the option to separate the paths for different users, such as pedestrian vs. bicyclist.
6. The Temple Avenue Green Corridor would create two gateways for people entering the campus on Temple Avenue, one near the intersection with Grand Avenue and one near the Farm and the eastern edge of the campus.
7. At the western gateway, much of what is currently Parking Lot B could be transformed into a Living Laboratory, which could support the educational objectives of the Wildlife Sanctuary, but would not be a part of it. Therefore, it could be more accessible to be public and students and used for science and horticulture classes. It could also be used for experimentation and demonstrations, such as planting plots set up to study cultivation within an urban setting.
 - a. Faculty and staff that teach in and manage the Wildlife Sanctuary and Farm, as well as those who attended the Mt. SAC Eco Charrette, strongly expressed their desire to use the campus as a living laboratory. This area would not merely be used passively as a park, but would be used for instruction. This idea also ties in to Dr. Scroggins' idea to develop a sustainability research institute.
 - b. This location also benefits from being a key point for the campus' water infrastructure and would be a great location to demonstrate potential water treatment methods.
8. Jana noted that during meetings with the Farm Agricultural Science faculty and staff, the idea of creating an eastern gateway by extending the Farm frontage and pastureland closer to Temple Avenue was well received. The specifics will need to be discussed and developed in more detail.
9. Jana also touched on ideas to connect pedestrian circulation with the proposed improved parking distribution and circulation by planning for several passenger drop-off and pick-up areas. She also introduced the idea of improving the remaining surface parking lots by designing them with more plantings and landscaping.
10. An entry/gateway is proposed to create a more public orientation for the campus on Grand Avenue. Respondents to the landscape character survey preferred the example of a more modern and timeless look for the entry/gateway—they did not want its aesthetic style to soon look dated.

11. The proposal for the Town and Gown zone would feature an iconic building structure that would be highly visible to the community and identified with the College. This zone would include public plaza spaces and a passenger drop-off area.
12. Miracle Mile Green Spine of open spaces comprise a series of open spaces proposed within the center of campus that would be associated with and would anchor Miracle Mile within the campus-wide framework. These open spaces would provide different kinds of learning and gathering experiences throughout the campus core.
 - a. The Arts Garden and the Arts Plaza would enhance and strengthen the destination at the western end of Miracle Mile by improving the paving and site furnishings and introduce more plantings within these existing open spaces.
 - b. The respondents to the Landscape Character Survey preferred paving with an exposed aggregate surface, but expressed the importance of ensuring that the selected style of paving is universally accessibility. It will also be important to ensure that maintenance requirements for the paving are reasonable. The consensus among survey respondents is that less concrete would be preferred.
 - c. The Inspiration Lawn is proposed as an opportunity to integrate a smaller assembly/gathering/event space in the existing open space that is adjacent to the Performing Arts Center. The existing lawn, which is bounded by the Mountie Café and many mature trees, has been observed to be a very popular gathering space. Although the existing fountain may need to be relocated and the character of this space may change, however, it would likely be well used by students.
 - d. Mountie Plaza is proposed as an opportunity to satisfy the desire for a large outdoor assembly/gathering/event space.
 - i. Audrey Yamagata-Noji expressed concern that this location might be too far north and would not be well utilized. Jana suggested that, as the campus evolves and is more fully developed, the northern area of the campus core could well become more student-oriented and more heavily used by students.
 - e. Founders Green is proposed as an opportunity give more breathing room to Founders Hall and to enhance this iconic symbol of the College with a functional gathering space that ties it with Miracle Mile.
 - f. The Stitch Corridor is proposed to provide space for a series of universally accessible walkways that connect the upper elevations of campus to Miracle Mile and the heart of campus.
 - g. The Terraced Quad is proposed for the heart of campus and provides a sizable and flexible open space to host many kinds of events. It would be situated on Miracle Mile just to the north of the proposed Student Center. The respondents to the Landscape Character Survey liked the idea of a lawn

area and shaded seating areas. It would benefit from the direct connection to Miracle Mile, designed as a formal pedestrian walkway passing through the Quad.

- h. The Library Gardens would support the LRC by providing students with quiet outdoor study spaces that are designed with a similar character to the well-loved gardens that currently exist between Buildings 12 and 13.
 - i. Library Grove would incorporate and expand the collection of existing trees near Building 26. Circulation paths would meander through this shaded open space.
 - j. Innovation Grove would have outdoor study and learning spaces that would support the instructional programs being taught in the surrounding buildings.
13. Along the Temple Avenue street front, a “campus window” is proposed that would take advantage of the opportunity to show the community a significant and well-designed view of campus buildings and open spaces as they travel on Temple Avenue. Key elements of this area include:
- a. Well-designed outward facing views of important Mt. SAC buildings, including the Science Lab Building, Eco Center, and LRC.
 - b. Landscaped outdoor areas, including the Temple Avenue Green Corridor, a passenger drop-off and pick-up zone, and a surface parking lot where access can be controlled for special event parking, but would generally be used for the LRC and other campus destinations. Access into the surface lot would come from Temple Avenue, although it is not likely that another traffic signal could be provided.
14. At the far eastern end of campus, Miracle Mile is proposed to be anchored within the agricultural science-themed campus gateway, by a picnic grounds with tables shaded by trees and views of the hills and Farm pastures.

6.6 Proposed Campus Development Options

- A. Sheryl reviewed the overall land use zoning of the campus, which had been presented in the February MPSTF meeting and analysis of existing campus conditions. The zoning scheme was established in previous master plans, but it was noted that the zones might shift slightly due to the recommendations of this EFMP. The Master Plan Consultant Team presented a closer look at specific functional zones within the overall campus land use zoning plan and proposed options for building new facilities.
- B. Student Services Zone
 - 1. The Student Services zone is proposed for the area near the heart of the campus core, residing just to the north of Miracle Mile, with adjacency to the new Student Center, instructional buildings, the Terraced Quad, the Inspiration Lawn, the Mountie Café, as well as to parking structure PS-A, and a passenger drop-off area. Four options for new student services facilities were presented. All four options include a new Student Services building where Building 9A currently exists, as well as a future

building location in case it is needed. Mika asked the MPSTF to keep in mind that these proposed buildings would be two- or three-story buildings.

- a. Option 1: There would be an adjacent outdoor amphitheater for events, a designated drop-off, and an outdoor courtyard between the existing and proposed Student Services buildings. This option locates the future Student Services building within the Terraced Quad.
 - b. Option 2: Proposes the drop-off location to the north of Building 13. The future Student Services building would be where Building 9C currently exists. It was noted that a future building in this location would likely be constrained by the limited space and be smaller than shown in the other options. It would also encroach on Miracle Mile and Founders Hall. For these reasons, the selection of this option is not advised.
 - c. Option 3: Proposes the drop-off location to the north of Building 13. The future Student Services building is proposed to be located in the Stitch Corridor, which it would modify. This option would provide the closest adjacency between the existing and proposed Student Services buildings. The space between these buildings could provide the means for universally accessible movement between ground levels.
 - d. Option 4: The future Student Services building would be north of and adjacent to the new Student Services building. Or it could be added to the new building to create one large building. It was noted that, at the time of implementation, there is flexibility in Option 4 to build a larger building than in the other options.
2. Audrey expressed concern about placing the new and future Student Services buildings too far to the north. She fears it will make students feel too far removed and unwelcome. In her opinion, the proximity of the drop-off and parking lot were not important, because students are coming to Student Services when they are already on campus and not necessarily directly from parking.

C. Town and Gown Zone

1. It was noted that the city is interested in encouraging a town and gown development along Grand Avenue, which Mt. SAC could develop on the campus side. Further discussion is needed about the types of uses that could be developed, but ideas that have been mentioned include an assembly hall, the art gallery, the bookstore, eateries, and other services that would be compatible with the College and would serve students. Another possibility is flexible space that could be used for community education.
2. Assembly Hall and Town and Gown Development
 - a. Option 1: The Assembly Hall would be accessed from a plaza entry on the campus side and an entry from the Grand Avenue side. Space for other public-oriented uses would be included within the Town and Gown Development. The parking structure's vehicle entry goes beneath the building's ground level so pedestrians and vehicles do not cross paths.

Circulation would be simplified with a roundabout at which drivers would either go into the parking structure or to a passenger drop-off area and ADA/visitor surface parking.

- b. Option 2: The Assembly Hall with an outdoor plaza would connect directly into campus circulation paths and be accessible from both Grand Avenue and from the center of campus. As in the previous option, vehicles enter parking beneath the building's ground level. Parking beneath the Assembly Hall would allow people to go from the parking structure directly up into the Assembly Hall. The Town and Gown Development is shown in a separate building surrounded by outdoor gathering spaces. For example, eateries could have adjacent outdoor dining within these courtyard areas. This option provides some surface parking close to Building 4 and would provide access to the Science Lab Building, as well.
 - c. Option 3: This shows the option to break up the Town and Gown Development into several buildings and create more outdoor space in and around them. In other respects, Options 2 and 3 are similar.
3. Irene questioned why the Assembly Hall and the Town and Gown Development would be separate structures if Mt. SAC wants to encourage the community to patronize the Art Gallery and other College facilities by exposing them to people that come to the Assembly Hall.

D. Temple Avenue Zone

1. The options for the Temple Avenue Zone were planned according to the input received at the last MPSTF meeting, which was to have the LRC at a location with direct public access and exposure from the street. They also address the potential for a new Science Lab Building to create a Science Neighborhood that would encompass the Eco Center and the Living Laboratory. The options would create a Green Corridor—a landscaped streetscape on both sides of Temple Avenue. All the options include a passenger drop-off area and surface parking. Sandy advised the MPSTF to consider how the options to keep Building 28A and/or 28B would impact the view into the campus and how these buildings might limit the options for parking and the passenger drop-off area.
 - a. Option 1: This option shows the retention and repurposing of existing Building 28A and 28B and would be undertaken only if a study can show that renovation and structural upgrades needed to bring them into compliance with the current building code would make sense from a cost standpoint, as well as finding a use for which these buildings would be suited once they are repurposed.
 - b. Option 2: This option removes Building 28A and keeps Building 28B, which would be renovated and repurposed.
 - c. Option 3: Eliminates Buildings 28A and 28B altogether, allowing for more green space.

- d. Option 4: Similar to Option 3 but taking the opportunity to add an instructional building where Building 28A and 28B currently exists. The future building would be designed with a more appropriate height, size, and appearance for this highly visible location.
2. Mika noted it would be desirable to include short-term parking for the LRC and events, as well as ADA parking closer to the center of campus.
 3. Lina Soto asked what Building 6 would become if the LRC moves. Irene said it would likely be repurposed into classroom space.
- E. Campus Core
1. The Campus Core is intended to be the center of activity and encompasses facilities and open spaces that serve students pursuing all areas of study.
- F. Instructional Expansion Zone
1. A new Instructional Building Zone is proposed to complete the redevelopment of the area east of the Terraced Quad. It would include an Instructional Building Complex where Lot G currently exists, the new Technical Education Center, and, potentially, an Instructional Building where Buildings 28A and 28B currently exist.
- G. School of Continuing Education
1. Sandy reported that the Master Plan Consultant Team had a good discussion with the School of Continuing Education and came away with a proposed location for a new facility that will meet their needs. It provides an opportunity for a drop-off integrated with Parking Structure PS-F and a plaza/outdoor study area. The location is situated on Miracle Mile, which links it to the Language Center and instructional programs that partner with the School of Continuing Education.
 2. Marc Ruh noted that discussions have occurred about building pedestrian bridges to connect across Temple Avenue. They have included a bridge from Parking Structure PS-S to the Transit Center and another bridge from the planned Gymnasium in the Physical Education Complex to parking on the north side of Temple Avenue. He commented that careful planning for parking is essential, especially given the number of the athletic events that will be held in one area of campus. It's nice to see green space on campus, but we must be sure to accommodate parking needs for athletic events.
 3. It was suggested that Parking Structure PS-F be switched with the location for the School of Continuing Education, but the concern was raised that doing this would farther remove the School from Miracle Mile, which connects it to Language Center 66 and other programs that are housed to the west of Bonita Drive.
- H. The Farm
1. Much of the proposed Farm improvements revolve around reorganizing it and updating its facilities and infrastructure to align it with the Agricultural Science Program's educational plan. These changes include right-sizing and updating labs,

providing demonstration space, and providing space for needed functions such as composting. The proposed plan for the Farm was developed through a series of meetings with Matt Judd and the Agricultural Science faculty and staff.

I. Campus Support Zone

1. A Repurposing Depot would be included in this area to handle the recycling and repurposing of campus furniture, equipment, electronics, etc.
2. Space in Buildings 23, 47, and 48 will be renovated and/or repurposed.

J. Wildlife Sanctuary

1. The proposed plan for the Wildlife Sanctuary was developed through conversations with Matt Judd and the Biological Science faculty. The improvements would renovate existing structures, provide for visitors, and extend fencing and infrastructure to recently added land—the Wildlife Sanctuary Extension.
2. A Nature Center is proposed for the Wildlife Sanctuary to support instruction, research, and tours for visitors.
3. An Eco Center on the north side of Temple Avenue, is proposed to help raise awareness of Mt. SAC's sustainability efforts, such as the presence of the Wildlife Sanctuary, by featuring them in a highly visible facility that will be easily accessed by students and community visitors.
4. A portion of Parking Lot M would be designated for use by the Fire Training Academy. This area would function as parking when not being used for training.

6.7 Group Work and Reporting Out on the Selection of Options

- A. The participants met in five groups to evaluate the proposed campus development framework and options. Each group reported back to the MPSTF on their feedback and selection of options.
- B. Orange Group (Madelyn Arballo, Craig Deines, Mark Lowentrout, Mark Ruh, Facilitator: Sheryl Sterry) Comments:
 1. Student Services Zone – Option 2 buildings and Option 1 drop-off
The group preferred the locations of new Student Services buildings to the north and south of 9B, as shown in Option 2. They strongly opposed a building in the Terraced Quad as shown in Option 1. They liked the dedicated passenger drop-off for access, as shown in Option 1.
 2. Town and Gown Zone – Option 2
 3. Temple Avenue Zone – Options 4
The group preferred to remove existing Buildings 28A and 28B, and preserve this site for a future instructional building when needed.
 4. Additional comments by the Orange Group:

- a. The group really liked the proposed concept for campus-wide development.
 - b. The group agreed to the proposed location for the School of Continuing Education after much discussion. They said that ESL should remain with the Humanities in Language Center 66. This is where the School wants to be to remain near their instructional partners.
 - c. The development of the School of Continuing Education and a parking structure in Lot F would displace the motorcycle program. It was suggested that the top deck of a parking structure be used for this program.
 - d. A lab space for drone flight instruction is needed for classes that will soon be offered. Federal Aviation Administration regulations require an enclosed indoor space or an outdoor space that is contained (by netting, for example). Plans for such a facility have yet to be made.
- C. Red Group (Barbara McNeice-Stallard, Chisa Uyeki, Audrey Yamagata-Noji, Facilitator: Sandy Kate) Comments:
1. Student Services Zone – Option 4
This group preferred the variation on Option 4 with one large Student Services Building to the north of 9B (possibly directly connected to 9B, or with space between them) as opposed to two separate buildings. They thought the proposed location for the amphitheater would be too far away from the center of activity. They preferred an amphitheater in the Terraced Quad.
 2. Town and Gown Zone – Option 1
The group preferred the Town and Gown Development and the Assembly Hall to be housed in one large building, but said that they do not have a very strong opinion about its configuration.
 3. Temple Avenue Zone – Options 3 and 4
Under the assumption that Buildings 28A and 28B could be removed and replaced elsewhere, they preferred to repurpose this site as an open green space adjacent to the LRC. In the future, if the need arose, it would be used as a site to build more instructional space.
 4. Additional comments by the Red Group:
 - a. The group suggested moving the Bursar's office from Administrative Building 4 to the Student Services zone to relieve traffic in Building 4 and simplify students' access to financial transactions.
 - b. The group loved the Library Gardens and Library Grove.
- D. Blue Group (Francisco Dorame, Lina Soto, Facilitator: Ken Salyer) Comments:
1. Student Services Zone – Option 4
This group preferred Student Services Zone Option 4, with either the two new buildings to the north of 9B or one larger building. They also liked the amphitheater in that upper location shown in Option 4, because it simplified access for visiting K-12

groups. The location of the Student Services Zone allows for Student Services to be in a central location, where it would not be away from the instructional area of campus. They suggested having one cornerstone location with accessibility to Building 12 where Student Services holds orientations. The Blue Group preferred to preserve the Terraced Quad location for open space and allow Miracle Mile to provide access directly to the Student Center. They noted that if Student Services refers students to the Student Center, this option would offer a direct connection between these two areas. They liked having the passenger drop-off north of Building 12, with pathways into the center of campus.

2. Town and Gown Zone – Option 2

Regarding the Town and Gown Zone, the group preferred Option 2 with two separate buildings for the Assembly Hall and Town and Gown Development area. They liked the separation and the open parking space adjacent to the building. They noted their preference for the accessible surface parking as well, allowing easy access to Building 4.

3. Temple Avenue Zone – Option 4

For the Temple Avenue Zone, the group preferred a new building in place of Buildings 28A and 28B. It would give a face to the campus, take advantage of the opportunity to showcase the institution from Temple Avenue.

E. Green Group (Jeff Archibald, Tamra Horton, Jonathan Hymer, Facilitator: Gerdo Aquino)
Comments:

1. Student Services Zone – Option 3

The group liked the option to build another building to the right of the next Student Services building. They liked the Stitch Corridor, but thought that there could be an alternative. They said that they did not feel strongly about this opinion, because none of this group are Student Services people.

2. Town and Gown Zone – Option 3 and 4

The group preferred Option 3 for the Town and Gown Development. They emphatically did not like the idea of a single building as shown in Option 1, which would have the parking structure separate the Town and Gown Development from the rest of campus. Separate TGD buildings might be a better way to avoid a “mall” feel. In their opinion, the Town and Gown concept does not serve the College’s mission and they wondered why it is being considered. The College should be developing its spaces to serve students. They said that placing the bookstore in the Town and Gown Zone would not make sense, since it would be on the opposite side of campus from other services.

3. Temple Avenue Zone – Option 4 buildings with Options 1 & 2 passenger drop-off

The group liked the idea of a new instructional building in place of Buildings 28A and 28B, however, they would not want a new building in that location to be prioritized over instructional buildings on other sites. They noted that a new building here would provide the opportunity to remake the aesthetics of the campus. They also noted that the College doesn’t need green space in this location—they need a building. They also wanted to see a different passenger drop-off in this zone, preferring the drop-off shown in Options 1 and 2.

F. Yellow Group (Dalia Chavez, Ruben Flores, Irene Malmgren, Joumana McGowan, Thomas Mauch, Facilitator: Jana Wehby) Comments:

1. Student Services Zone – Option 2
They preferred to place the new Student Services buildings to the north and south of Building 9B.
 - a. The group said that the noise from an amphitheater in the middle of campus could be an issue, but said that maybe people are used to noise there.
 - b. They suggested placing the Bursar's Office back with Student Services Financial Aid.
 - c. They said that there should be 30-minute metered parking near Student Services.
2. Town and Gown Zone – Option 1
This group preferred Option 1, with the assembly hall joined to Parking Structure PS-B. In their opinion, if an art gallery is placed in this zone, it should be connected to the Assembly Hall.
3. Temple Avenue Zone – Option 4
They liked the idea of a new instructional building in place of Buildings 28A and 28B.
 - a. Regarding the Eco Center, the group asked if the College used existing landscaped areas for instruction, would they need to build a new structure? This area is far from the Horticulture Program; however, it is near the Biology Program. In their opinion, any new building in this location should be an instructional building.
4. Additional comments by the Yellow Group:
 - a. They acknowledged that the School of Continuing Education is important, but expressed concern that the proposed location would come between the planned Athletics facilities and the parking in Parking Structure PS-F that would serve athletic events. When athletic facilities were distributed across the campus, parking was not as much of a concern, but once they are in one area, parking will be a problem.
 - b. They expressed their concern about the lack of surface parking near buildings that students need to get in and out of quickly.
 - c. They suggested moving the motorcycle program to Lot M.

6.8 Next Steps

A. Next Meeting: September 8, 2017, 9 AM to 12:30 PM. Founders Hall Conference Center.

Submitted by,



Sheryl Sterry
Senior Educational Facilities Planner
HMC Architects

Attachments: Scans of each group's selected options; photos of MPSTF Meeting #6

cc: Distribution to Mt. SAC Attendees by Facilities Planning and Management
Master Plan Consultant Team Attendees
Aravind Batra (P2S Engineering)
Michael Bernal (HMC Architects)
Darlene Danehy (Psomas)
Ted Gribble (Five-G Consulting)
Masako Ikegami (SWA Group)
Karen Gulley (PlaceWorks)
Brett Leavitt (HMC Architects)
Glenn Roberts (Five-G Consulting)
Suzanne Schwab (PlaceWorks)
Nicholas Staddon (Horticulture Advisor)
Marcene Taylor (MTI)

ORANGE GROUP

Madelyn Arballo

Mark Ruh

Craig Deines

Mark Lowentrout

Facilitator: Sheryl Sterry



RED GROUP

Barbara McNeice-Stallard

Chisa Uyeki

Audrey Yamagata-Noji

Facilitator: Sandy Kate



GREEN GROUP

Jeff Archibald
Tamra Horton
Jonathan Hymer

Facilitator: Gerdo Aquino



YELLOW GROUP

Dalia Chavez
Ruben Flores
Irene Malmgren

Thomas Mauch
Joumana McGowan

Facilitator: Jana Wehby



Yellow Group
Ruben Flores
Thomas Mauch
Dalia Chavez
Irene Malmgren

MT. SAC EFMP
Explore Options Base Plan
MPSTF 5/19/17





Blue Group: Francisco Dorame, Lina Soto, Facilitator: Ken Salyer



Orange Group: Madelyn Arballo, Craig Deines, Mark Lowentrout, Mark Ruh, Facilitator: Sheryl Sterry



Green Group: Jeff Archibald, Tamra Horton, Jonathan Hymer, Facilitator: Gerdo Aquino



Red Group: Barbara McNeice-Stallard, Chisa Uyeki, Audrey Yamagata-Noji, Facilitator: Sandy Kate



Yellow Group: Dalia Chavez, Ruben Flores, Irene Malmgren, Joumana McGowan, Thomas Mauch, Facilitator: Jana Wehby

Photos from Master Plan Steering Task Force Meeting #6