

**Meeting:** **Master Plan Steering Task Force Meeting #2**  
Conference Center, Founders Hall, 10:00 am–noon

**Date:** November 21, 2016

**Project:** **Mt. San Antonio College**  
**2018 Educational & Facilities Master Plan**

**Project #:** 5018-016-000

**Present:** **Mt. San Antonio College:**

Jeff Archibald, President Academic Senate  
Miriam Ayala, Student, Associated Students of Mt. SAC  
Craig Deines, Faculty, Fine Arts  
Ruben Flores, Equipment Operator, Grounds, CSEA 651  
Jennifer Galbraith, Dean, Business  
Grace Hanson, Dean, Disabled Student Programs & Services & Student Health Services  
Tamra Horton, Faculty, Humanities & Social Sciences  
Jonathan Hymer, Faculty, Technology & Health  
Hanna Kang, Student, Associated Students of Mt. SAC  
Katherine MacDonald, Administrative Specialist II, Counseling, CSEA 262  
Irene Malmgren, Vice President, Instruction  
Tom Mauch, Dean, Counseling  
Gary Nellesen, Director, Facilities Planning & Management  
Lina Soto, Faculty, Counseling  
Chisa Uyeki, Faculty, Library & Learning Resources  
Dave Wilson, Chief of Police, Public Safety  
Audrey Yamagata-Noji, Vice President, Student Services

**Planning Consultant Team:**

Gerdo Aquino, SWA Group  
Eva Conrad, Collaborative Brain Trust  
Karen Gully, PlaceWorks  
Sandra Kate, HMC Architects  
Dan Rosenberg, Collaborative Brain Trust  
Suzanne Schwab, PlaceWorks  
Sheryl Sterry, HMC Architects  
Emilie Waugh, HMC Architects  
Jana Wehby, SWA Group

**Purpose of the Meeting:** To update the Master Plan Steering Task Force (MPSTF) on the progress of the Educational and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) process, to share the educational planning data portfolio and landscape planning best practices, and to hear feedback from the MPSTF.

## 2.1 Welcome & Updates

### A. Welcome

Co-chairs Jeff Archibald, Irene Malmgren, and Audrey Yamagata-Noji welcomed the MPSTF. Task Force members introduced themselves.

### B. Educational Master Plan (EMP) Update

#### 1. Instructional program interviews:

- a. Since the October 17, 2016 MPSTF meeting, the first round of instructional program interviews was held.

### C. Facilities Master Plan (FMP) Update

#### 1. Instructional program interviews:

- a. HMC participated in the first round of instructional program interviews to hear about Mt. SAC's teaching facilities and how they function.

#### 2. Landscape Planning Meeting #1:

- a. Landscape planning is an important component of the EFMP project scope. SWA Group and HMC of the Facilities Planning Team met with Mt. SAC Facilities Management and Planning staff, including Grounds staff, as well as a faculty representative who uses instructional resources in the campus outdoor space. The discussion covered:
  - i. Maintenance needs and concerns.
  - ii. Faculty needs and concerns and the ways in which the campus is used as a learning laboratory by many instructional disciplines.

#### 3. Farm Tour:

- a. The Facilities Planning Team toured the Farm with Matt Judd, Brian Scott, Matt Pawlak, Mika Klein and faculty and staff of the Agricultural Sciences Program. The Planning Team includes a horticulture advisor and an animal sciences/farm planning advisor who attended the tour.
- b. The Mt. SAC Farm comprises about a quarter of the campus and it presents unique needs and planning challenges. The tour covered:
  - i. Visits to individual indoor and outdoor lab facilities and discussions about how each is used and how well they function as labs for the Agricultural Sciences programs.
  - ii. How the Farm is used by other programs, the college community, and the surrounding community.

#### 4. Pull Planning Meeting:

- a. This meeting included representatives of the Mt. SAC Office of Instruction, Facilities Management and Planning, and the Master Planning Consultant Team, which includes many specialists in different areas.
- b. Pull planning is a tool that is being used to coordinate the work of a multi-discipline team and keep the project on schedule. During the meeting, the participants identified milestones and worked backwards to identify the tasks that must be done to achieve those milestones:
  - i. The final EFMP draft (Board of Trustees first reading) is due on December 13, 2017.
  - ii. The pull plan establishes the schedule for the MPSTF to review drafts of the EFMP document.

5. Changes to the MPSTF Meeting Schedule:
  - a. Input from the MPSTF is critical to the planning process and the need for longer meetings became apparent during the pull planning process. More time is needed at several meetings for engagement with MPSTF members through participatory working sessions and discussions. Jeff Archibald said that most members would have more availability for longer meetings if they were held on Fridays.
  - b. The MPSTF agreed to a revised meeting schedule:
    - i. Friday, February 10, 2017, 9 AM-2 PM – no change
    - ii. Monday, March 20, 2017, 10 AM-noon – no change
    - iii. Monday, April 17, 2017, 10 AM-12:30 PM – same date with longer duration
    - iv. Friday, May 19, 2017, 9 AM-12:30 PM – new date and longer duration
    - v. Friday, September 8, 2017, 9 AM-12:30 PM – new date and longer duration

## 2.2 Favorite Places

Sandra Kate noted that the Master Planning Consultant Team finds it helpful to hear the MPSTF members' insights about the existing campus. Hearing about their favorite campus places, studying these places, and watching the interaction that happens in them will help us to preserve those spaces and duplicate their good qualities elsewhere.

The Task Force members placed colored dots on their favorite places on a campus aerial photograph—blue dots for indoor places and green dots for outdoor places. See attachment: *Favorite Places Aerial Map*.

Comments included the following:

- A. The **outdoor area south of Building 12** that was recently remodeled gives people a lot of access options (such as stairs/ramps) whether you're temporarily in a wheelchair or temporarily pushing a stroller. It exemplifies universal design. This is one of most difficult places on campus to navigate. It cost a lot of money to install elevators. It's green and the trees will hopefully grow to be large and give us shade. It's peaceful and quiet.
- B. The **approach to Founders Hall** (where this meeting is being held) shows how a ramp can be incorporated into the environment without looking ugly.
- C. The **approach to Building 26**, near the accessible parking lot, is a bridge to the 2nd floor. Would love it if that bridge curved around to the 3rd floor. It's a nice way to navigate if you can't use stairs.
- D. The new **Design Technology Building 13, Room 1700**, where they do active shooter presentations. It's just a phenomenal venue to address 400-500 people. They have had a number of people from outside campus come in and they were stunned at what a nice venue it is.
- E. **Building 12**—all the green area is like a little oasis. Plenty of space for students to sit around and talk. A lot of plug-ins as well.
- F. Same spot (**outside Building 12**)—students can sit down there in those rotunda seating areas on the blocks with perforations so skateboarders can't ride them.
- G. **In front of Building 1A, the Art Center**, there is new landscaping that is really nice. Along the walking path to the Art Center there are murals and there should be some other painting that matches the murals. People want an instructional area outside. So much space is wasted. The outside area is really instructional space. The best example of universal signage is the walkway of the Getty Center. More things like that would be great.

- H. **Founders Hall**, the building we're in, even before they remodeled it. And the remodel has incorporated solutions to so many of the needs we have. The rooms have technology and there's a lightness and openness—it feels much bigger than it is. They didn't take away the charm and they added functionality.
- I. **Between Buildings 66 and 67**, the Language Center and the Health Careers Center (Fire Technology/ EMT/Nursing). You can find a seat, grab coffee. It's nice to walk through—people are just chatting.
- J. **Sherman Park** is a place where we see instruction in action from different divisions that use it. Our students get to see that and check out what other people are doing. And it gives faculty a chance to do some hands-on learning. Great learning space. Would like it to stay. Wish it were a little more accessible. It seems like a bit of an obstacle course to travel to it.
- K. In **Administration Building 4** there's a large lobby outside the offices. Students relax, hang out, and eat there. Love to see students claim it as their own. They can relax or study or nap.
- L. When you walk into the **Library/Learning Technology Center**— it's not big enough, but has a great energy level and you get to see learning going on.
- M. The **Building 12 / Building 13 patio** is what our campus should look like. The College got it right! People love the greenery, the peacefulness and that it's right in between two buildings. It was done in a way that was more useful.
- N. People like the **public art in the courtyard of the Performing Arts Complex**. It's nice that there is public sculpture and art. Things that make the campus beautiful, aside from the buildings.
- O. The **west side of the Mountie Cafe**, the elevated outdoor seating area from which you can look down on the view below, the steep hillside that is designed for water runoff, and the California native plants and bench seating. You can see arts murals on **Art Center / Gallery 1A, 1B, and 1C** that give you a sense of history.
- P. Also in the **Performing Arts Center** area, the **Dance Studio** is turned into a beautiful holiday center. There's snow machines and it's snowing everywhere (seasonal).
- Q. The big, **historic mural on Arts Center 1C** done in 1957. We haven't done enough to celebrate it.
- R. The **Baseball Field** is where I'm most at home. The other place is the **Student Services Center**. It is most energized during the first week of school—love the hustle and bustle, but the building also needs the most work (students have outgrown it). It should be expanded and grown.
- S. The **Cross-Country Course** if you look backwards going up **Reservoir Hill** you will see an amazing view of campus with the mountains in the background. In the afternoon, depending on time of year, you will see the community and high school people out there.
- T. **The Rose garden** is a good mix of quiet and hustle and bustle.
- U. **Administration Building 4 outdoor area** where students sit. At 6 pm they're getting kicked out by security.
- V. **The Koi Pond**, in the **Farm**
- W. **The Demonstration Garden south of Sherman Park**
- X. The **area between Buildings 7 and 60**
- Y. **The Wildlife Sanctuary**
- Z. The **Baseball Field** in the spring time as the sun goes down and the mountains are purple. Amazing view.
- AA. **Wherever there are trees**. The **shaded patio of the Mountie Café** has a great view down to the Performing Arts Center and the Library. The College needs more places with shade.

BB. **Building F2** in the nursery section of the Farm with the **Koi Pond** that was built by students. There is a big BBQ around there. A lot of students go there. Photography class goes there. Lots of people have never even been there.

CC. The **view from the water tanks** at the top of campus is amazing.

DD. What hasn't been mentioned is the **rooftop astronomy dome in Building 60**. It doesn't quite function as envisioned. But it is a good concept to use under-utilized spaces such as rooftops, although it is challenging to get people up there in a functional, safe, and accessible way. But the concept is really cool.

EE. The **Library/Learning Technology Center**, is a really quiet space, really nice.

FF. The mix of old and new, is so great. That should be something we consider throughout campus. The way that the renovation and addition was done to this building, **Founders Hall**, was great.

GG. The **fountain in front of the Library**

### 2.3 Data Portfolio

Eva Conrad and Dan Rosenberg of CBT presented preliminary results of research—external scan (population and demographics of residents in service area) and internal scan (information on students, faculty, and staff).

#### A. External Scan Data

1. Population in Mt. SAC District boundaries and service area:
  - a. Legal district boundaries: encompasses 189 square miles and 12 cities.
  - b. Service area: encompasses an additional 18 cities where a significant proportion of students reside.
  - c. Population growth over the next decade is projected to be less than 1%.
  - d. MPSTF suggestion: include Fullerton and Brea in the service area.
2. Age profile:
  - a. Between 2016 to 2021 the proportions of 25-44 year olds and 65-85 year olds are projected to increase.
  - b. The proportion of the population in prime college-going age categories (18-24) is projected to decline slightly.
3. Race and ethnicity:
  - a. US census considers Hispanic origin (of any race) so numbers don't add up to 100%.
  - b. The service area population is 45% white non-Hispanic; overall the Hispanic population is expected to increase almost 1% over 5 years.
4. Education:
  - a. 12% of the service area residents in K-8 and 7% in high school.
  - b. 45% of service area residents have a high school diploma or less, which is higher than the proportion in California, (38%).
  - c. The proportion of residents with an associate degree is the same for the Mt. SAC service area and the state.

- d. Compared to the state, there is a lower proportion of Mt. SAC service population with bachelor's degrees or higher.
  - e. MPSTF suggestion: Include data on high school enrollment and graduates at feeder high schools.
5. Language spoken at home:
    - a. 38% of service area residents speak English at home compared to 55% statewide.
    - b. Spanish is the most common language spoken at home: 42% of service area residents compared to 31% statewide.

## B. Internal Scan Data

1. Student headcount and FTES:
  - a. Student headcount increased 10% between 2012-2013 and 2015-2016.
  - b. During these years, total FTES increased 5%, with the greatest increase in non-credit FTES.
2. Student age:
  - a. A larger percentage of Mt. SAC students are between the ages of 20-24 and over age 50 compared to the State.
  - b. MPSTF suggestion: disaggregate data to determine whether students over age 50 are primarily taking non-credit courses, such as Education for Older Adults.
3. Distance Education:
  - a. The percentage of FTES earned in distance education decreased between fall 2012 and fall 2015, from 3.4% to 2.8% compared to the State, which has increased from 9.5% to 11.4% FTES earned through distance education.
  - b. MPSTF suggestion: change the graphic presentation to more fairly represent the data. As presented, the data exaggerates the differences between Mt. SAC and the State. Mt. SAC is cautious about offering distance education because of patterns of lower student success in these courses.
4. Full-time/part-time students:
  - a. Between fall 2012 and fall 2015 the percentage of Mt. SAC students enrolled in 12 or more units declined from 31.9% to 29.5%. This percentage is now comparable with the State average.
  - b. In the same period, there has been an increase in the percentage of Mt. SAC students taking 6-12 units and decrease in those enrolled in 15 units or more.
5. Race and ethnicity:
  - a. The three race/ethnicity categories of Mt. SAC students in fall 2015 are: Hispanic (55%), Asian (18.5%), and White (11.5%).
  - b. Between fall 2012 and fall 2015 there has been increases in the numbers of Hispanic students and Asian students.
6. Degree and certificates:
  - a. The numbers of degrees and certificates awarded over the past four years have increased.
7. Faculty and staff:
  - a. Total of 1,883 total faculty and staff in fall 2015.

- b. Increase in the number of part-time faculty, with the number of full-time faculty declining slightly.
- c. The majority of the faculty and staff are female in every category.
- d. The race/ethnicity categories of Mt. SAC faculty and staff in fall 2015 follow the same pattern as the race/ethnicity categories of Mt. SAC students: Hispanic (41.4%), Asian (13.4%), and White (33.8%).
- e. MPSTF suggestions:
  - i. The numbers of employees in each category seem low, especially for full-time faculty. Request that the researcher verify the data.
  - ii. Consider whether it is useful to analyze faculty/staff by age.

#### C. Fall 2016 Data

1. MPSTF question: Will fall 2016 data would be included in the document? The answer is that since fall 2016 data will not be final until mid-February, the Instructional Management Team in collaboration with the Office of Research and Institutional Effectiveness set the two data points as fall 2012 and fall 2015.

## 2.4 Landscape Best Practices

Sheryl Sterry noted that many Task Force members chose outdoor spaces as their favorite places on campus, highlighting their importance. She reintroduced Jana Wehby and Gerdo Aquino of SWA Group to talk about best practices for landscape and open space planning.

Gerdo Aquino noted that their work is about understanding the DNA of the campus. As landscape and open space architects, it is their goal to keep and enhance what is good. This is important for a campus like Mt. SAC's. Knowing people's favorite places helps SWA to understand what is good and look at ways the campus can be enhanced and performative. It is important to think about beauty, but to also consider the performance of space and how it is used. Here are several ways in which open space can perform and serve the College:

#### A. Resource Efficiency

How can the campus landscape support the efficient allocation and use of resources? Are there opportunities in parking lots to have more solar? Is water being looked at as a resource? Is too much being used? The campus is converting areas to more efficient drip irrigation. Are there opportunities to collect water and be even more efficient? Converting more areas to low maintenance, drought-tolerant plantings can save water and redistribute maintenance labor. How is the soil being considered? Is the College considering waste management and creating symbiotic relationships? Is it looking at on-campus composting programs? Last week, during the Farm tour, the Planning Consultant Team learned that the campus is sending green waste off-site. Perhaps it could be treated on campus—mulched and used on the landscape. Similarly, food waste could be composted. Student interns could collect and sell it to the public, earning revenue to fund programs.

#### B. Connectivity

The campus is over 400 acres with varied topography. Planning for a universally connected campus will be a challenge. Ways must be found to make this a more strongly connected campus. The design of pedestrian corridors should be optimized in terms of function, as well as how they enhance the campus experience through site furnishings, landscaping, and good design—artfully integrating ways to move through campus. Adequate amenities should be planned at connections to public transport. Adequate parking and biking opportunities should be planned. Ways should be considered as to how to plan for bike facilities that perform well for cyclists, while sharing the campus with pedestrians and other vehicles in a safe and orderly way.



### C. Place-making

Finding balance and creating experiences are what people remember about a campus. Places need to be created where people can be outdoors and be engaged in informal interactions of all scales. Together we will think about the distribution of place-making throughout the campus—in buildings and extending to the outdoors. We will consider elements that help to shape experiences, such as shaded outdoor spaces, outdoor power outlets, spaces to gather for large events. Passive places are important too for quiet reflection and study. Thought should be given not only to courtyards and lawns, but to connective spaces and how they can support the campus environment.

### D. Ecology

The campus eco-system could be magnified by connecting the campus to larger natural systems. The analysis could reveal certain natural systems that run through the campus that could be turned into spaces for the College to enjoy, study, and learn from. For instance, consider opportunities related to storm water drainage. The Master Planning Consultant Team saw opportunities to improve areas served only by concrete ditches that are a safety concern and are unattractive. Consideration should be given to opportunities for restoring Snow Creek, south of the Wildlife Sanctuary, and for ways to weave habitat throughout campus in the spaces between buildings, such as by enhancing the campus forest. Green roofs, which provide multiple benefits, should be considered as well.

### E. Discussion

1. Jeff said that the biggest issue with the campus landscape is that there is no intentionality to it at all. No order to buildings and outdoor spaces. He would like to see more intentionality moving forward—a vision for the campus as a whole. The College has been improving these things and these efforts should continue. It is not a coincidence that most of people's favorite spaces were outdoors. This speaks to a hunger among people here for a stronger connection to the outdoors.
2. Gerdo noted that the campus is a framework. The Master Planning Consultant Team is going to look at all those opportunities to strengthen the sense of place on campus.
3. It was asked whether the planning process will look at safety on campus and ways to evacuate the campus in emergencies? Sheryl said that planning to improve security and emergency exiting is a specific focus of this project.
4. Gary Nellesen said that the plan is also looking at circulation and parking, as well as traffic planning from a regional perspective. Very little of this has been included in previous plans.
5. Jennifer Galbraith said it seems like the College is putting up more and more buildings. Her concern is that the College shouldn't lose outdoor educational space as it continues to grow. This should be a priority. For example, she feels that the College should have an outdoor amphitheater.
6. Audrey said the two highest priorities of students surveyed are parking and places to sit. The College is working on this through its Grounds and Facilities staff and have created more places with seating. Mt. SAC is a commuter campus, but there is not enough of these places.
7. The Associated Students have said that they can't get work done because the Wi-Fi doesn't always work. As the number of devices continues to increase, it seems that we can never have enough Wi-Fi capacity.
8. Gerdo said that the planning team will look closely at balancing parking, seating, buildings, shade, etc., and will plan for power plugs and Wi-Fi coverage.
9. Students will sit anywhere there is a power plug.



10. Jeff Archibald said that it is hard to travel from north to south on campus. Parking is concentrated on each end but it is hard to get from end to end, because of the poor flow between the two. Also, it is difficult to travel between parts of campus that lie on the northern side and the southern side of Temple Avenue. The College should take the opportunity here to make better use of pedestrian pathways by providing routes that make more sense and by making them beautiful places where people want to hang out. There are some areas that are not accessible at all because you have to climb a set of stairs then go down another set of stairs to get from building to building.
11. Gerdo said that the Master Planning Consultant Team must figure out what things might be quirky and worth keeping and what really needs to be mended.
12. Gary said that water-efficient landscaping and having big trees are two different things. Water efficiency is not going to drive what we do. Instead, it's important to design for the trees and then to irrigate in a water-efficient manner.
13. The College has a public relations problem with the community. It was inquired as to why there are not community members at this meeting and whether they would be included in the planning process. Sheryl said that in addition to internal college outreach, the Educational and Facilities Master Plan project includes outreach to Mt. SAC's community.

## 2.5 Next Steps

### A. Community Engagement

The master planning process includes community outreach that is intended to extend and broaden input to the EFMP, while working in concert with Mt. SAC's ongoing outreach activities to strengthen the College's relationship with its communities. It is a way for the College to find out what their external communities are thinking. The Master Planning Consultant Team will report back to the MPSTF on what they hear and MPSTF members are welcome to participate in any of the outreach events.

Karen Gulley and Suzanne Schwab of PlaceWorks are the Master Plan Consultant Team members who are focusing on community outreach for the EFMP project. Karen Gulley said that an important part of the community outreach effort will involve Mt. SAC's Community Facilities Plan Advisory Committee (CFPAC). Its members come from Mt. SAC's entire service area—they include business people, educators, and civic leaders. They will be asked to be a conduit between Mt. SAC and its community. CFPAC has met a couple of times and has been learning more about Mt. SAC. PlaceWorks will be joining a CFPAC meeting next Monday to talk about the EFMP and kick off their involvement in this project. PlaceWorks will meet with them five times to engage them throughout the process.

In addition to CFPAC meetings, PlaceWorks plans to reach out to the community in other ways. They will hold pop-up workshops and tie in with other events on campus. Twice during the EFMP process, PlaceWorks will hold open houses within trustee areas. Once, early in the EFMP process, to ask the questions that they have been asking the MPSTF, gathering input on facilities, and asking for ideas for ways that Mt. SAC can better serve their community. Then PlaceWorks will go back and meet with them later to get feedback on facilities planning options.

B. Educational Planning

The EMP will include a description and analysis of each instructional, administrative, and student service program. The information gathering process for each service area is the same. Using the College's online resources, CBT will write first drafts. CBT will meet with the leadership of each service area and conduct interviews to go over the drafts. Then they will rewrite the descriptions.

The first round of instructional program interviews was held in early-November and CBT is working on the second drafts. Student Services and Administrative Services will get their drafts in mid-January. Then CBT will come back in February to interview them. CBT will rewrite their drafts and come back in March to have the second round of interviews. CBT will not be sharing the drafts with this group until the leaders of each area have looked at them twice.

C. Facilities Planning:

Currently, the Master Planning Consultant Team is analyzing the College's existing facilities, landscaping, and open spaces—focusing on many aspects such as circulation, condition of buildings, and environmental considerations. The team will meet with faculty and staff for the following:

1. Wildlife Sanctuary Tour
2. Climate Commitment Committee Meeting
3. Landscape Planning Meeting #2

The Master Planning Consultant Team will be reporting their findings and vetting them with the MPSTF in the next meeting on February 10, 2017. There will be a lot of detail and the group will need that longer working session.

D. MPSTF Campus Tour

The MPSTF was asked about touring the campus as a group. Roughly half the members were interested. Mika Klein will look into potential dates.

Audrey said that the tour would be an opportunity to talk about spaces that work for students, other than our favorite places. Spaces that are conducive to learning and studying, including in the classroom environment. Aside from outdoor places, these indoor spaces are the other critical part of the campus.

E. Next MPSTF Meeting:

Friday, February 10, 2017, 9 am-2 pm; in the Building 46 Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Training Room. Parking will be available in the adjacent lots. Lunch will be provided.

*The above notes document our understanding of items discussed in the above-referenced meeting. Unless notice to the contrary is received, the notations will be considered acceptable and HMC will proceed with work based on these understandings. Any discrepancies should be brought to our attention within seven (7) working days of receipt*

Submitted by,



Sheryl Sterry  
Senior Educational Facilities Planner, HMC Architects  
Sheryl.Sterry@hmcarchitects.com

**Attachments:** *MPSTF Meeting slide presentation*  
*Favorite Places Aerial Map*

**Cc:** Attendees  
Aravind Batra (P2S Engineering)  
Michael Bernal (HMC Architects)  
Ted Gribble (Five-G Consulting)  
Masako Ikegami (SWA Group)  
Mikaela Klein (Mt. SAC)  
Brett Leavitt (HMC Architects)  
Glenn Roberts (Five-G Consulting)  
Ken Salyer (HMC Architects)  
Nicholas Staddon (Horticulture Advisor)  
Marcene Taylor (MTI)  
Alysen Weiland (Psomas)

**File:** N:\Projects\5018 Mt. San Antonio College\016\_FMP\12 Meeting Minutes\02 MM\2016-11-21\_MPSTF-Mtg2\2016-11-21\_MtSAC-MPSTF-Workshop2-FINAL.docx