

Meeting Minutes

Mt. SAC Master Plan Steering Task Force Meeting #5

Date April 17, 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
Francisco Dorame, Associate Dean, Counseling
Carlos Duarte, Public Safety Officer, Public Safety, CSEA 262
Ruben Flores, Equipment Operator, Grounds, CSEA 651
Jennifer Galbraith, Dean, Business
Grace Hanson, Dean, Disabled Student Programs & Services and Student Health Services
Jonathan Hymer, Faculty, Technology & Health
Joe Jennum, Dean, Kinesiology, Athletics, & Dance
Mika Klein, Senior Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning & Management
Mark Lowentrou, Associate Dean, Arts
Katherine MacDonald, Administrative Specialist II, Counseling, CSEA 262
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
Gary Nellesen, Director, Facilities Planning & Management
Mark Ruh, Faculty, Kinesiology, Athletics, & Dance
Don Sachs, Special Assistant to the President
Robert Toyer, Sergeant, Public Safety
Chisa Uyeki, Faculty, Library & Learning Resources
Audrey Yamagata-Noji, MPSTF Tri-chair and Vice President, Student Services

Master Plan Consultant Team:

Eva Conrad, Collaborative Brain Trust
Sandra Kate, HMC Architects
Brett Leavitt, HMC Architects
Ken Salyer, HMC Architects
Sheryl Sterry, HMC Architects
Emilie Waugh, HMC Architects
Jana Wehby, SWA Group
Alysen Weiland, Psomas

Purposes

- Presentation of the Interview Themes (formerly known as Strategic Directions)
- Presentation of Preliminary Facilities Options

Items Discussed

5.1 Welcome and Updates

- A. Irene Malmgren welcomed everyone to the meeting. She said that the MPSTF is about halfway through the process and we have gone from gathering information, to beginning to look at recommendations. Today, we will do the important work of weighing in and giving feedback on proposed facilities recommendations.

- B. Sandy Kate talked about the goals of the meeting:
 1. The MPSTF will reviewing Strategic Directions, which are big picture ideas for the Educational Master Plan.
 2. The MPSTF will also be looking at and discussing facilities concepts. The Master Plan Consultant Team has taken all the information from many meetings with the College and incorporated them into an approach for organizing the campus. The goal of today's meeting is to get confirmation from the MPSTF that this is the right direction.
 3. Sandy emphasized the importance of today's meeting because it will determine what happens in the May 19th meeting, which is a very critical point in the process. The May meeting will be 3.5-hours long working session and the outcomes of that meeting will inform the final plan that HMC will develop over the summer.

- C. Eva Conrad gave some updates on the educational master planning process:
 1. The Master Plan Consultant Team has completed two rounds of interviews with Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services.
 2. The MPSTF reviewed chapters 1 and 2 in late March. Eva thanked the people who sent feedback on these chapters.
 3. The Tri-chairs met in early April to review the feedback and make decisions about edits to the document.
 4. Chapters 1 and 2 will be distributed for college-wide review on April 24th and feedback will be due May 5th. CMPCT will also provide feedback on the drafts of Chapters 1 and 2 during this period.
 5. The next four chapters will be distributed for review and comment by the MPSTF also on April 24th, with feedback due on May 5th. Eva emphasized that this will be a large amount of reading and encouraged people to review the portions they want to review, but not to feel obligated to review the entire document.

D. Sheryl Sterry gave an update on the planning process for the Farm and the Wildlife Sanctuary:

1. Work sessions have been held with faculty, staff, Matt Judd, Gary Nellesen, and Mika Klein. The Master Plan Consultant Team came away with concepts for the farm and Wildlife Sanctuary that will be folded into the overall campus concept and presented to the MPSTF at the May 19th meeting.

5.2 Interview Themes (formerly Strategic Directions)

- A. Eva explained that the term “Strategic Directions” could be used as the name of the summary of the ideas that came out of the interviews, but that the MPSTF could choose a different name. The MPSTF discussed this issue and decided that “Interview Themes” was a more appropriate term.
- B. Eva emphasized that these are not institutional goals/objectives unless the MPSTF decides that they want them to be during the development of the strategic plan in the fall. These are a summary of what the master planners heard in two rounds of interviews and meetings held with approximately 170 people on campus, representing 75 instructional units, 20 student services units, and 5 administrative units.
- C. Eva said that two things struck her team, upon completion of these interviews:
 1. Eva’s team applauded the dedication shown by Mt. SAC’s people. They found this campus to be unique in terms of the passion that people at every level have for student success and student equity.
 2. Additionally, they were struck by the degree of similarity in the ideas expressed for how to move forward.
- D. CBT has identified five “Interview Themes”:
 1. Increase student’s successful completion of a course, which, as defined by the State Chancellor’s office, means finishing a class with a grade of C or better. It is important to help students experience success as early as possible.
 2. Use pathways to increase the rates of successful completion of degrees and certificates. The desire to help students finish degrees or certificates was often cited as a challenge. The chosen method most often mentioned was the development of pathways to ensure that the sequence of courses is available in the right order and that Mt. SAC’s degrees align with other universities’.
 3. Expand interdepartmental collaboration. CBT heard a lot about the vision for greater collaboration between instruction and student services and across departments.
 4. Expand opportunities for distance learning. A good possibility for the future is to provide student access through distance learning. Students can set their own schedule. Distance learning also has the potential to improve equity because students have the flexibility to review the material at their own pace.

5. Expand opportunities for learning-by-doing. CTE programs emphasized this as did traditional academic departments, such as sociology and psychology, which would like to add venues for student research.
- E. Eva explained that *Chapter 6 Interview Themes* outlines the commonalities across the interviews. It is not a summary of the details included in chapters 3, 4, and 5. Sheryl noted that the chapter that links the EMP and FMP will connect many of these ideas to the facilities recommendations.
 - F. Table Discussion: The participants at each table discussed the Interview Themes and then reported their conclusions out to the entire MPSTF. They provided the following feedback.
 1. Irene said that these interview themes are a helpful snapshot of what the College is thinking. She prefers the term “Interview Themes” instead of “Strategic Directions,” because it will not be confused with the Strategic Plan that will be prepared in fall 2017.
 2. Madelyn Arballo noted that there should be greater incorporation of the School of Continuing Education initiatives. And their facilities should be integrated into the campus, not separated. Eva asked Madelyn to edit the drafts that the group will receive in the coming week to add a greater focus on the School of Continuing Education initiatives.
 3. It was noted that in the last meeting the group discussed projecting graduation rates in the area, so as Madelyn said, it’s going to be important that continuing education not be forgotten. This needs to be addressed in both the educational and facilities plans.
 4. Audrey Yamagata-Noji noted that the College has done so much over the last few years to define who they are and what they do. She recommended that the final document refer readers to other documents that more comprehensively cover the issues mentioned in these chapters. She also noted that Irene and Barbara would be the best resources for providing these other documents.

5.3 Parking and Circulation Master Plan

- A. Gary Nellesen noted that the Parking and Circulation Master Plan (PCMP) is providing important information for facilities planning. The primary reason for doing the PCMP is because, due to litigation, the College lost the opportunity to build a parking structure in Lot A and they are falling behind on parking capacity. The logistics of building parking is complicated and will drive what and when the College can build for instructional or support functions. He emphasized that the plan for parking needs to be determined early, which is why the PCMP is a separate project.
- B. Alysen Weiland reported that the campus parking lots were surveyed on March 15th to determine the level of usage during various times of day. Drones were employed to photograph the parking lots and record where cars were parked and queued in the aisles. The patterns of use and access/circulation are being studied.

- C. Alysen showed a diagram that illustrates the level of parking usage in the parking lots on the day of the survey. The highest demand occurred during 11am-12pm, however parking utilization was consistently high all day. Peak time began at 8 or 9am and continued until about 7pm. The busiest parking lots are filled to over 97% capacity. The next busiest lots are 90-97% full—still very full.
- D. Mika noted that the high proportion of part time students increases parking demand. There are more students coming in and out because they are not on full-time schedules.
- E. Alysen noted that their report will analyze the survey results in further detail. The PCMP will identify where the highest demand occurs, where surface parking areas will be lost to other land uses, and where parking structures can be built to help alleviate the shortage. It is important to get cars off the main roads before they get to the busy intersection at Temple and Grand Avenues.
- F. It is not cost effective to build a structure under 2-3 levels. As far as sequencing, Lot S is being considered as the first parking structure location, followed by Lot A, Lot F, Lot B, then Lot H. Alysen noted that it is early in the planning process and as information from the parking survey is analyzed, they will start to look at phasing and how it would work with the implementation of the EFMP.
- G. It was noted that parking structures should always be referred to in “levels” not “stories.” Some of these levels can be underground.
- H. It was mentioned that the local public transportation system is not convenient because of long travel times. Interest was expressed in knowing how many students use the Fast Pass.
- I. There was a concern about what would happen to faculty parking when the planned campus Transit Center is built. It was noted that the PCMP analysis is not yet complete and this conversation will continue in more detail in the May MPSTF meeting.

5.4 Facilities Planning Objectives

- A. Sandy described the facilities planning objectives as what the College wants to accomplish on the physical campus. It is a list that brings together the results of the facilities analysis; looks at issues, opportunities, and challenges; and ideas voiced in interviews and master planning meetings with college stakeholders, including the program interviews, MPSTF meetings, the eco charrette, and Farm planning meetings.
- B. Sandy touched on a few of the key items that came up repeatedly:
 - 1. Creating a “front door” to the campus—where do we announce Mt. SAC?
 - 2. Creating appropriate zones on campus.
 - 3. Connect the campus through a prominent connector road, as well as smaller pathways to other areas of campus.

4. Stitching the campus together from north to south.
 5. Blending the campus into the community at the edges to make it flow within the city. There are concerns about the view of the campus being just a sea of parking.
 6. Balancing greenery and open spaces with the need for buildings and paved areas.
- C. Potential new buildings under consideration were also reviewed.

5.5 Planning Assumptions

- A. Sheryl Sterry talked about the assumptions that are framing the development of a campus concept.
1. Over the last few months, the Master Plan Consultant Team has studied the enrollment data and the college's space inventory and have established, based on Title 5 space standards, that the College has a clear need for additional lab space, office space, library space, and instructional media space.
 - a. Taking a closer look at laboratory space needs, in terms of the current enrollment and the current space inventory, a need for additional space can be demonstrated for several broad instructional disciplines, including natural sciences, communications, engineering and industrial technology, health careers, psychology, public and protective services, and interdisciplinary studies.
 - b. It was requested that the lab space needs for interdisciplinary studies be analyzed in more detail to understand which programs show a need. Programs in the School of Continuing Education must be addressed specifically.
 2. The planners also looked at "other" space types, such as food service space, assembly space, exhibition space, merchandise space, and recreation space, for which Title 5 does not set standards.
 - a. Jeff Archibald asked how these needs were developed. He felt that some of these "space needs" would be of the lowest priority for most people on campus.
 - b. Sheryl said that the planners are looking at these figures together with input from master planning discussions to verify where more space may be needed. She explained that "other space" is not regulated by Title 5, but there still may be a need for these types of space on campus.
- B. The starting point for planning on campus assumes that three projects that are currently in planning will be completed. These projects are the Business and Computer Technology (BCT) Center, Phases 1 and 2 of the Physical Education Project, and the West Parcel Solar Project.

1. The facilities planners recommend removing the temporary spaces on campus and replacing them with permanent space. This will be highly relevant to the School of Continuing Education and to Student Services, which both occupy many temporary buildings.
 2. The planners are also looking at buildings that are, due to their condition or age, not feasible to renovate.
- C. A campus plan showing aged and temporary buildings removed—a clean slate—illustrates the opportunity to implement a campus-wide concept to better organize the campus and accomplish the Facilities Planning Objectives.

5.6 Preliminary Site Concept

- A. Jana Wehby talked about how, just as pathways are important for educational planning, they are also key to site planning. She noted that Mt. SAC's unique topography contributes to beautiful views and a unique sense of place. But the topography can also make it difficult to get around. The campus is also unique in that it is bisected by a major thoroughfare.
1. How can the campus be organized to stitch it together internally, and outwards to the community?
 2. Jana proposed to strengthen the Miracle Mile as a key corridor through the campus. It would have a consistent identity, provide shade and amenities along the way, and would be anchored at both ends—on the western end to an Arts District and on the eastern end to the Farm.
 3. She proposed a series of prominent campus open spaces through the center of campus—a green spine along Miracle Mile.
 4. Jana noted that the facilities and site planners are also coordinating on the Parking and Circulation Master Plan to try and streamline vehicular circulation and determine how best to get people on campus, encouraging them to enter campus before they get to the Temple/Grand intersection. Parking and strategically located passenger drop-off and pickup locations will be planned.
 5. To stitch the campus together, strong pedestrian corridors are being proposed across Temple Avenue to connect to the southern half of campus and across Grand Avenue to the adjacent commercial land uses. The planners are also looking at street intersections and how to get people across the street without slowing vehicular traffic unnecessarily. Pedestrian bridges and scrambles (coordinating traffic lights) are being considered.
 6. Additionally, a system of universally accessible secondary routes and tertiary circulation routes are being proposed to help people navigate through all areas in an intuitive manner.

7. The idea of a “healthy living loop” was proposed, which would be an amenity for both the campus and the greater Walnut community. It would provide pathways that are safe for both pedestrians and cyclists and could also be used by the cross-country team.
 8. A Temple Avenue green corridor was proposed, which would give the campus a green frontage along this thoroughfare, instead of a sea of parking lots.
 9. Jana also addressed the desire for creating more of an identity and a gateway into the campus. The goal is to make Temple Avenue feel like a part of campus—to give people the sense that they are entering a special place. The green corridor would draw on Mt. SAC’s unique programs with the Wildlife Sanctuary on the west and the Farm on the east. Pasture land would be extended along Temple Avenue to provide green space with a farm gateway on the east side of campus. A Wildlife Sanctuary living laboratory would be extended across Temple Avenue on the west side of campus into what is now Lot B.
 10. Jana proposed that Mt. SAC take the opportunity to create a public interface along Grand Avenue and the commercial uses that exist across the street. Community-oriented facilities could be located along Grand Avenue, such as an Assembly Hall, art gallery, and bookstore, with the aim of creating a “town and gown” feel and initiate improvements that would benefit the wider public as well as the College.
- B. Brett Leavitt asked the MPSTF to respond to ideas for organizing the building locations on campus.
1. Space in the center of campus should be used to create a safe and welcoming home for students and staff. Locations that are being considered for parking and parking structures are conveniently near, but outside of the center of campus. Removing parking from the center of campus will remove barriers to pedestrians and free up open space for more appropriate functions.
 2. The campus is currently organized into several informal zones based on academic disciplines or other functions, One approach would be to strengthen and improve these zones. Aligning circulation systems with functional zoning can begin to build intuitive wayfinding.
 - a. One way to strengthen Mt. SAC’s zoning is by expanding these zones strategically—the science zone, for example. Building zones could be expanded out toward the public street so that the architecture helps to define how the community perceives Mt. SAC.
 3. Brett asked the MPSTF to look several decades into the future when the campus would take on its ultimate form. What could the center of campus look like when Building 6 is eventually removed? Founders Hall, a beautiful and symbolic building that is currently hidden, would be revealed to those entering from San Jose Hills Road. The Humanities Building 26 currently acts as a barrier to the Miracle Mile at the halfway point. If Building 26 were eventually removed, the center of campus could be opened up to create a central park.

- C. Mika noted that she is not comfortable with making the decision to remove Technical Education Buildings 28A and 28B without first studying the potential for their reuse.
- D. Mika also noted that the College cannot do any critical work in the core of campus until the row buildings are taken down. The building of new space cannot be justified until these aged buildings are removed.
- E. Brett encouraged people not to focus on the details of phasing, but to think about the big picture. In terms of framework, what makes sense? Where is it best to build a new LRC? Where is it best to build the School of Continuing Education?
- F. Table Discussion: The MPSTF separated into small groups to discuss these initial ideas and offer their feedback. The group then reconvened to share their thoughts:
 - 1. It was noted that building parking structures will invite security issues.
 - 2. Irene said that, though she likes the idea of the healthy living loop, the idea of people walking through the Farm makes her nervous. There is no supervision and a lot of animals there, so security would be an issue.
 - 3. Many MPSTF members commented that they really liked the idea of the healthy living loop. One idea was to have other options to weave in and out of it, rather than a single continuous loop.
 - 4. Jeff Archibald noted that it would be more desirable for Mt. SAC to make a connection to the businesses across the street on Grand Avenue, if improvements were made to those properties.
 - 5. Some concern was expressed about locating an Assembly Hall away from the center of campus. Some wondered if it would be used less.
 - 6. Many positive opinions were expressed for the idea of developing the Miracle Mile.
 - 7. There were differing opinions about the best location for the LRC.
 - a. Some thought the Parking Lot G location might be safer.
 - b. Others felt the LRC should be placed closer to Temple Avenue, where it would be visible and a part of the College's identity.
 - c. One group said they were leaning toward the southern option where the LRC would be more accessible to the athletics zone, passenger drop off, and transit center, although it would be somewhat further away from much of the parking. Ideally the LRC would be on the quad, but they also liked the idea of the LRC being located on the edge of the center of campus as an identity point for the College.
 - d. Another reason given in favor of the southern LRC location was to allow for more instructional space in the northern location. Because its programs have

already outgrown Building 13, Lot G has become more desirable for developing more instructional space.

8. Better quality and more food options throughout campus were requested.
9. One group recommended locating short-term parking near Student Services. Currently, students park far away and trek across campus.
10. Some were very positive about collaborating with the City of Walnut and the idea of building a bridge across Grand Avenue.
11. The ideas for more green spaces with shade were well received.
12. It was noted that the building numbering scheme must be improved.
13. A location for the School of Continuing Education was discussed.
 - a. Currently, the School has its own access and parking, which helps because some of their students can find it challenging to deal with the level of activity on a large campus. However, this location is quite isolated from other instructional buildings in the center of campus. There has been discussion about integrating Continuing Education more fully into the campus, but that approach may not be best for every program that they offer.
 - b. A new Continuing Education location in Lot F was suggested.
14. There was concern about the size of building footprints on the diagrams and whether they will be large enough. Mika noted that these footprints represent multi-story buildings. The campus should build upward to maintain enough land area for both buildings and open space.

5.7 Next Steps

- A. Sandy Kate emphasized that the next meeting will be very crucial to the process. More detailed options will be presented for input by the MPSTF. It will be the last time that this group will meet before summer, during which the Educational and Facilities Master Plan document will be developed.
- B. Next Meeting: May 19, 2017, 9 AM to 12:30 PM. Founders Hall Conference Center.

Submitted by,



Sheryl Sterry
Senior Educational Facilities Planner
HMC Architects

Mt. SAC MPSTF Meeting #5
Mt. SAC
April 17, 2017
Page 11 of 11

Attachments: Master Plan Steering Task Force Meeting #5 Slide Presentation

cc: Distribution to Mt. SAC Attendees by Facilities Planning and Management
Master Plan Consultant Team Attendees
Gerdo Aquino (SWA Group)
Aravind Batra (P2S Engineering)
Michael Bernal (HMC Architects)
Karen Chan
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)

Visit: www.mtsac.edu/efmp

