

# Meeting Minutes

## Mt. SAC Master Plan Steering Task Force Meeting #8

**Date** December 1, 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  
Dalia Chavez, Faculty, Counseling, School of Continuing Education  
Carlos Duarte, Campus Safety Officer, Campus Safety, CSEA 262  
Ruben Flores, Equipment Operator, Grounds, CSEA 651  
Jonathan Hymer, Faculty, Technology & Health  
Joe Jennum, Dean, Kinesiology, Athletics, and Dance  
Mika Klein, Senior Facilities Planner, Facilities Planning & Management  
Mark Lowentroun, Associate Dean, Arts  
Tom Mauch, Dean, Counseling  
Martin Ramey, President, Academic Senate  
Mark Ruh, Faculty, Kinesiology, Athletics & Dance  
Don Sachs, Special Assistant to the President  
Lina Soto, Faculty, Counseling  
Chisa Uyeki, Faculty, Library & Learning Resources  
Dave Wilson, Chief of Police, Campus Safety  
Audrey Yamagata-Noji, MPSTF Tri-chair and Vice President, Student Services

**Master Plan Consultant Team:**

Ken Salyer, HMC Architects  
Sheryl Sterry, HMC Architects  
Emilie Waugh, HMC Architects  
Jana Wehby, SWA Group  
Alysen Weiland, Psomas

### Purposes

- To update the Master Plan Steering Task Force on EFMP progress.
- To discuss the review of the facilities master planning chapters.

### Items Discussed

#### 8.1 Welcome and Updates

- A. Sheryl Sterry welcomed the Task Force to this final scheduled Master Plan Steering Task Force (MSPTF) meeting.
- B. Mika Klein reported on the current status of the Educational and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) process.

1. Mika noted that the first six chapters of the document (the educational planning chapters) have been reviewed by the MPSTF and CMPCT, and are now available for review by the College at large. Mika thanked the MPSTF for their assistance in this process.
2. Mika noted that the preparation of Mt. SAC's Parking and Circulation Master Plan (PCMP) began before the EFMP process began, and it is now complete. The PCMP informs the EFMP, which takes the recommendations further into the future.
3. Mika explained that the first drafts of the Introduction, Chapter 7, and Chapter 8 have all been released to the MPSTF, CMPCT, and specialized consultants. Comments from these reviewers are due today (December 1, 2017). The second draft of these chapters will be released for College-wide review after comments from the MPSTF and CMPCT have been addressed.
4. Chapters 9 through 12 and the Appendix are all currently being developed with the input of CMPCT.
5. An hour-long EFMP presentation will be on the agenda for a special Board meeting that will be held on Saturday, February 3, 2017. The College will report on EFMP progress and ask for the Board's input. This meeting will be open to the public, and Mika invited members of the MPSTF to attend.

## **8.2 Review of Table of Contents**

- A. Sheryl reviewed the Table of Contents with the task force and noted that some changes have been made since the last meeting to improve the document's organization and to assist readers in finding information.
  1. The first volume of the document will consist of the Introduction and the educational planning chapters (1-6), which have been reviewed and are near completion.
  2. Volume 2 will comprise the facilities planning chapters (7-9).
    - i. Chapter 9 will list and describe the sources of input to the facilities planning recommendations. Most importantly, it describes the linkages between the educational planning input and data in Chapters 1 through 6 and the facilities and site improvement recommendations in Chapters 10 and 11. Chapter 9 also describes the other sources of input that inform the recommendations, including the public meetings, student focus groups, and the facilities analyses in Chapters 7 and 8.
    - ii. Chapter 10 will describe the recommended building projects and the campus-wide projects.
  3. Volume 3 will cover the site and infrastructure planning and implementation planning chapters (11-12).
    - i. Chapter 11 will describe the site infrastructure and site improvement projects. It will also include the landscape master plan, which will provide guidance for the development of Mt. SAC's campus landscape character.

- ii. Chapter 12, which will include tools and information that will help with the implementation of the EFMP.
4. Volume 4 will contain the Appendix.

### **8.3 Facilities Project List Review**

- A. Chapter 10 will consist of the following project categories.
  1. Major New Buildings
  2. Major Renovations
  3. Campus-wide Facilities Projects
  4. Other Facilities Projects
    - i. Minor Projects
    - ii. Scheduled Maintenance
- B. Each project description will answer 4 questions.
  1. What is this project?
  2. Why is it needed?
  3. How does this project apply to the needs identified in the master plan themes in Chapters 3, 4, and 5?
  4. Why is this project located where it is and how does it relate to the adjacent spaces?
- C. Sheryl presented the current draft of the master plan campus graphic and noted that the last time this task force met, Gary Nellesen reviewed the facilities project list. Since then much progress has been made to develop the facilities recommendations. Although the master plan must be a flexible and high-level plan, much has been done, and is still ongoing, to coordinate the plan on many levels (infrastructure, adjacencies, circulation, open space)—to ensure that the plan be buildable.
  1. The recommended plan incorporates new buildings, major renovations, and parking structures.
  2. The project list has been reviewed and approved by CMPCT.
  3. Changes since the last time the MPSTF met include the addition of a new fine arts building instead of the renovation of Art Center 1A and a new makerspace building.

D. Sheryl did a quick review of major new buildings project list to remind the task force what was discussed in the last meeting. She emphasized that the plan shown today would be at full build-out and does not demonstrate phasing. The list of projects is being discussed in alphabetical order (not phasing order).

1. Adult Education

- i. After much review, Adult Education has been revised to be located closer to the School of Continuing Education, allowing pedestrians to travel between these two facilities more easily.
- ii. An improved connection is planned to the paths along Bonita Avenue into the complex.
- iii. Once Adult Education and the School of Continuing Education projects are built, Building 40 will remain, but would no longer be used for Continuing Education.
- iv. The idea is to cluster these programs together and make them as connected as possible. Adult Education would include a courtyard overlooking Sherman Park. The complex would be visible with a presence and clear identity from Bonita Avenue. The plan includes an adjacent parking lot and passenger loading zone.
- v. There will be a lot more discussion about what does and does not go into these buildings during the project scoping meetings.

2. Auditorium

- i. The location remains the same for this building and Parking Structure B, with recent development being focused on the surrounding site work. The site surrounding the Auditorium will be one of four areas being developed to a higher level in the site improvement recommendations.

3. Bookstore

- i. The Bookstore would be in the central area of the campus, along with the new Student Center, Library/LRC, and Makerspace.
- ii. A worksession was held with the architects for the new Student Center to work out the locations of buildings, the terracing and ground elevations, pedestrian access, service vehicles access, and infrastructure in this important central area.

4. Campus Safety

- i. This building is in the same location as previously discussed.

5. Fine Arts

- i. This project has been changed since the last time the MPSTF met. Instead of a renovation project, it will be a new building with more space in the same general location as Arts Center 1A.

6. Library/LRC

- i. This building is in the same location as previously discussed.

7. Makerspace

8. Nature Center

- i. This will be located next to the Wildlife Sanctuary with good access for its visitors.

9. Physical Education Complex

10. School of Continuing Education

11. Science

12. Student Center

13. Student Services North

- i. This is another area where planning efforts have been focused on the surrounding site area to develop a prominent northern arrival area into the campus and plan for many student-oriented outdoor spaces and connections that would support the student services programs.

14. Technical Education

15. Transit Center

E. Sheryl reviewed the list of major renovations proposed for the campus.

1. College Services

- i. Space in Building 6 will be renovated and repurposed after the new Library/LRC is built and those functions have moved out.
- ii. Space in Building 23 will be repurposed after the new Campus Safety building is built.

2. Building 28A/B

- i. After the Technical Education building is built, there will be an opportunity to look at how or if Building 28A/B could be repurposed.

3. Humanities and Social Sciences 26A/B/D and Planetarium 26C would receive its first comprehensive renovations and reorganization.
  4. Buildings 7 and 60 will be reorganized after the new Science building is built.
  5. Student Services 9B will be renovated/reorganized after the new Student Services North building is built.
- F. Mika reviewed the recommended Campus-wide Projects.
1. Mika noted that the campus-wide projects were derived from many discussions during the educational master planning phase. The scopes of these projects are not limited to single buildings, but would be implemented across the campus.
  2. Building renumbering and wayfinding needs to be addressed, both within buildings and across outdoor spaces. Guidelines are needed for wayfinding on the campus.
  3. Office suites with spaces that support collaboration should be an important part of every new building.
  4. Energy and infrastructure development was discussed many times and always rose to the top of people's priorities.
  5. Informal student spaces were also a major priority in master plan discussions. In addition to dining spaces and resource centers, students asked for places to sit and study, hang out, and wait. There were many requests for more shaded outdoor seating.
  6. Interactive learning environments are needed where students will have the space and tools to effectively learn and that will support various instructional modes.
  7. Public art came up as a priority in master plan discussions. Public art is most successful when it is planned for from the start of a project and integrated into the design from the beginning. This project is a huge opportunity to incorporate art intentionally into facilities and outdoor areas.
  8. Universal design is a priority, given the topography of the campus. Facilities must be carefully planned from the start to be accessible to all.

#### **8.4 Site Projects**

- A. Sheryl noted that the planning for site projects is still undergoing development and review by CMPCT and that the illustrative campus graphic being presented in this meeting is still a work in progress. The MPSTF feedback will be valuable to CMPCT.
- B. Mika noted that a campus is more than just the buildings, it is also the adjacencies of outdoor spaces and how various campus elements function together. Which is why the planning process is so involved and lengthy.
- C. Jana Wehby presented a progression of the drafts of the campus framework have been shown to the MPSTF in previous meetings.

1. As the primary pedestrian corridor, Miracle Mile is planned to be a strong, cohesive element on campus. It would strengthen the pedestrian connections in the east-west direction and link to strong secondary north-south pathways. The overall hierarchy of circulation would be improved.
  2. The healthy living loop has been developed further, offering opportunities for wider community and College activity and exercise.
  3. The Temple Avenue green corridor will provide gateways to the campus on the east and the west sides that will inform drivers and pedestrians that they have arrived at the Mt. SAC campus.
  4. The plan also proposes many significant and useful open spaces throughout the campus.
- D. Chisa Uyeki asked about the previously proposed living laboratory space in Lot B. The graphic now just shows parking.
1. Mika said that because of the great need for parking, CMPCT didn't think it was feasible for that to be included in the 10-year plan, but it can be discussed as a future potential project. The thought at this point is that the Nature Center could move forward, but CMPCT was not comfortable extending the living laboratory into Lot B.
  2. There is an opportunity to plan for a sustainability center as a future project. Could it be a part of the recommended Library/LRC building or the Science building? Should its functions be centralized or dispersed? That kind of detail won't appear in the master plan, but the plan will include it as a future potential project.
- E. It was asked whether there will be a burn tower in the fire training area, which could have a significant impact on air quality and be at odds with the uses of the Wildlife Sanctuary next door.
1. Mika said that a burn tower is not planned for the fire training area. Students train in an off-site burn tower near the College.
- F. Joe Jennum pointed to the southeast quadrant where the stadium area is and questioned the path of travel for the Healthy Living Loop, which is shown crossing through locked facilities.
1. Jana agreed that there would be alternative routes incorporated into the Healthy Living Loop to accommodate the need to close off certain portions of campus at times. She noted that this is also something that would be addressed in the Farm.
  2. Joe also noted that the Kinesiology Program should be included when the Healthy Living Loop is programmed and designed. It would be nice to be able to use this feature in their curriculum.
    - i. Chisa noted that, in addition to Kinesiology, the people she has spoken to are very excited about the Healthy Living Loop idea.

- G. Jana talked about the balance between incorporating enough parking and having a more aesthetically pleasing frontage to the campus. This is a key point of discussions about how to start building the green frontage and extending the Farm frontage pasture through Lot F.

### **8.5 Parking and Circulation**

- A. Alysen Weiland reviewed the outcomes of the PCMP, which has been completed.
  - 1. The parking recommendations address projected student enrollment growth.
  - 2. Four of the six parking structures shown in the PCMP are being recommended in the EFMP. These four were the most implementable and in the least controversial areas.
    - i. The PCMP also has long-term recommendations for Lots H and A.
    - ii. The PCMP shows options much farther out in the future that are not based on stall counts.
  - 3. Alysen noted that the sizes and locations of recommended parking structure were planned with an awareness of campus land uses and circulation, to integrate them into the campus master plan.
  - 4. The PCMP also looked at surface lots in Lots A, B, D, F, and W. The existing lots are not functioning as efficiently as they could be, so the PCMP recommends ways to increase their parking capacity and improve the circulation of vehicles within the lots.
  - 5. The PCMP also included recommendations for working with the City to improve intersection signalization to improve the flow of traffic into and out of the campus.
    - i. Concern was expressed about Grand Avenue being impacted by vehicles waiting to enter new lots.
    - ii. Alysen noted that new parking structures could have informational signage showing how full they are. Many colleges have successfully implemented this type of signage.
    - iii. Mika noted that Cal Poly has installed this type of signage and that she no longer sees traffic backing up into the public streets.
    - iv. It was also commented that there needs to be signage that tells people where parking is available if a lot is full.
  - 6. Alysen explained that currently Lot B is the most popular lot for parking. It also has major circulation issues. In the short term there is a recommendation to improve stall allocation and improve circulation. They found that hundreds of additional stalls could be added with an improved design, which also will help when other lots are closed for construction.
  - 7. Mika noted that general fund money cannot be used to build parking structures. One of the purposes of the master plan is to get these projects on a bond list for funding.



- i. It was commented that this should be made clear to members of the community. The College often gets requests for free parking on campus, and they don't realize that parking fees are needed to fund maintenance and improvements of the lots.
8. Lot D will need improvement and a passenger drop-off for the Bookstore.
9. A safe place is needed for buses loading and parking near the Wildlife Sanctuary and the proposed sand volleyball courts. The proposed changes do remove some parking spots, but they provide safer circulation. The plan separates the parking aisle from the driveway for through traffic. The requirement was to allow for two buses to load at a time, but this plan allows for four.
10. Parking Structures S and R are being designed right now in order to be available with the stadium, which is under construction, opens. It is planned that Parking Structure and Lot R would be open before the Olympic trials in 2020 and that Parking Structure S would open right after the trials.
  - i. Parking Structures S is being designed for potential future bridges—one across Temple Avenue and one across Bonita Drive that would connect to the Aquatics Center.
11. The reallocation of stalls in Lot B allows the incorporation of bioswales that would improve water quality and improve the balance between parking and green space to improve the aesthetic quality along Temple Avenue.
  - i. It was commented that the Temple Avenue Green Corridor should be included in the design of Parking Structures S. This will be the first part of the green corridor to be built.
12. Mika noted that the bus ridership numbers have increased with the free bus passes. Foothill Transit is interested in improving transit connections between eastern LA County to Union Station by building transit centers. The traffic issues in the area are not going away, so we must look at regional solutions, including alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle.
  - i. Commuting is Mt. SAC's number one greenhouse gas contributor.
    - ii. The use of public transit may have an impact on class timing.
13. It was commented that more people are using Uber or Lyft to get to campus, so there may be more vehicles backing up on the roads to drop off/pick up passengers. Maybe certain lots on campus should be designated for ride-sharing drop-off zones.
- B. Jana reviewed the recommendations for circulation within campus.
  1. Miracle Mile will extend completely across campus, and link with pedestrian promenades that connect to the north and south. These promenades would be shaded with trees.

2. The Healthy Living Loop's outer loop would be just under three miles, with signage for alternative routes.
  3. The Temple Avenue Green Corridor would make the campus feel more cohesive, rather than divided by a barrier (Temple Avenue).
  4. Universal circulation would be expanded throughout the campus, rather than being implemented in a fragmented manner as it is currently. Various strategies will be recommended to address the topographic challenge of traveling north-south across the campus.
- C. Jana presented the concept for Miracle Mile that was reviewed by CMPCT.
1. A 60-foot width would be reserved for Miracle Mile, which allows 40 feet for paths of travel for pedestrians, service vehicles, emergency services, and carts; as well as the zone for underground infrastructure pathways.
  2. The 10-foot width on both sides would accommodate lighting, permanent seating, shade trees, and event pop-up tents supported by wifi and electrical receptacles.
  3. The master plan will include consistent design concepts for primary, secondary, and tertiary circulation routes to support a consistent and unified aesthetic.
  4. This concept for a pedestrian circulation hierarchy is being integrated with the current Student Center design—the first piece of Miracle Mile that will be built. When 9C is removed, space will be cleared for the second piece of Miracle Mile to be built.
  5. Mika noted that CMPCT responded favorably to this concept. The impetus for this idea comes from the EFMP's educational planning and input from the MPSTF, students, and the community.
  6. Each element of pedestrian circulation would provide consistent visual cues, such as paving materials, to help with wayfinding.
  7. If, in the future, bicycles use is permitted on campus, a portion of pathway, such as Miracle Mile, could be designated for cyclists and bicycle racks could be added.
    - i. Carlos Duarte noted that since Mt. SAC is a commuter campus, bike storage should be placed interior to campus instead of just on the periphery.
    - ii. Sheryl said that one approach would be for the College to engage in a college-wide discussion to reach consensus on campus bicycle use and to develop a bicycle policy that addresses safe use and design standards for bicycle facilities.
    - iii. Mika noted that the College could add bicycle striping in the future if it were needed. Secure bike storage will be included in the Transit Center to serve people who cycle from home to their bus stop. The existing bike racks are not used because they are not located well and are poorly lit, resulting in frequent thefts. For now, the best the College can do is to plan its infrastructure with the flexibility to add bicycle facilities in the future.

8. It was asked if future forms of transportation had been built into the plan. Uber is developing a plan for air taxis and has signed a contract with LA county. Could there be a landing site on Mt. SAC's campus?
  - i. The roof of a parking structure was suggested.
9. It was asked whether infrastructure to support landscape plantings is being considered. There is a limited amount of grounds staff and over the years, trees that are planted are removed because the infrastructure for deep watering of roots is lacking. The roots grow on the surface and become a trip hazard that costs the District a lot of money. Sufficient distance should separate the underground infrastructure corridor from tree roots.
  - i. Chapter 11 will include a robust Landscape Guidelines section which has been reviewed by the Grounds Department and the Ornamental Horticulture Program, and lists the trees/shrubs/groundcover/irrigation can be used on campus. The Landscape Guidelines will provide the grounds and maintenance teams with a roadmap for when they're working on minor projects. The Guidelines will also address paving to make sure the approved types are installed in the correct manner. Utilities should be offset from trees—this should be explicitly included. Jana will include this in the diagrams and narrative.

#### **8.6 Open Space Programming**

- A. Jana noted that this section of the document will include updated diagrams of open spaces such as lawns and flexible outdoor spaces.
- B. Courtyards will be integrated with certain buildings to support indoor/outdoor uses.
- C. Gardens will be larger spaces that will be organized into smaller seating areas/outdoor study spaces and a variety of plantings.
- D. Larger plazas will support larger outdoor and campus-wide events.
- E. The document will identify some larger, key outdoor spaces.
  1. Arts Garden Plaza
  2. Inspiration Lawn
    - i. It was suggested that this name be changed to either "North Lawn" or "Kern's Corner" as those are names already associated with this area.
  3. Auditorium Plaza and Rose Garden
  4. Incline Garden (supporting student services)
  5. Founders Green (existing, but will be expanded to give Founders Hall more space and develop it as a historic icon on campus)

6. Mountie Gardens (the area between Buildings 12 and 13) is referred to by some as “the jungle.”
  7. The Terraced Quad is flexible open space by the new Student Center. The Equity Center and the Campus Testing Center are being designed for this site—both in modular buildings. Because the EFMP is a long-term vision, this area should be shown as an open quad. The modulares could be moved to another part of campus, if needed.
  8. Library Learning Gardens
  9. Makers Green would be flexible space to support the Makerspace
  10. Innovation Grove, south of the BCT
  11. Sherman Park would remain
  12. Demonstration Garden and the koi pond would remain
  13. Farm frontage on Temple Avenue
- F. It was suggested that there could be contests on campus to name these spaces, when these projects are being implemented.
- G. Joe asked whether there are size requirements for outdoor spaces and said that it would be nice to have some significant green space incorporated on the south side of campus, near the stadium. Public art should be incorporated there as well. Perhaps the artwork could be incorporated into the Healthy Living Loop, along with Heritage Hall.
- H. Jana noted that these three major site improvement concepts relate to “gateways” into the campus:
1. Auditorium Plaza and Rose Garden
  2. Student Services North building “arrival area”
  3. Library Learning Gardens
- I. Jana showed preliminary sketches for the Auditorium Plaza and Rose Garden.
1. An amphitheater had been considered for this area, and that idea is still evolving. The objective behind this idea was to have an outdoor performance venue that would support the auditorium and to create an active space along the pedestrian path to Miracle Mile.
  2. A pedestrian promenade accommodates circulation from the passenger drop-off area at Mt. SAC Way to Miracle Mile.
  3. Mika noted that CMPCT has requested that changes be made to this concept.

4. Carlos asked whether the existing drive-up information booth at San Jose Hills Road will be recreated in the new plan and suggested that it could be part of Parking Structure B. Jana will include it in the plan.
  5. Campus Safety expressed the need to including bollards on the promenades to prevent cars from gaining access to them and injuring pedestrians. Designs for bollards should be included in the Landscape Standards.
  6. Audrey Yamagata-Noji asked why the Terraced Lawn was located there.
    - i. Mika said that there had been much discussion about how to create a large enough outdoor area for students. CMPCT wants to keep the existing Rose Garden because the College invested funds to build it, so the terraced quad would not be feasible there.
    - ii. Jana noted that this change will require in how accessibility will be accommodated within the topography of this site.
  7. Mika noted that CMPCT chose not to show the promenade extending through the parking lot along Grand Avenue.
  8. CMPCT wishes to include an elevator in the corner of the parking structure.
  9. CMPCT would like the lower level of the auditorium to face the back of house. The 2<sup>nd</sup> level of the auditorium and the parking structure would be built at the same level, with a unified and beautiful façade facing Grand Avenue. There would remain the potential for a future connection with the commercial area across Grand Avenue, should it be desired.
  10. The option is still available to include Mt. SAC's Art Gallery with the Auditorium.
- J. Jana showed the preliminary sketches for the Student Services North outdoor area.
1. The objective is to make this location into a welcoming entrance to the campus. This plan proposes to keep the existing road at the current elevation, but look at ways of making the area accessible. The parking area would be redesigned and the ground floor of the Student Services North Building would be set at the second level of Building 9B. On the north side, you'd enter the second level from a terraced outdoor plaza space with furnishings and seating. This plan also included the Stitch Corridor, which provides an accessible path of travel via a winding path through a beautifully landscaped area that allows a connection from Parking Lot A into campus. The advantage of a grade change is the opportunity to create interesting outdoor spaces, such as public art gardens within a series of terraces. To the west of Student Services North would be steps with a view out over campus. The lower plaza would be a shared space between the two student services buildings.
    - i. There was a concern that the Stitch Corridor might encourage skateboarding, however Jana pointed out that this kind of space actually wouldn't be appealing for skateboarding because, as an accessible path, it wouldn't be very sloped, and it would zig-zag back and forth.

- ii. It was agreed that skateboarding deterrents should be included in the Landscape Guidelines.
  2. Audrey and Mika shared CMPCT's reactions to this site concept.
    - i. The stitch corridor looked like ramps and appeared to be costly to build, so CMPCT asked for its removal from the plan.
    - ii. They asked that the ground level of Lot A be lowered to allow pedestrians to enter Student Services North at the same grade level as the upper level of Student Services with no stairs or barriers to access.
    - iii. Audrey noted that Student Services envisions the buildings here to be linked, and the central space in between them should be designed as that cohesive link. There could be some sort of glass connection so that it's more of an indoor/outdoor space, instead of just a pathway.
    - iv. CMPCT favored the integration of public art, especially student-created art, in this area.
    - v. Other than the Stitch Corridor, the variety of proposed landscaped space was well received.
    - vi. It was commented that this could be a functioning student arrival area, with outdoor rooms that welcome students who are arriving on campus for the first time. It could serve students arriving for orientation, assessment, etc.
    - vii. It was suggested that perhaps two drop-off areas are needed in this area.
    - viii. It was also suggested that perhaps the Student Services North building would need to be three levels to allow for future growth.
- K. Jana presented the Library Learning Garden preliminary site concept.
  1. This would be south of the new Student Center and west of the Library/Learning Resources, Makerspace, and Bookstore.
  2. There have been ongoing discussions about this space with the Student Center architects.
  3. A dedicated receiving area for service vehicles is planned to be shared by each of these buildings. Large delivery trucks would access the shared receiving area from the Transit Center.
  4. This concept is focused on having a large outdoor space, but because this area is sloped, pathways must be made accessible.
  5. There will be a passenger drop off in Lot D to serve this area with universal access to the Student Center and to Miracle Mile, as well as accessible and short-term parking.

6. It was suggested that the entire front of the Library/Learning Resources be glass with many doors to welcome people coming from all directions. There shouldn't be "us" and "them" entrances—separate accessible and non-accessible entrances. If there is a main entrance, it would be on the south side of the building to accommodate universal access.
7. Chisa noted that, though she likes the idea of the Library being a nice frontage building off Temple Avenue, she thought it seemed strange that the front door would be on the south side of the building, away from the center of campus.
  - i. It was noted that people won't necessarily have to go all the way down and around on the accessible pathways. They could use paths that cross the gardens.
8. Audrey suggested that the study garden area be the amphitheater because sound in this area would not impact sensitive facilities.
9. Mika pointed out that the Bookstore second story could provide space for administrative functions. The long-term outlook for bookstores is less focused on selling books and more on retail.
10. Mika also stated that this is the best location for the Library, when taking into account all of the functions that have to come together in the EFMP.
11. Carlos was concerned that large delivery trucks would be turning around in the service yard of these buildings where students need to walk.
  - i. Sheryl noted that the receiving area extends into the ground floor of the Student Center.
  - ii. Upper level walkways could traverse this area without crossing it on the same level.
  - iii. Mike noted that trucks would not be delivering all day long and the best that can be done for this purpose is to at least consolidate the location of the deliveries, rather than having them spread throughout campus.
12. Chisa asked that more thought be given to pedestrian connections between the Library/Learning Resources and Miracle Mile.
  - i. The potential to connect Building 26 to the Makerspace and on to the Library has been discussed.

### **8.7 The Farm Recommendations**

- A. The EFMP recommendations focus on site improvements and infrastructure upgrades in the Farm. These improvements must be done first and will prepare the Farm for further development.
- B. The plan proposes shifting the Farm Road to the east to avoid bisecting the animal areas, improving drainage infrastructure, and creating safer pedestrian circulation.

- C. Long-term recommendations for agriculture, animal sciences, and ornamental horticulture facilities will be described for future implementation.

### **8.8 Campus Neighborhoods**

- A. A plan to organize the campus into neighborhoods for renumbering buildings and improving wayfinding was reviewed by CMPCT. Mika asked the MPSTF for additional feedback.
- B. The numbering uses a three-digit system to help students find their way around the campus.
- C. CMPCT would like the campus support areas to be separated out from the South neighborhood.
- D. It was suggested that it would be difficult to have some neighborhoods be named by their placement on the campus and others by area of study.
- E. It was agreed that Miracle Mile could serve as a dividing line between neighborhoods. Buildings south of Miracle Mile could be even numbered and north of Miracle Mile could be odd numbered.
- F. Major pedestrian walkways could help frame the neighborhoods clearly.
- G. Neighborhoods don't have to be named—they should just be identified by their numbers.
- H. Geography should trump function, so build neighborhoods based on location, not the use of buildings, since that will change over time.

### **8.9 Future Development**

- A. Future development on campus includes the following projects.
  - 1. Lot A (potential for future parking structure), Lot B, Lot G (logical place if the College needs a future instructional building), and Lot H (another potential parking structure location).
  - 2. Student Services Northeast (the area to the east of the new Student Services North building). This area is intentionally being identified for student services in case an additional facility is needed. Doing so would keep Student Services in one cohesive neighborhood.

### **8.10 Input/Discussion About the Introduction, Chapter 7, and Chapter 8**

- A. Chisa suggested that maybe findings and conclusions could be pulled into the Executive Summary when the document is finished.
- B. Chisa said that, in Chapter 8, the charts were difficult to read. She suggested adding a sectional diagram that illustrates the concept being described in the narrative. The charts could be provided, along with the narrative, for those who know how to read them.



**8.11 Review Schedule for Remaining Chapters**

- A. Mika noted that because of the length of the EFMP document and the lengthy time it has taken CMPCT to review these chapters, progress has been delayed.
- B. Mika encouraged people to share these chapters with their constituents.
- C. MPSTF and CMPCT's comments for the Introduction, Chapter 7, and Chapter 8 will be addressed prior to sending these chapters out for College-wide review.
- D. The need to present the EFMP at the February 3<sup>rd</sup> Special Board Meeting is a reason to move forward with the review process.
- E. Chisa said that she, Marty Ramey, and Lina Soto have talked at Academic Senate about how the primary input from the campus needs to occur during the school year. Asking for input from the College when the College is closed would seem disingenuous.
- F. Mika noted that it is important for Chapters 10, 11, and 12 to be reviewed by the MPSTF and CMPCT before College-wide review.
- G. Mika emphasized the importance of conducting the EFMP process in an inclusive and transparent manner. Therefore, the EFMP document review schedule will be revisited. Mika will keep the MPSTF members apprised of schedule changes.

Submitted by,



Sheryl Sterry  
Senior Educational Facilities Planner  
**HMC Architects**

Attachments: PowerPoint Presentation

cc: Distribution to Mt. SAC Attendees by Facilities Planning and Management  
Master Plan Consultant Team Attendees  
Gerdo Aquino (SWA Group)  
Eera Babiwale (HMC Architects)  
Aravind Batra (P2S Engineering)  
Michael Bernal (HMC Architects)  
Eva Conrad (CBT)  
Darlene Danehy (Psomas)  
Ted Gribble (Five-G Consulting)  
Masako Ikegami (SWA Group)  
Karen Gulley (PlaceWorks)

Sandra Kate (HMC Architects)  
Brett Leavitt (HMC Architects)  
Glenn Roberts (Five-G Consulting)  
Suzanne Schwab (PlaceWorks)  
Nicholas Staddon (Horticulture Advisor)  
Marcene Taylor (MTI)