

December 5, 2006

TO: The College Community

FROM: The Facilities Planning Committee

RE: Facilities Planning Committee Recommendations

At the beginning of Spring 2006, a Facilities Planning Committee was created to review, revise and update the Educational/Facilities Funding Plan and to submit its recommendations to College Council and ultimately to the Board of Trustees for approval. The committee's charge was to take into account increased construction costs; projects already underway; public expectations; state funding issues; program, physical plant and building needs; and the lack of ongoing funding to maintain current facilities. This committee met through the spring, intermittently during the summer and again weekly throughout the fall semester (usually from 7:30 to 9:00 am). Committee members were committed to taking an institutional perspective and participating in shared decision-making.

While all meetings have been open to all members of the campus community, at this juncture committee members recognize the importance of providing a campus-wide update on the progress of the committee's work. In addition, this effort provides an opportunity to share the contextual and philosophical basis of our decision-making process as we near the completion of this assessment and prepare to forward our recommendations to College Council and the Board of Trustees. The following pages include:

- A little history, to explain more fully why this Committee was formed
- The names and positions of those who served (and continue to serve) on this Committee
- The criteria established early-on to ensure that effective and fair decision-making took place
- What type of information was gathered as a means of informing the process and its proposals
- The recommended funding plan

To ensure that there is opportunity for this plan to be shared with the College as a whole and for healthy discussion to take place, a Facilities Planning session will be offered during Flex Days.

If you have questions and comments to share with the Facilities Planning Committee, please address them to Joe Bissell, Committee Chair.

We look forward to seeing you during the Flex Day event.

Facilities Planning: Putting the Pieces Together

A Little History

Tuesday, November 5, 2002 was a momentous day for MPC: the community passed a \$145,000,000 bond to enhance this College by “repairing deteriorating roofs, worn wiring/plumbing, inefficient heating/cooling systems; renovating aging classrooms, labs, buildings; repairing/acquiring/constructing/equipping college buildings, library, public safety training facility, sites, science and computer labs; upgrading technology campus-wide and training computer technicians.” The College began to plan to use these funds, and after almost two years of planning guided by Michael Maas and Associates, the Board of Trustees accepted MPC’s Funding Plan for the Educational/Facilities Master Plan (often referred to as The Maas Plan). The total capital construction budget was \$212 million, based on the following expectations:

MPC Bond funds	\$145 million
State capital construction funds	\$47 million
Campus Center refinancing	\$1 million
Redevelopment funds	\$1 million
Federal grants	\$12 million
Local/private funding	\$3 million

The College moved forward on the first phase of the Maas Plan. It completed “early start” projects (old library analysis, master signage, old plant services demolition, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) needs, 5 vans, architectural and engineering fees, walkway and safety, landscaping, roof repairs, new plant services building, new phone system, HVAC—BC, SS, AD); created project teams for the PE-Field/Track and Fitness building, the Education Center (Fort Ord), the Public Safety Training Center Colonel Durham Site (Fort Ord), a new Student Services building, a Math/Science Project, a Music/Theater project, and the Old Library; prepared to submit to the state IPPs (Initial Project Proposals) (Humanities project, Gymnasium, and the Public Safety Training Center Parker Flats site, Fort Ord) and FPPs (Final Project Proposals) to renovate the Old Library, build a Child Development Center, create a Music/Theater complex, and renovate spaces for the Math/Science programs. The College began work on the stadium and the Fitness building and completed working drawings for the new Student Services building. The FPP submitted for Math/Science in 2005 did not make the funding cut but was resubmitted in 2006, along with an FPP for Music/Theater.

The Maas Plan was a best case scenario, developed with optimism. Circumstances changed; it appeared that the Maas Plan had been too ambitious. Primary issues adversely affecting the Maas Plan’s assumptions were:

- **Escalation in construction costs** – The initial assumption included escalation at 2-3% per year. Actual escalation during the past two years exceeded 30%.
- **Outside funding** – State funding for Math/Science was projected at \$11,300,000. The project did not earn a sufficient score to receive any funding. Also, Maas had proposed pursuing \$1,000,000 for PE. His proposal was not accepted.
- **Lack of expected growth** – The original plan projected growth of 2-3% per year for most programs. The District actually showed a 9.3% decline in enrollments during the last three years.

The Formation of the Facilities Planning Committee

In Spring of 2006, Joe Bissell was directed to create a committee to review and revise the Maas Plan, making recommendations to the College Council and Board of Trustees. The Facilities Planning Committee was established when the following people were asked to serve:

- ✓ Joe Bissell, VP of Academic Services (Chair)
- ✓ Andres Durstenfeld, Biology Instructor
- ✓ Bill Cochran, VP Academic Affairs
- ✓ Carsbia Anderson, VP Student Services
- ✓ Caroline Carney, Social Sciences Division Chair
- ✓ Diane Boynton, Humanities Division Chair
- ✓ Gail Bartow, Math Instructor
- ✓ Jeffrey A. McCart, Athletic Trainer
- ✓ Joe Demko, Project Manager (Kitchell Consultant)
- ✓ John Anderson, Creative Arts Division Chair
- ✓ Michael Gilmartin, Dean of Instruction
- ✓ Rosaleen Ryan, Institutional Research Director
- ✓ Stephen Ruth, College Readiness Instructor
- ✓ Steve Morgan, Director of Facilities

The Facilities Planning Committee began its work with the following projects already in process:

- Stadium (in construction)
- Fitness building (in construction)
- Childcare Center (plans had been drawn and accepted; project had gone to bid. Project had received almost 100% of funding from the State and has since received some augmentation from the MPC Bond due to escalation of costs.)
- Student Services building (in design phase)
- Old Library (in design phase. Had received 50% of funding from the State. Included moving Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, Fiscal Services, Foundation

Human Resources, Information Services, PIO, President's Office, and VP of Student Services to this location.)

The Committee was apprised of the following issues:

- There is not enough money from the bond to fund all projects projected by the Maas Plan.
- The College's Capacity/Load Ratio is much too high; this ratio is undermining the College's ability to receive State funds. Capacity/Load Ratio is based on the number of students enrolled, available square footage, and State guidelines for usage.
- Much of the College is in serious disrepair.

In order to meet its mandate, the Committee established the following criteria for decision-making.

For consideration, projects must:

- Be eligible for MPC Bond funding
- Reflect Bond information provided to voters

The committee will:

- Base decisions on verified data (e.g. assignable square footage, building conditions, and actual dollars available)
- Maximize additional outside funding
- Use state capacity/load guidelines
- Base decisions on district and student needs
- Not build unless it results in substantial improvement
- Establish minimum renovation standards for all buildings
- Consider the needs of each program

Step 1: Understanding the Issues

State Funding. The Committee began by seeking to understand State funding formulas, State funding project categories, and Capacity/Load ratios. Points for State funds are granted on the following basis:

- Building conditions
- Growth (Increase in enrollment creates need for more buildings)
- Capacity/Load ratios (ratios of computed capacity—Assignable Square Footage—vs. actual usage based on a state formula)
- Activating unused space
- Improved use of underutilized space

Capacity/Load Ratios. Given that MPC's enrollment has been decreasing rather than increasing, the College needs to improve its capacity load ratio (to less than 100%) to

improve its chances of receiving state funding. The college's current capacity/load ratios are not good:

- Lecture 188%
- Lab 143%
- Office 116%
- Library 129%
- Audio/Visual 85%

To improve capacity/load ratios, the Committee discussed the demolition of the following buildings to be carried out once the programs or services currently housed in these facilities are relocated:

- Administration
- Business/Humanities
- Childcare/Supportive Services
- Drafting
- Music

Program Needs. In addition, the committee reviewed individual program needs on campus to see if there were other ways to improve capacity/load ratios and improve space utilization in existing buildings. The following is a list of some of the unique needs:

- Astronomy (star gazing location needed)
- International Students Program (poor location for international students)
- Math (classroom, office, and lab space needed)
- Music (needs of the program are quite unique, and the building is in serious disrepair)
- Photography (currently not enough space for program)
- Public Safety (currently housed in building soon to be renovated)
- Supportive Services (no classroom space in new Student Services building. Needs of students require classrooms near Student Services building)
- Women's Programs (no available space in Student Services building. Current space not large enough to house all services)

Physical Plant and Building needs. As the Committee examined program needs, it also sought to understand physical plant and building needs. Almost all buildings on campus need repairs, some more critical than others. Current maintenance budgets for operations and staffing are not adequate to maintain current facilities. The committee examined infrastructure issues (utilities, sidewalks, lighting, parking, bridges, etc.), building conditions (Structural, ADA, Life Safety, Seismic, Roof, Restrooms, and HVAC), and needs unique to each building (e.g. the gym floor, the art gallery exterior, Lecture Forum rooms, and the use of space in the first floor of the International Center).

Growth Opportunities. Enrollment on this campus has been declining in recent years primarily because population has been flat or decreasing in Monterey, Carmel, and Pacific Grove. Growth opportunities appear to be in the north; Marina is expected to

grow significantly. From 2000 to 2030, for example, Marina's population is expected to grow from 19,163 to 35,357. During the same time period, Monterey's population is expected to decrease from 29,674 to 28,815.

Step 2: Creating a Plan that Meets the Needs

After seeking to understand college-wide issues, and realizing that there was not enough money to do the original Maas Plan, the Committee made the following recommendations:

- Abandon plans for a new math building; instead, improve Cap/Load ratios and meet Math's space needs by moving Math classrooms and creating math lab space in the bottom floor of BC.
- Improve use of International Center (IC) by moving Art Graphics, Design, and Drafting programs to IC (house with Photography).
- Move offices and services that are located in current Student Services building to *new* Student Services building. In addition, move EOPS and Assessment Center from 2nd floor of Humanities building to new Student Services building. **THEN:**
- Move Humanities' offices & classrooms from Business Humanities (BH) to vacated space in *old* Student Services building. In addition, move Supportive Services classroom spaces from Art Dimensional to old Student Services building (share with Humanities).
- Provide additional space for Satellite Women's Programs in Student Center.
- Move International Student Programs to Student Center.
- Create outdoor Astronomy viewing site near Physical Science (PS).

The Committee also recommended that the following Initial Program Proposals (IPPs) and Final Program Proposals (FPPs) be submitted to the State for consideration:

- Music/Theater (FPP)
- Physical Science/Life Science/Math/Business Remodel (FPP)
- Humanities (IPP)
- Public Safety at Parker Flats, Ft. Ord (IPP)
- Gymnasium (IPP)

Given that the Committee's charge was to recommend how to best use Bond dollars, the Committee completed a Preliminary Building Costs Analysis, including estimated escalation costs, breaking up the projects using the following categories:

1. Done or in construction
2. Department of State Architects (DSA), drawings completed, bidding started.
3. Committed to complete
4. Minimum standards/possible renovation projects
5. Awaiting additional funding

A list of the projects in each category is attached.

Looking Forward

The Committee believes that all projects in the first three categories will have the funding to be completed using existing bond and other funds already received or committed to be received. If the State decides to support future FPPs and IPPs or if the College receives other monies, projects under the fourth category will, in all likelihood, be able to be completed. Possible funding sources include:

- Energy upgrades
- Scheduled maintenance monies
- Instructional equipment grants
- Grants
- Fund raising efforts
- New bond
- Refinancing existing bond
- Aggressively pursuing State funding by continuing to improve capacity/load ratios

The Committee also recognizes that the Plan is fluid; it is impossible to anticipate every element in the planning process. In other words, facilities planning is an on-going process that will require continued attention and deliberation, and a willingness to return to the table for further decision-making as conditions and circumstances require.

The committee welcomes your input.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Bissell
Facilities Planning Committee Chair