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This physical master plan has been under development since last summer, and it provides an overall concept for a new “MPC.”

To provide some context for this plan, by the end of the 2004 spring semester we had an educational/facilities master plan completed by the Maas Companies that outlined a renovation and building program to be funded by the college’s bond measure. We also had an approved funding plan with timelines and budgets for implementation of our bond and capital outlay program. Also, a campus parking study had recently been conducted.

In addition, over the past 10 years, we had submitted various building project proposals to the Chancellor’s Office for state funding consideration, such as the Library & Technology Center, the Plant Services building, the Math Science Complex, and the Child Development Center. For each of these facilities, a building site on campus was identified and proposed, but without consideration of an overall site plan.

So, a year ago, as we were looking at building sites for bond projects, it was apparent that the one thing we still lacked was an overall campus site plan to identify suitable locations for buildings and guide our facilities planning. Thus, development of an overall campus physical site plan was one of the first tasks assigned to our bond program managers, David Tanza and Bogard + Kitchell.

I asked Dave and his team from EHDD Architecture and Joni Janecki and Associates to take an unfettered look at our site, due to the importance and long-range implications of the plan for the future of the campus. During the past year Dave and his team of architects have essentially taken the college through a “physical” master planning process and challenged us to see the campus with fresh eyes.

The Physical Master Plan also addresses several deficiencies that were identified in the Maas Plan such as the ravine acting as a barrier to divide the two sides of campus, the need for more parking, the lack of an official main entry, the need to unify the varied architectural styles on campus, and that the campus lacked a “sense of place.”

The result is a plan which provides us with an overall framework for future development on campus that will improve access and wayfinding, strengthen the connections between academic programs, and promote the existing natural environment. The result is a vision for what MPC can become, a concept that will reorganize the campus into a more cohesive whole, enhancing the educational experience of our future students.

The plan was developed with the input of faculty and staff; it has been adopted and endorsed by the Governing Board. This plan represents big change, but it is the kind of change that is important for our future as an institution and a critical step in our continuing development as a college for our community. It represents an impressive achievement for Monterey Peninsula College.

Dr. Kirk Avery
Superintendent/President
September 2005
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INTRODUCTION

Monterey Peninsula College (MPC) is embarking on an exciting chapter in its 58 year history. Over the next twelve years, the campus is effecting a comprehensive upgrade program, a program that will enhance every aspect of the learning environment at MPC.

The current building program is funded in large part by a local bond measure passed in 2002. In addition, state and private funding sources round out the financial picture.

The community supported bond mandate is to ensure that current life safety and universal accessibility codes are met on the campus, and that all academic and support buildings are equipped for their functions. MPC is committed to fulfilling the bond mandate.

MPC can exceed expectations, do more than meet the basic standard of need, and further enrich life on the Monterey Peninsula. The buildings, land and landscape of the campus work together to establish patterns of movement and create opportunities for exchange which have educational and collegial consequences. The campus should evolve to reflect the value the community has placed in it.

MPC is using this opportunity to set the framework for growth into the future, beyond this current building program. MPC has invested in this physical master plan process to establish guidelines for effective growth, sensitive to academic, environmental and community needs.
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Goals of the Physical Master Plan
The physical master plan has two goals:

1. Provide a framework to implement campus improvements which guide both current plans and future development.

2. Provide direction on suitable building sites to accommodate immediate program driven needs for new facilities on campus.

In order to understand what the physical master plan is it is first helpful to discuss what the physical master plan is not.

The physical master plan is not a design solution for individual projects on campus but rather a set of guidelines which provide a cohesive setting for development.

The physical master plan does not provide a specific time line or budget for campus improvements but rather provides an integrated approach to improvement which can be implemented over time, phased according to funding availability and other factors.

The physical master plan is not a static document but rather a document open to periodic review as campus academic and demographic goals evolve.

The physical master plan does not include all property owned by MPC but is specific to the Main Campus at Fremont Street. As the Fort Ord Campus develops areas of the physical master plan may need to be amended.

It is important to note that this document has a planning limit of 20 years. Consequently, as the campus grows or as the demographics of the Monterey Bay Region change, the physical master plan may require updates. A process for updating the physical master plan should be implemented that includes careful independent study and analysis.

The physical master plan is a blueprint for the campus that lays the groundwork for future changes to the built campus environment. The physical master plan addresses long-term goals and policies that guide projects and choices related to new buildings, renovations, parking, roads, landscaping, natural resources and other land uses at MPC. The physical master plan should serve as a vision and reference point for campus-wide standards.

To preserve, enhance and develop the finest features of MPC, four guiding principles are put forth in this document. These concepts should be used to inform all future design and planning projects made for the campus. The guiding principles are:

1. Clear Connections
2. Academic Neighborhoods
3. Promote Natural Features
4. Sustainability
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The BIP will be managed by a Committee chaired by the President. Coordination of the plan, including schedule and budget control, and interim housing needs will be managed by the Bond Program Manager. Individual projects will have project committees that will represent the Campus on individual projects. Outside consultants including architects, engineers and construction managers will be needed to complete many of the projects.

In addition to campus wide input, the following reports were used as a basis for preparing this document:

Space Quantification and Facilities Master Plan dated January, 2004, prepared by Maas Companies

Facilities Conditions Assessment Report dated October 29, 2004, prepared by Walsh Ruhuke & Dost Architects, LLP

Monterey Community College District Report 17 dated October 13, 2003, prepared by Monterey Peninsula College

Traffic Study for the Monterey Peninsula College dated May 7, 2004, prepared by Higgins Associates

Arborist Report - Field Notes Monterey Peninsula College Oak Grove, Monterey dated April 5th and 9th, 2005, prepared by Barrie D. Coate and Associates

Document Format
The College section highlights campus history and development, site attributes and the current conditions of facilities and campus amenities.

The Guidelines section offers insight into campus wide planning goals and attitudes towards future development.

The Neighborhood Reports contain in-depth guidelines as they apply to specific Academic Neighborhoods on campus and summaries broken down into the four guiding principles.

The Appendix contains references for implementation of the master plan and record materials from workshops and breakout sessions.

The Plan insert is the culmination of planning discussions and a vision for campus development.

Process and Implementation
The Educational Facilities Master Plan (Space Quantification and Facilities Master Plan, Maas Companies, January, 2004) was approved in February, 2004, and provides the projects, budgets and schedules to be executed by the Bond Implementation Plan (BIP) being developed by Bogard & Kitchell.

The BIP will take the information from the Board-approved Facilities Master Plan and develop individual project budgets, schedules and phasing strategies. The plan describes an approach for MPC to use to accomplish the work outlined in the Facilities Master Plan. The plan is intended to provide a detailed “itinerary and road map” for implementing the Board-approved Facilities Master Plan.

The BIP describes the steps required for each individual project. Each step will include an updated and accurate cost estimate of the total project and construction costs. Any adjustments to initial project budgets and schedules will be made with shared governance inputs and will require approval by the Board. The BIP will include seven sections that describe Funding, Budget and Cost Control, Schedule and Schedule Control, Management, Design, Construction and Communication. The BIP recommends an early and accurate definition of scope for each individual project with input from the Campus and project committees in all phases of design. Adequate time will be allotted to include shared governance input and Board approval.
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Campus Location
Once situated in the midst of farmland, MPC is now part of an emerging urban and suburban context. Access from downtown Monterey is from the west on city streets. Slowly the downtown density is growing towards the campus at the west. Access from surrounding communities is from the east at Highway One.
The COLLEGE ENVIRONS

Site Attributes
MPC is located just over half a mile from the Monterey Bay on the north face of the peninsula. The maritime climate, characterized by warm dry summers and coastal fog, influences the regional planting palette of native and Mediterranean species. The surrounding Monterey Bay landscape is abundant with a rich tapestry of colors and textures. Hillsides bloom with sprays of Blue Blossom, while evergreen cypress and Monterey pine trees dominate the coastal areas. Striking aloes, agave and red-hot poker accentuate the built environments.
Existing Landscape

MPC is embedded within an oak woodland and a predominant ravine traverses the campus. Upon entering the campus, visitors are greeted by a dense evergreen planting at the perimeter of the campus consisting of pine and oak trees. Entry roads, parking lots and pathways are tucked into a dense oak woodland. Pedestrians visiting campus may find themselves winding their way through paths dotted with large overhanging oak tree limbs and dense vegetation. The existing paths and bridges frame views through the woodland ravine.

The central campus is comprised of a more traditional plant palette and grass covered mounds. Pathways navigate the significant grade changes on campus, winding circuitously around large cultivated grassy mounds and bermed planting areas. The mounds are under-utilized and block line of sight to the buildings surrounding them. They also require extensive water and on-going maintenance. While a campus-wide nostalgia for the sweeping pathways and grassy mounds is often expressed, this conflicts with the stated need for direct routes to and through the campus open spaces.

As the campus evolved over time, the continued development left remnants of a diverse and varied landscape area and outdoor spaces in need of renovation. Building entries and paths are both difficult to find and also lack visual cues within the landscape that direct visitors clearly through the campus.
Mission
It is the mission of MPC to offer stimulating, high-quality courses, programs and student services to its diverse community. MPC, recognizing the worth and potential of every individual, is dedicated to providing equal access and adequate support to any interested member of the community.

In order to best fulfill its mission, MPC is committed to:

• A learner-centered environment that values diversity of students, staff, faculty, administration and course offerings
• Innovative curriculum development and instruction
• Learning resources and academic support services to ensure student success
• Institutional self-evaluation in order to effectively improve and update programs and services
• Shared governance, with the active participation of students, staff, faculty and administration
• A workplace environment that values the contributions of all employees
• Partnership with community businesses, schools, colleges and universities

MPC is committed to helping community members explore their potential, develop their skills and deepen their understanding for the benefit of both the individual and the larger society. (Monterey Peninsula College Catalog of Courses, 2004-2005)
Campus Profile

MPC is a commuter campus with an enrollment in the Fall of 2004 of 14,385 students divided between credit and non-credit students (California Community Colleges Office of the Chancellor data). Most students have full time jobs, making quick access to campus buildings important. In addition to enrolled students, many members of the community use campus facilities such as the library and performing arts buildings. The average age of students on campus is 33.6. The student community includes many older and returning students along with disabled student service programs, making accessibility a growing concern.

MPC offers a broad base of courses and services for both students and the community at large. The curriculum includes basic skills courses, course offerings to develop potential interests and critical thinking, associate degree programs, transfer programs for those preparing for four year colleges and universities, occupational and technical programs and lifelong learning. Student services, such as counseling, tutoring and personal development courses are available to those enrolled at MPC. A variety of cultural offerings are presented for the benefit of the community.

MPC is part of California’s public community college system of 109 campuses in 72 districts across the state. It is a comprehensive community college that responds to the educational, cultural, and recreational needs of community members, insofar as its resources permit.

The college serves the communities of Big Sur, Carmel, Carmel Valley, Del Rey Oaks, Marina, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Pebble Beach, Presidio of Monterey Annex, Sand City and Seaside. MPC classes are held on the main campus during Fall and Spring semesters, Early Spring session, and Summer session.
History
MPC commenced its operation in September of 1947 on the campus of Monterey High School. During this first year 87 acres of land were purchased on Fremont Street. The following September classes opened in converted barracks buildings with 280 students and 20 faculty members.

The campus was originally designed for approximately 1,000 students but by 1957 enrollment had neared capacity and it was evident new buildings were necessary to meet the growing enrollment. The engineering building was constructed in 1958, the library followed in 1960, and then the art and music center and swimming pool in 1962. The junior college separated from the Monterey Union High School District in 1961 and became a separate junior college district.

The student population continued to grow as well as the need for additional classrooms. In 1965 the building program was renewed, and the “temporary” buildings of 1948 were replaced with new buildings for business, humanities, life science, physical education, physical science and social science. The lecture forum, the college theater, and the student center were built as part of this campus renewal.

In 1982-83, MPC was selected as the site for the Maurine Church Coburn School of Nursing. The nursing school is operated in partnership with the Community Hospital Foundation of Monterey Peninsula. The engineering building

“... All through the summer of 1948, they looked forward to starting their sophomore year on the new campus. At last the day came. They drove up to the new college ... what did they see? A few finished buildings, many unfinished ones, many carpenters, and dust.”
Anonymous, 1949 El Paisano Yearbook
was remodeled to house the School of Nursing in August, 1988.

Each building era at MPC has its own distinct architectural character and consequently the built environment on campus reflects this. Despite numerous building booms, two styles dominate the campus, Monterey Style and post and beam construction.
Architectural Styles
Most of the early buildings on campus, from 1947-1948, were built in a regional style similar to those found in downtown Carmel. The buildings are one story wood frame stucco buildings with peaked roofs. They have narrow floorplates providing well day-lit interiors. They are sited in a tightly clustered fashion with exterior corridors and breezeways. The current Business and Humanities building has seen the least renovation, so while in need of major repair, it is also in the best shape from the standpoint of intact architectural integrity.

A site plan by Robert Stanton AIA, from 1948, indicates a series of one story villages strung along the east and west edges of campus. A ring road connects the two halves in front of the Old Armory left over from the site’s military past. Athletic facilities were planned to the south of the campus. The only parts of this master plan that remain intact are the three clustered buildings at the East, forming a historic edge to campus.

The Business and Humanities building is one of the original buildings on campus.

The Family and Consumer Sciences building helps form the historic eastern edge of campus.
Architectural Styles
1955-1962 was the era of one story post and beam architecture on campus. Some later buildings mimicked this style, notably on the west side of campus. The pathways around the post and beam buildings are fingers which extend the length of the building, creating many smaller but appropriately scaled courtyards. In general the spaces are rectilinear, sited perpendicular to the ravine, with exterior corridors taking advantage of ravine views.

Key
- Oak Woodland Ravine
- Grass Mounds
- New Building
- Building From Previous Era

1955 - 1962 Development
Enrollment 1,000 Students
Architectural Styles

The current campus buildings and landscape owe much to the building program from 1967-1970. There are two site plans from this time by Fred Keeble and George Rhoda Architects with projections for 3,000 students and 5,000 students respectively. All of the buildings identified in the 3,000 student plan were implemented. The hallmark of this building era, two story concrete structures, signified a shift in density on campus. Some buildings have peaked roofs and exterior corridors paying homage to the Monterey Style. Others have shed roofs and interior corridors. The Lecture Forum is an anomaly with a distinctive cruciform shape and a sloping shake roof.

The historic site plans concentrated the buildings on the east side of campus with the main bulk of parking placed on the west. The Lecture Forum Bridge was built at this time along with a series of paths through the ravine, connecting the east to west. The new buildings on the east were arranged around an informal grassy open space made up of three dominant mounds.

At the south end of campus, where the ravine widens to a gentle slope, a trio of buildings by Edward Larabee Barnes was built at this time. The Theater, College Center and Amphitheater frame the top edge of the ravine. These three structures are appropriately designed to respond to their specific sites but do not address their location within the greater campus context. They turn their back on the rest of campus, presenting many blank walls to the east and west.

---

**Key**
- Oak Woodland Ravine
- Grass Mounds
- New Building
- Building From Previous Era

**1967 - 1971 Development**
Enrollment 3,314 Students
Until recently there was a lull in major campus improvements. In 2003 a new plant services building and the Library and Technology Center opened. The library is by far the largest building on campus; the library has three floors in lieu of a larger building footprint. Portions of the building are set back from one another to reduce massing while remaining in scale with the rest of campus.

The library forms the northern terminus of campus.

The campus fades out to a parking lot at the south.

The Plant Services building is one of the most recently constructed buildings on campus.

### Key
- Oak Woodland Ravine
- Grass Mounds
- New Building
- Building From Previous Era

### 1997 - 2003 Development
Enrollment 14,317 Students
The COLLEGE
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Existing Building Use and Condition
The academic program denotes the major use for each building on the site plan at the right. Some buildings such as Building 19, International Center, house multiple programs. Mixed use spaces have been determined by availability rather than by optimum function or their relationship to similar programs.

The Neighborhood Reports (see section 4) have information on program moves that will increase synergy between academic, administrative and campus life functions. While critical maintenance has been performed on the campus, tight budgets have prohibited renovations. Many buildings have not had any significant improvements since they were built and may not meet current standards for accessibility, seismic or life safety.

A Facilities Conditions Assessment Report was conducted in 2004 outlining repair and maintenance needs throughout the campus. The facilities report should be cross referenced as elements of the master plan are implemented.
Existing Vehicular Circulation and Parking

Most campus traffic comes off of Highway One to Fremont Street (Traffic Study for Monterey Peninsula College, Higgins, May 7, 2004). The new library is visible briefly from Fremont Street; however, once the turn is made onto Aguajito Road, the first building seen is not a college building but an adjacent hotel. The main entrance is located at the intersection of Aguajito Road and Via Lavandera. Once on campus most drivers turn left at the first intersection encountered. Drivers then proceed up and down Costanoan Drive, searching for available parking in the limited east side lots. For those that do park on the west, routes across the ravine are few and far between, making the plentiful parking spaces feel remote.

Demand for additional parking spaces increases during the first two weeks of class and during certain peak times of day. Often there is a problem with parking distribution, with the southwestern lots least utilized (Traffic Study for Monterey Peninsula College, Higgins, May 7, 2004). The current class scheduling, coupled with limited class offerings on Fridays, concentrates people on campus at the same time.

The existing west side parking layout has quite a few unconnected lots. It is difficult to move from north to south and from one lot to the next without exiting a lot and driving along Fishnet Road. In addition, two buildings, Art - Dimensional and the International Center, block both the view and direct access to the largest lot at the southwest of campus.
Fishnet Road is the main vehicular thoroughfare on the west side of campus. It connects to Iris Canyon Road at both the south and north sides of campus.

Local bus routes serve the campus along Via Lavandera. Pedestrian or bicycle entry to campus can be quite hazardous as there is no linked system of pathways and there are numerous blind spots which overlap with vehicular traffic. In addition, there are no designated passenger drop off zones located at main public entrance points.

A system of campus trams operates on an on-call basis. They also provide the bulk of the service deliveries, including refuse and recycling pick-up on campus. These trams currently drive on the pedestrian paths creating congestion and potential conflict.
Existing Pedestrian Circulation
The pedestrian paths at MPC have an “old threadbare pair of jeans” quality, lovable to those familiar with the college and equally uninviting to newcomers. At present, a walk through the campus has a pleasant meandering quality. Paths skirt around the mounds on the east and weave through the ravine on the west. There are no single destinations to the paths; they present multiple options to be explored and to reach any campus location.

The drawback with the current path network is that there are no quick north-south connections. The mounds form an obstacle. They are too tall to see over and hence make it difficult to choose the quickest walking route. Bridges across the ravine are hidden, obstructed by buildings, landscape and topography. Without knowledge of the bridge locations the ravine becomes impenetrable. Furthermore, the ravine itself is hidden with overgrown vegetation.

At the Amphitheater, views are framed inward towards the ravine. Approaching this area one is met with the back rather than the front of buildings. Additionally a combination of vegetation and building walls obscures easy orientation through the campus.
03 THE GUIDELINES
Introduction to Campus Guidelines
The guidelines for the physical master plan are based on four guiding principles that will allow the campus to take advantage of its natural setting, strengthen some of the existing planning ideas, correct some of the current weaknesses in its campus layout, and set a sustainable course for its future. These four principles are the creation of clear connections within the college campus, the strengthening and creation of formal academic neighborhoods, promoting and protecting the existing natural features, and planning and developing the campus using environmentally sustainable solutions. These principles therefore make up both the structure and spirit of the guidelines. By following these principles in future planning and project designs, MPC will become a more integrated campus that is easier to navigate through an even more beautiful setting while also setting the standard for future generations in responsible environmental design.
1 **Clear Connections**
Simplify orientation throughout the campus with a system of roads, paths, bridges, entries and signage that clearly link all features of the college.

2 **Academic Neighborhoods**
Cluster similar or complementary academic and support functions in adjacent buildings to create a synergy among the uses. Locate new buildings to create pedestrian friendly academic neighborhoods within the larger campus structure.

3 **Promote Natural Features**
Utilize the distinctive natural environment found on campus to enrich the academic experience. Open building views to the ravine, campus open spaces and distant vistas. Respect the oak woodland interwoven throughout campus.

4 **Sustainability**
Sustainable solutions should be based on the unique Monterey environment. Use climate responsive solutions that adjust to the site micro-climates. Use naturally available energy sources, such as the sea breeze for night cooling. Use water responsibly. Educate students and the community through example.
Clear Connections

This section focuses on improving three distinct elements that contribute to the overall character of MPC. It will address the vehicular routes, including alternative transportation and parking, the network of pedestrian paths and wayfinding. These components should be simplified to create a campus that is useful to all and easy to navigate.
The GUIDELINES
CLEAR CONNECTIONS

Vehicular Circulation

MPC is a commuter campus. The car, however, should not displace the academic core nor disturb the distinctive natural environment on campus. The east side of campus should be reserved for academic buildings. Ultimately parking lots on the east should be phased out, leaving only short term parking along Costanoan Drive and parking at the Child Development Center. In the near term any parking that remains on the east should be assigned to faculty/staff, short term visitor or accessible to limit congestion and cross traffic at the pedestrian center of campus.

To facilitate direct access to the bulk of parking found on the west, a new campus entry off Fremont Street should be created. The entry along Via Lavandera remains but it should assume a secondary role. The existing north entry along Iris Canyon Road should be closed off to vehicular traffic. Consequently Fishnet Road should be realigned to meet Fremont Street at the north. Fishnet Road remains a thoroughfare through campus with a south entry at Iris Canyon Road.

In following the recommendations presented in this master plan, over a hundred new parking spaces could be added on the west side of campus. Art - Dimensional and the International Center should be relocated both to draw traffic into the southwestern lots and to increase parking in this area. Automotive Technology should be shifted south to allow for the creation of additional parking spaces as well. Make efforts to streamline circulation throughout the parking lots to ease movement from one lot to the next and encourage parking distribution north to south. Pedestrian routes should be clearly defined and separated from vehicular traffic.

Two pedestrian bridges across the ravine should be added providing a more direct path between the parking on the west side of campus and the east side. Vehicular entries to parking lots should align with the pedestrian bridges and be further emphasized by accents in the landscape and lighting elements.

To ease the demand for increasing parking lots, the use of alternative transportation should be encouraged. The local bus route might be expanded into campus. A system of connected bike paths also should be added. Replacing the existing trams with a shuttle system that provides service at regularly scheduled intervals might also encourage people to use outlying lots.

Fire truck access to the site is overseen by the local jurisdiction. Currently there is adequate fire truck access on existing roads and pedestrian paths. Creation of new and/or modifications to the parking lot layouts, pedestrian paths and building siting must be reviewed by the local authority having jurisdiction prior to finalization of the design.
The master plan proposes a new campus entry on Fremont Street. In addition, Fishnet Road should be realigned to meet this new entry. Use landscape elements to reinforce the entry point on Fremont Street. Provide accent plantings at the entry signs and line the entry drive with single species trees.

A new signalized left turn into campus will accommodate most traffic approaching campus from the Fremont Street Exit off Highway One. There will be a left turn lane on Fremont Street and right turn lanes in and out of campus. Further study should be done to determine if a four-way traffic signal is required and if a left turn out of campus is possible.

The location of the new entry along Fremont Street is based on visibility requirements discussed in consultation with the City of Monterey Traffic Engineer and takes into consideration the crest in the hill. An effort should be made to preserve trees in the median, however some modifications may be required for visibility. Two main entry signs should be visible from the east and west approach.

The new campus main entry would divide the Science and Library Lot in two. This would be the only location on campus where pedestrian traffic would need to cross Fishnet Road. A crosswalk should be added to this area for safety.
The GUIDELINES
CLEAR CONNECTIONS

Parking Lot Layout
Though the majority of parking is on the west side of campus and most of the buildings are currently located on the east side, getting people to embrace parking exclusively on the west is a paradigm shift for the campus. It is a shift that needs to occur to enhance the academic center of campus. As MPC is a commuter college, parking is often the introduction to the campus experience and occupies a large portion of the site. Due to the prominence of parking on campus, it deserves to be designed as a landscape element.

Currently the parking lots are identified with a letter designation. The physical master plan proposes renaming the lots according to the Academic Neighborhood on campus that they serve. Named lots would assist drivers in choosing a lot that is closest to their campus destination and improve wayfinding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A loop road should serve the science buildings and library along Via Lavandera. Include a passenger drop-off zone and short-term parking where the loop meets the new entry plaza. Limited assigned parking should be located between the loop and ravine edge.

Parking lots that remain on the east should be reserved for faculty/staff assigned, accessible or short term visitor parking only. The terminus of Costanoan Drive at the parking lot should be set behind the new Student Services building edge at the top of the Central Green. Dedicated parking, drop-off and pick-up for the Childhood Development Center is located on the east side of Costanoan Drive.

MPC should seek alternative solutions to increasing parking spaces on campus. As an alternative to dedicating potential building sites and valuable open space on campus to parking, increasing the number of classes scheduled for Fridays should be considered. A more dispersed range of class times could alleviate the concentration of cars on campus and consequently the expressed need for additional parking. Reconfiguring existing lots to include compact spaces is another means of increasing the number of spaces without increasing surface area on campus dedicated to parking.

The Science and Library Lot is located at the northwest corner of campus. It is bisected by the realigned Fishnet Road and will be the first lot encountered on campus from the new entry. Additional parking spaces can be added adjacent to the ravine edge and along the west side near Iris Canyon Road to offset those lost to the new entry road.

At the Art and Humanities Lot, the drive aisles and parking spaces should be configured perpendicular to Fishnet Road to improve access. A new campus gateway should align with a drop-off zone and the plaza for the Performing Arts Center. Truck traffic to the theater loading zone must be maintained and an enclosed service yard will be located in the Creative Arts Promontory. The drive aisles and parking layout should be sized accordingly to accommodate the loading and deliveries to this area.

At present the access to the Physical Education (PE) Lot has no relationship to any campus gateway. The new parking layout should reorient the main vehicular path towards the PE Complex. Landscape and plantings should be introduced in this lot to reduce the excessive paving in this area. A passenger drop-off zone should be located at the new plaza north of Adapted PE.

Parking to the west of Fishnet Road and behind the Old Armory should be reserved for peak use and special events. Consider using permeable pavement in these areas.
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Parking Lot Character
In order to foster clear connections, the parking lots should be organized hierarchically. Main vehicular aisles from Fishnet Road should lead directly to main campus gateways. Passenger drop-off zones should be situated adjacent to pedestrian gateways. All drop-off zones should join accessible plazas and paths. Parking permit machines should be located at each major vehicular entry and regularly throughout the lots. Ensure that the permit machine locations provide access on the driver’s side of the car and are located in pull-outs when near campus entries to prevent blocking traffic.

A dominant oak grove runs through the west parking lots. Healthy oaks should be preserved and protected during construction. A continuous planted edge along both sides of Fishnet Road should be maintained. Use landscaping to buffer views of parking from the academic core on the east.

Incorporate measures to avoid heat island effects. Provide perimeter trees and plantings at all parking lots to both soften edges and provide shade. High albedo paving materials should be used to further reduce heat gain. Terminate all parking aisles with trees. Avoid using low scale dense bushes that limit visibility. Parking lot designs should be responsive to the site topography and retaining walls should not exceed thirty (30) inches in height.

Entry aisles should each have a row of small scale single species trees and signature plantings. These aisles will look different than the dominant oak groves and provide a visual clue to signify an entry. Signature campus pole lighting should also be installed along these entry aisles further defining the campus gateways. Standard parking lot lighting should be used at all other locations providing a safe level of illumination. Light fixture specifications can be found in the Site Furnishings section of the Appendix.

Attempts have been made to maximize parking to meet peak demands and address the campus’ request for additional parking. Thus, some parking aisles may not have planted medians. Space permitting, interspersed green medians will mitigate a “sea of parking effect.”

Limit stormwater runoff to the adjacent Iris Canyon Greenbelt and El Estero Lake. Maximize permeable surface area and limit asphaltic concrete paving. At most lots there is an opportunity to install small scale bioswales at the planted medians. As parking lots are developed or renovated look for opportunities to grade run off into the planted medians and the ravine. Consider using wheel stops in lieu of curbs or provide cut-outs at existing curbs to aid drainage into the bioswales.

Preserve existing oaks in the parking lots.

Bioswales can be used for drainage solutions.

Emphasize pedestrian and vehicular routes to entries with single species trees.
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Alternative Transportation Plan

MPC is currently served by three Monterey Salinas Transit (MST) bus routes. Eastbound busses enter campus on Iris Canyon Road and travel along Via Lavandera exiting campus at Aguajito Road. Westbound busses follow the same route in the opposite direction. All bus routes should be adjusted to enter and exit at the new main entry on Fremont Street.

MPC currently operates intracampus trams for two purposes: to provide service deliveries to all campus buildings and to offer on-call door-to-door drop off for disabled students. The physical master plan proposes two key changes to the existing system. A perimeter shuttle system should be established and conflict between pedestrian and tram routes should be minimized. These changes will contribute to clear connections and enhance the campus environment.

The campus tram service should be replaced with a shuttle system that has a set route and schedule around the perimeter of campus. An inner loop along Costanoan Drive and the west ravine edge path would service all areas of campus. With the exception of the ravine and the Child Development Center the grade change east to west across campus is minimal. A perimeter route should easily accommodate shuttle stops at all the campus accessible paths of travel.

Building deliveries and maintenance carts would be allowed continued access through the center of campus. However, the deliveries should be
limited to off-peak hours only. All carts should be restricted to the larger paths through campus and should not be permitted on the bridges.

The shuttle should be separated from pedestrian paths. In addition, the paving for the shuttle route should be differentiated from that of footpaths. Alternately the shuttle could run on the campus roads. Shuttles could be hailed and make stops on request anywhere along the scheduled route. As use increases, dedicated stops should be developed. All shuttles should have a campus map affixed to them.

When the campus shuttle system is instituted, there may be increased operating costs. MPC should evaluate options to offset these costs. Creating a tiered parking permit structure should be explored as means to fund the shuttle route.

A bike path should be added to connect the main entry to the Fishnet corridor. Consider including a Class II bike entry if deemed appropriate by the City Traffic Engineer. Although the north entry at Iris Canyon Road will be closed to vehicular traffic, both pedestrians and bike access should be maintained. Provide bike parking throughout campus, choosing bike rack locations that do not obstruct or clutter building entries. In most instances, bikes can share pedestrian paths. However, campus policy requires that “walk your bike” zones be enforced on the bridges and in certain other areas on campus.
Vehicular Circulation Checklist

• Develop a new main entry which leads directly to parking on the west side of campus. Phase out student parking on the east side.

• Consider parking as a landscape element. Avoid large unobstructed areas of parking by preserving the oak groves in the west parking lots.

• Provide single species landscape aisles to identify main gateways to campus.

• Provide security lighting in all parking lots that is night sky friendly. Accentuate entry aisles with signature lighting.

• Clarify the vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns. Provide separate and dedicated paths for each. Remove cars and parking lots from the center of campus.

• Buildings, landscaping or the ravine edge, rather than parking lots, should define the edge to the campus.

• Recognize that parking is a significant need on a commuter campus. Provide clear and accessible paths from parking to campus through improved east-west campus connections. Create walking routes that are enjoyable so that the journey from car to campus is a positive experience.

• Incorporate bioswales into both new and reconfigured parking lots for managing storm water run-off.

• Provide planted median strips and perimeter trees to provide shade at parking lots to prevent heat island effects at new and reconfigured parking lots.
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Pedestrian Circulation
Currently many perceive the campus as hard to navigate and that distances from one end to the other are too great to comfortably walk. It takes approximately 6 minutes to walk from the library plaza in the north to the College Center in the south of campus. The route from west to east is even shorter, walking time from Arts–Dimensional to Humanities via the Arts Bridge takes less than 5 minutes. Walking time from the northwestern corner of the proposed Science and Library Lot to the library is estimated to be 5-7 minutes when the recommendations of the physical master plan are implemented. The common misconception of distance is due in large part to the lack of clear connections in the path systems throughout the campus.
West Campus Circulation

A primary goal of the master plan is to improve the pedestrian connections in the western parking lots over the ravine into the campus. The ravine is a tremendous asset to the campus site, contemplative and wooded, but in its current overgrown state forms a barrier to direct pedestrian access to the east side of campus. Improvements to the two existing bridges and providing two new bridges at the north and south ends of campus will help overcome the perceived distances west to east.

All bridges should have a gathering spot and a landing, a start and a destination. Tree canopies should be trimmed, improving visibility from one side of the bridge to the other. Security on bridges and paths is important. Sufficient lighting is needed and a system of emergency call boxes should be provided at bridges and throughout campus. New bridges should angle to avoid existing trees. Bridge structures should be designed to avoid impact to the ravine floor. New bridges should be kept essentially level to provide an accessible path of travel across the ravine.

The two existing bridges, the Lecture Forum Bridge and the Arts Bridge, are difficult to find and only serve a small portion of the parking area. Both bridges land on the east side of campus at the backs of buildings without appropriate connection to the major path systems. These bridges should remain. However, improvements to signage, lighting, and the "landings" at each side of the bridges are needed. Each end of the Lecture Forum Bridge is located low in the landscape making it difficult to find and access. If ever replaced, it should be raised to meet the level of the west parking lots. Utility lines are currently hung from the under-side of this bridge and should be relocated. Paths that lead down to the west end of the bridge should be improved to meet campus wide standards and re-graded to meet current accessibility requirements.

Two new bridges, the Science Bridge and the Performing Arts Bridge should be added to link the currently underserved northern and southern portions of parking with primary pedestrian hubs on the east side of the campus. The new Science Bridge links the Science and Library Lot to both the Science Quad and to the Library Plaza. This bridge is the first encountered upon entering the site from the new main entry. Due to its prominent location, it functions as a main campus gateway. Likewise, the new Performing Arts Bridge serves as both a gateway to the southern portion of campus and is an integral element in the procession leading to the Performing Arts Center.
West-east pedestrian circulation in the area between the Theater and the Physical Education Complex is especially difficult to navigate as are the footpaths along the Amphitheater. Tall walls and blank faces of buildings block any sense of direction and the view to where one is going. Measures improving visibility should be taken in these areas. Consider lowering or removing landscape walls. Paths and stairs should be added to link parking to the Amphitheater. It is also important that improvements in this area connect the new Performing Arts Bridge to the theater lobby at the Performing Arts Center.

A new north-south path should be added along the western edge of the ravine. It should be approximately 6’ wide and paved in concrete. It should link all the western plazas and bridges and provide a continuous pedestrian route from the Science Bridge to the Physical Education Complex. This path should follow the edge of the parking lot from the Science Bridge to the Lecture Forum Bridge, shift away from the ravine edge to serve the Creative Arts Promontory, proceed on to the Performing Arts Center and then continue on past the Amphitheater ending at the Physical Education Complex.
East Campus Circulation
There is currently no clear sense of where the center of the campus lies. The addition of the new library introduced a dominant use and scale to the northern portion of campus. Consequently, the library has become an "anchor" but lacks a counterpart on the south. The College Center is oriented toward the Amphitheater to the west, turning its back on the rest of campus. The master plan also proposes removing the existing administration building, further opening up views to the south.

A new plaza is proposed between the College Center and the Student Services building. This plaza should help revitalize the south end of campus. It will act as an informal gathering place for student events and should include outdoor eating and seating spaces, and offer contemplative views into the ravine. In addition, this south plaza creates a well needed link into the Physical Education Complex, integrating the Physical Education program into the rest of campus. The plaza along with the building adjustments noted above work together to better define the campus core and provide a true center to the campus.

The existing north-south pedestrian path system is circuitous, making shortcuts desirable. Grass mounds block views across the center of campus making orientation difficult. A main pedestrian promenade should be created that provides a direct north-south path of travel through the center of campus. This main promenade should also link to the parking lots on the west.

The scale and design of the main pedestrian promenade should reflect its prominence and remain consistent along its entire length. This promenade should be approximately twelve to sixteen feet wide and use easily identifiable decorative concrete paving framed with two foot wide accents on both sides. Secondary concrete paths branch off this main promenade at a smaller scale (approximately six to eight feet wide) to serve the Academic Neighborhoods and individual buildings.
Path and Gateway Plaza Improvements
A clear hierarchy of paths connecting parking, drop-off zones and plazas should be developed throughout the campus. Choose lighting, signage, path widths and paving materials according to their place in the campus hierarchy. When improving the existing paths and creating new minor paths, respect the informal character of the campus. As site infrastructure improvements are made to the campus it provides an excellent opportunity to replace existing paving and utility runs simultaneously. New pedestrian paths should not be paved in asphalt.

In the west parking lots, landscaped elements and parking entries align with new pedestrian plazas situated at the parking lot edge. The plazas at both the Science Bridge and at the Performing Arts Bridge form major campus gateways. Plazas lead either directly or via secondary paths to bridges that cross the ravine. The bridges land on a minor plaza at the east side of the ravine and join directly or via secondary paths to the main pedestrian promenade. Each plaza should be uniquely defined, reflecting individual styles and materials used.

Key
- Bridge
- Approximate walking time in minutes to traverse zone

One Minute Walking Grid
(based on average walking speed of 3mph)
Paving
Paving materials should be selected that reflect the Monterey Style and those currently in use on campus. Consider using a mix of exposed aggregate, brick, adobe pavers and concrete. Paving selections should follow a campus wide hierarchy and reflect their location. The main pedestrian promenade should use decorative paving and be easily distinguished from the rest of the campus connector paths. To create a clear distinction between pedestrian and vehicular routes pedestrian paths should not use asphalt.

Campus Lighting
Lighting is a vital component to path design on campus. Lighting frames the pedestrian paths and should be located to provide a safe and uniform light level. All lighting is to be night sky friendly; use low cut-off fixtures with a downward directed beam. In general, site lighting should be unobtrusive. See Appendix for specifications on campus light fixtures.

Similar to path design, lighting choices should reflect the campus hierarchy. Provide simple pole mounted lighting in the parking lots. Accentuate the campus gateways with bell shaped fixtures, similar to downtown Monterey. Continue the signature bell fixtures along the main pedestrian promenade. Provide subtle bollard style lighting along secondary pedestrian paths. Illuminate the bridge ends with bell shaped pole lighting to identify their locations; lighting on the bridge should be incorporated into the bridge structure.

Banners may be hung from the lights in the parking lots and along the main pedestrian promenade but a durable material should be used, and one integral to the fixture is preferred. These banners can be used to designate parking lot locations and to provide other directional information. They should have a uniform design throughout campus that matches the campus’ environmental graphics.
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Wayfinding
Wayfinding is an essential component of the master plan. It combines the previously discussed Clear Connections elements with environmental graphics and building entries.

Good signage throughout the campus is needed to orient the visitor and student alike. A marquee sized sign may announce arrival at a particular destination; however, that sign proves useless if not properly situated to lead the viewer to a clear entry or path.

Environmental Graphics
The design of environmental graphics must be discrete yet clear and concise to be successful. A campus wide hierarchy of sign types should be instated and maintained. The campus signage will work together with the portals to the Academic Neighborhoods and the building entries to clearly orient the visitor on campus.

Sign types should be sized according to their respective task and location. Each sign type should have a consistent size and mounting method. The signs should be light in scale and not overwhelm the environment. The primary goal of campus signage is to convey information succinctly. It need not promote a brand, such as at a shopping mall.

A list of suggested sign types can be found in the Appendix.
Pedestrian Circulation/Wayfinding Checklist

- Invest in a cohesive series of pedestrian connections rather than more costly and potentially disruptive system of roads.

- New pedestrian bridges should be developed connecting parking with the campus.

- The network of campus paths should be a combination of direct routes with neighborhood connections branching off at a smaller scale.

- The addition of new direct paths on campus should be closely coordinated with site infrastructure improvements as they are an excellent location for relocating utility trunk lines.

- Size paths according to the role they serve. Create a main north-south pedestrian promenade with a series of east-west ladder paths. Provide a secondary north-south path linking all of the bridge plazas on the west at the edge of the ravine.

- Create a new gathering hub at the center of the campus that anchors the primary north south pedestrian promenade.

- A clear hierarchy of parking, drop-off zones, paths and gathering plazas is recommended campus wide to augment clear orientation. Path materials, lighting and signage should support this hierarchy.

- Consider the spaces between buildings as part of the entry procession and create spaces that are useful both as an informal meeting place and a wayfinding device.

- Locate new bridges to provide edges to existing neighborhoods and define the pedestrian paths and plazas.

- Provide information and access signs at both key entry points and destinations alike. Signage should be visible but not overwhelming in the environment. All signage should augment clear campus circulation, but cannot compensate for poor planning.

- Use landscape elements to reinforce and support the campus architecture.

- Provide bold plantings at entry plazas and to direct pedestrian views toward building entries.

- Building entries and path origins should not be hidden behind blank walls.

- Avoid building entries without hierarchy and unconnected entries from opposite ends of a building.
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Landscape Character
MPC offers students a unique and distinct environment for both learning about and developing an appreciation for nature. The oak woodland setting is a defining element within the campus and provides a framework for the development of a clear campus identity. The new planting and design of open space on campus should reinforce the identity of MPC within this distinctive natural environment.

The physical master plan provides tools to reference and adopt during future development and building site selection that will reinforce an open space hierarchy. This hierarchy will reinforce circulation through campus and energize the outdoor space. Landscape should be used to reinforce the guiding principles and support the proposed building expansions.

Use native plantings to enhance ravine and campus edges.

Oak trees provide a spectacular backdrop to existing and future buildings.

The oak woodland ravine provides a unique and distinctive environment for learning and appreciation of nature.
Landscape Zones
The physical master plan organizes the campus into a series of clearly defined open spaces based upon the predominant landscape found at MPC. These distinct landscape types can be divided into three zones: the oak woodland ravine, the Central Green and the campus landscape. Together they form the structure and fabric that tie the campus together, and create a natural atmosphere that should be maintained and preserved during future campus development.
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Oak Woodland Ravine

The most identifiable and significant landscape feature on the campus is the oak woodland ravine. Nearly traversing the entire length of campus, the ravine is experienced by those who use the campus. The ravine is encountered when traveling across the bridges and on paths through it; it is found in tree-framed views from inside classrooms; and many paths are located adjacent to it.

Future development on the campus should respect the delicate native environment of the ravine. The existing oak trees and accompanying woodland should be a primary consideration when siting any new building on the campus. Buildings should be sited to provide views to the ravine and through existing trees. Great effort should be made during site planning and construction to avoid removing and damaging trees.

Paths should extend over, rather than through, the ravine. All paths to the campus, both those alongside the ravine and via bridges, should be well lit for safety but respect the ravine as a wildlife corridor. The existing ravine path should retain its informal character. However, due to the poor condition of many of the existing trees, traffic through the ravine should be limited to instructional use only. No new paths should be located in the ravine basin.

An arborist’s report was completed reviewing the general health of the ravine. The report identifies a number of issues that require immediate maintenance as well as recommendations for ongoing upkeep to the ravine. Specific findings and directions are documented in the Arborist Report - Field Notes Monterey Peninsula College Oak Grove, Monterey dated April 5th and 9th, 2005 prepared by Barrie D. Coate and Associates and should be cross referenced as elements of the physical master plan are implemented.

The arborist report suggests removing all Algerian Ivy from the ravine basin and all debris at the root collar of all oak trees, treating the existing oak trees for White Rot Disease (Hypoxylon) and removing all dying or dead branches to prevent limb failure and limb drop. Many of the trees suffer from poor pruning and remediation is required. Future maintenance should address clearing the ravine for safety and improving visibility while maintaining the integrity of the natural woodland. Efforts to control invasive plants and weedy species are critical for this location as well as at all other areas of campus.

This natural environment presents an opportunity to restore the native understory and reinforce a unique habitat within the campus setting. As the ravine meets the central campus, edges should be enhanced with native understory plantings to create a gentle transition to the campus.
The Central Green

A campus green or quad traditionally identifies a space as the center of campus. At MPC, the simple and expansive green spaces at the campus core provide contrast to both the ravine and the built environment. Unfortunately, many of the cultivated lawn spaces are formed into mounds and only traversed by meandering pathways. The existing green also lacks proper drainage, integrated seating and comfortable spaces for informal gathering. Consequently, this area is under-utilized.

The Central Green provides students, faculty and staff opportunities for gathering, relaxing in the sun and enjoying the Monterey Bay views. A cultivated grass lawn should be retained at the center of the campus for outdoor activities and as an informal gathering space. Surrounding smaller grassy areas may be renovated to native meadow grass and plantings adapted to the Monterey Bay climate.

A main pedestrian promenade should be created providing a direct route through the campus core. The central path will establish a hierarchy among the existing circuitous pathways on campus. This central path, the main pedestrian promenade on campus, should be differentiated in size and character from the other campus paths.
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The main pedestrian promenade runs through the Central Green.

Limit large areas of grass to the Central Green.

Modifications to the grassy mounds will provide more opportunities for gathering.
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Campus Landscape
A supporting landscape comprises the bulk of the remaining campus open spaces. Pathways, plazas, courtyards and athletic fields are what define the structure of a campus within this natural setting. These spaces provide an opportunity to further develop a hierarchy of spaces as well as to enhance the individual identity of the open space within the campus. The goal of this section is to direct the development and enhancement of these special spaces within the campus framework and to develop a hierarchy and cues to reinforce the guiding principles.

Landscape Hierarchy and Visual Cues
The landscape elements and outdoor spaces on campus should provide a hierarchy and visual cues to direct clear travel from parking lots to plazas, and from building to building without the assistance of numerous signs. Landscape elements such as tree lined walks in parking lots, well defined plazas and accent planting should be used to identify campus access points, building entries and clear routes across the campus. Furthermore, campus landscape should be developed that supports and enhances the architecture.

Landscape and planting should be used to reinforce clear connections on campus. It should be designed in an appropriate style and scale for the location on campus. Plantings used at the main entry should be differentiated from other campus access routes. Groupings of single species trees with bold understory plantings should be used to develop visual cues leading visitors from the parking lots to the campus gateways. Similarly, plantings within the academic neighborhoods should be used to emphasize neighborhood portals and building entries and to highlight bridge locations.

Use accent plantings to identify building and neighborhood entries.

Many existing buildings on campus present blank walls to the adjacent pedestrian path.

Convert under-utilized lawn areas to low maintenance landscape.
Plant species selections should be appropriate for the conditions in the Monterey Bay as well as the campus setting. Native and Mediterranean species should be selected that are low in water and maintenance requirements, long-lived and adapted to the Monterey Bay climate. Refer to the appendix for a complete planting list.

Key
1. Ceanothus griseus and Ribes speciosum
2. Salvia spathacea
3. Arctostaphylos species
4. Garry elliptic and Salvia species
5. Ceanothos species
6. Arctostaphylos species
7. Aloe arborescens
8. Festuca ovina glauca
9. Kniphophia
Irrigation
A centralized irrigation system should be installed on the campus. Each new building should include irrigation controllers that support the central system. All new irrigation should be installed with water conserving features such as a weather station, moisture sensors and flow sensors. These improvements will assist the campus in meeting sustainability goals by reducing water consumption and maintenance. Low-flow, matched precipitation rate spray heads and drip irrigation should be integrated into new landscape areas. Temporary irrigation systems may be considered for remote areas and restoration zones. Additionally, a grey water or cistern system may be introduced as a supplement on new building projects as well as temporary or drip irrigation systems.

Mature Planting Replacement
Much of the existing campus landscape is over-mature and in need of replacement. Decay and disease have affected many of the pines and oaks on campus. Measures should be taken during campus development and future projects to remove these plantings and replace them with appropriate species outlined by the physical master plan. Standard tree protection measures to be used during construction should be developed and implemented by the campus.
Promote Natural Features Checklist

- Use bold accent plantings to reinforce campus gateways and give visual cues to neighborhood portals. The plantings used at the main entries should be differentiated from those used at other campus access routes.
- Use plantings to reinforce vehicular entry points as well as to reinforce the campus access routes from the parking lots. Single species tree plantings with understory plants should provide visual cues leading to the campus gateways.
- Landscape elements and plantings on campus should reflect the distinct Monterey Style and make an ecological connection with the surrounding context of the Monterey Bay Region.
- Structural landscape elements, such as arbors and trellises, should be used to reinforce plazas, entries and bridges.
- Energize the edges of campus by providing clear access and usable outdoor gathering places with seating.
- Emphasize cross campus views, use distinct paving materials and minimize landscape forms to reinforce a clear pathway from north to south campus.

- Provide a clear distinction between vehicular and pedestrian routes. Do not pave pedestrian paths with asphalt and avoid redundant routes.
- Use uniform path paving materials and maintain path widths according to a clear campus wide hierarchy.
- Large cultivated grass areas should be limited to the center of campus at the Central Green. Additional existing landscaped mounds should be converted to low maintenance planting areas or outdoor seating.
- Design courtyards to maintain the views through campus. Avoid desolate empty courtyards.
- Modify the existing mounds, incorporate seating and improve drainage to create open green spaces that are utilized by faculty, staff and students.
- Avoid large mounds that block views across campus and large cultivated lawns without clear purpose.
- Individual courtyards should be more structured and formal while the landscape at the ravine edge should be more natural and informal.

- Develop distinct open spaces within each Academic Neighborhood. They should be designed to attract both active and passive student use and oriented in sunny locations when possible.
- Do not locate plantings that obscure views to building entries and destinations on campus. Avoid clustered plantings.
- Landscape should be developed that supports and enhances the campus architecture. Use landscape to screen blank walls and emphasize building entries.
- Use native plantings to create a gentle transition to the oak woodland.
- Preserve healthy heritage oak trees throughout campus. Develop and implement a campus standard for tree protection and restoration.
- The oak ravine should be a priority for ongoing maintenance and native restoration. Avoid creating any new paths through the ravine basin.
- Perform an arborist evaluation of existing trees that are located in potential building and parking lot sites.
MPC has the opportunity to be an exemplary neighbor in the Monterey Bay Region and educate those who use the campus through incorporating sustainable design practices such as energy efficiency, appropriate allocation of resources and healthy indoor environmental quality into the campus experience.

(Graphs from Christopher Hawthorne, “Turning Down the Global Thermostat,” Metropolis Magazine, October 2003, p.103.)
Sustainability
Most people believe that the biggest consumers of energy are automobiles and SUVs. Actually, the number one consumer of energy in the world is the making of materials for construction and the construction industry itself. This underscores the reason why the use of materials that are made of recyclable content, or the use of substitute materials that are of lower energy use, is so important to the future of our world. The production of cement which goes into concrete, for example, is responsible for 8% of the world’s annual production of CO$_2$. Substituting fly ash, a byproduct of generating power, directly results in lowering the amount of energy needed to make cement.

MPC can take steps to reduce energy use at a local level. Building designs that adopt ambitious low-energy performance targets and use an integrated approach to employ a broad range of sustainable energy strategies can result in reduced operating costs and an improved environment. Furthermore, the prerequisite to obtain LEED Energy and Atmosphere credits is establishing a minimum level of energy efficiency for base building and building systems. In California, the baseline standard is complying with Title 24. By optimizing energy performance of new buildings to exceed Title 24 requirements, additional LEED credits can be achieved.

Longtime residents of the Monterey Peninsula know that the conservation of water and the recharge of the underwater aquifer are two critical constraints to the long term development of Monterey and MPC. For these two reasons alone, policies which not only conserve water, but prevent runoff, excess storm water runoff and sedimentation are all part of the policies which will help make MPC an exemplary neighbor on the Peninsula. Marc Reisner, in his now definitive work The Cadillac Desert clearly conveys the importance of these contemporary actions we must take as a society, as he warns that the major crisis of the next twenty five years in the West will be a shortage of water.

We need to start now with informed policies and exemplary behavior to help avoid a coming crisis on the land. By implementing these guidelines at both the site and building levels, MPC has the extraordinary opportunity not only to be an exemplary neighbor but to educate current and future students, faculty and staff.
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Site Checklist

- Develop appropriate management principles and strategies for specific areas of campus.

- Minimize erosion and sedimentation in the ravine and off campus. Post storm runoff should not exceed flows occurring under predevelopment conditions. Minimize the creation of additional impervious surfaces. Avoid loss of percolation following the installation of impervious surfaces (i.e. no net loss of percolation).

- Formulate engineering and drainage plans that are sensitive to subsurface drainage. Address hydrology as a landscape issue rather than as an engineering problem.

- Minimize impacts to tree root zones in facilities planning, design and construction; maintain healthy trees, rather than attempting to save all trees.

- Utilize drought tolerant species in landscape plans for facilities. Maintain understory vegetation and ground cover as a means of retaining soil moisture.

- Minimize concentrations of cultivated turf; consider replacing existing lawns with water conserving plantings.

- Implement water saving irrigation systems such as moisture sensors, flow sensors and weather stations on campus. Consider implementing a greywater recycling or cistern system for landscape irrigation.

- Develop a system for interpretive signage and labeling of important species and habitats to promote environmental awareness and education on campus. Utilize campus orientation activities as a vehicle to better inform new students about the campus environment.

- Use site furnishings containing recycled materials or from rapidly renewable resources.

- Establish geographic limits for campus development; minimize intrusions and access beyond these limits.

- Promote alternate means of transportation by providing for adequate pathways from public bus systems, bike paths and pedestrian routes.

- Provide ample centrally located bike parking and consider shower facilities for faculty and staff in new buildings to encourage bicycling to work.

- Choose site lighting that does not contribute to night sky pollution.

- Institute a campus policy for waste management during construction that reduces the amount of building material waste sent to the local landfills.

- Make design choices for horizontal surfaces on campus, such as the use of high-albedo paving and roofing materials that reduce heat island effects.

- Include landscape elements such as perimeter trees, plantings and bioswales to provide shade and reduce heat gain at all parking lots.
Building Checklist

- All new and renovated facilities should be designed, constructed and operated using the guidelines outlined in the LEED building rating system. While not mandatory, the physical master plan recommends that projects should strive to obtain a minimum of “LEED Silver” certification.

- Make architectural choices that will result in more energy efficient buildings including appropriate siting, the use of operable windows, overhangs and sunshading, and a high performance envelope.

- Make electrical choices that will result in a more energy efficient building including the use of high efficiency light fixtures and lamps, low energy office equipment and the addition of daylighting controls. Use natural light as an effective lighting source.

- Make mechanical system choices that will result in a more energy efficient building. Consider underfloor air delivery systems and natural ventilation where appropriate. Use air handling units and pumps with variable frequency drives so that the system operates at the optimum speed, saving energy. Given the temperate Monterey climate, use natural ventilation in lieu of air conditioning.

- Reduce water consumption. Specify low flow toilets, waterless fixtures and sensor faucets. Where appropriate implement grey water recycling.

- Choose building materials that are environmentally responsible. Where possible specify materials that contain recycled content, that are rapidly renewable or are locally produced. Use FSC certified wood.

- Ensure good indoor environmental quality through natural ventilation. Specify materials that minimize off-gassing. Provide carbon dioxide monitoring to ensure that precise quantities of outdoor air are being supplied when and where needed, improving indoor air quality and optimizing energy use.

- Conduct building life-cycle analyses to determine the long-term payoff of design choices. Higher initial expenditures may result in greater long-term savings.
The GUIDELINES
ACADEMIC NEIGHBORHOODS

Academic Neighborhoods
Academic Neighborhoods are distinct from the shared public spaces on campus and their design should reflect their individuality. Each neighborhood should share a common vocabulary of building materials. Academic Neighborhoods create concentrations of shared uses and reduce the overall campus scale.

The guidelines for the Academic Neighborhoods are divided into two main topics. Neighborhood Zones identify locations on campus for future development of specific academic programs and Architectural Character will guide that future development.
Neighborhood Zones

An Academic Neighborhood is a grouping of buildings clustered with its own dedicated open space accessible from the main campus. There should be a clearly defined neighborhood portal that is visible from main campus paths. The neighborhood open space should step down in scale and provide a more intimate setting for studying and quiet academic uses.

Landscape should be used to define each neighborhood. It should reinforce the distinct architectural character and when possible reflect the predominant academic discipline of the neighborhood. The plantings should reflect the reduction in scale from the overall campus landscape and can be more gardenlike and striking.

The neighborhoods presented in this plan are not always strict interpretations of individual departments. In some cases a few smaller departments are linked together to create a neighborhood synergy lacking in individual isolated buildings on campus.

The neighborhood zones should guide future space planning. Currently a number of programs are divided across several buildings, based on available space rather than appropriate adjacencies. By designating areas on campus dedicated to serve certain programs, future decisions on placement can be more productive.

The neighborhood zones are:
- Performing Arts Center
- Creative Arts Promontory
- Math and Science Quad
- Business and Humanities Quad
- Student Life Hub
- Physical Education Complex

Each of the above neighborhood zones will be discussed in greater detail in the Neighborhood Reports section.
Individual Campus Improvements
In addition to the neighborhood zones, the master plan proposes a number of other specific modifications that bring clarity to the campus.

Some programs are “stand alone” uses which do not have nor require direct connections to other buildings. These buildings are located on the plan and salient features will be described in this section only. They are not the subject of separate neighborhood reports.

Nursing is currently split between two buildings on the west side of campus. It should be combined in one building and relocated to the Old Armory. Relocating Nursing allows for easy access from the south end of Fishnet Road for the hospital shuttle. The Old Armory location is also a quiet place on campus with access to outdoor space to the south of the building. This outdoor space could be developed into a calm garden space for respite from the high stress program.

Automotive Technology is located at the southwestern corner of campus. The building should shift to the south and the size of the workyard should decrease. Shifting it increases the area available for parking. Up to forty (40) additional parking spaces could be added to the Physical Education lot. Plant Services would remain with no change.

Administration would relocate to the old library building. Administrative functions which are currently distributed throughout campus could then be consolidated under one roof at a central location on campus.

Social Sciences acts as a transitional building between the Science Quad and Humanities. The building is located adjacent to the proposed Central Green and contains a food kiosk that should remain.

The Lecture Forum houses shared general classroom space. The entries to the various classrooms should be better defined during renovation.

Family and Consumer Sciences currently contains the Culinary Arts program and the Interior Design program. The Interior Design program should be located within the proposed Creative Arts Promontory. The vacated space could be used as multi-purpose classroom space serving the adjacent Business and Humanities Cluster as well as the rest of campus. The Culinary Arts program space remains and doubles as a catering kitchen for conferences of special events held in the multi-purpose rooms.

The new Child Development Center occupies a secluded site on the east edge of campus. It is currently in the construction documents phase of design. Providing clear pedestrian access from Student Services should be considered in the design.
The GUIDELINES
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Architectural Character
The quality of buildings on campus and their architectural characteristics help define the environment of MPC. Over the course of the physical master plan effort, the architectural character of the campus was reviewed and a set of guidelines developed that elaborates on the best traits found on campus. Building design and renovations should incorporate the following design criteria that should guide all future development on campus.

Building Materials
• Building materials should fit within the dominant campus palette of concrete and stucco.

• The individual character of each academic neighborhood should be reflected in the palette for each new building added to the campus.

• Hardier composite materials that are not subject to woodpecker damage yet reflect the post and beam neighborhood character are recommended instead of wood siding.

• Building materials and finish colors should be within a range of natural colors. Choices should reflect the surrounding landscape and historical communities.

• See the Appendix for a suggested building palette.
The GUIDELINES
ACADEMIC NEIGHBORHOODS

Building Sites

• Maintain spaces with the desirable natural features for all to enjoy. Locate building sites adjacent to those natural features to take advantage of views into the landscape.

• Create pedestrian friendly neighborhoods; do not dwarf adjacent open spaces with oversized buildings.

• Group buildings to create neighborhood gathering spaces and promote opportunities for social interaction.

• Develop neighborhood portals that are clearly evident from the main pedestrian promenade.

• Place active edges along building entries and adjacent pedestrian routes.

• Screen or conceal mechanical equipment, service yards and storage areas. Avoid using chain link fencing or large blank walls and consider the use of landscape to minimize impacts to the campus.

Careful juxtaposition of several buildings can be used to create neighborhood quads but avoid desolate plazas.

Locate buildings to suit the terrain of the site.
The GUIDELINES
ACADEMIC NEIGHBORHOODS

Building Massing

- Use rectilinear shaped buildings.
- Maintain the typical building height on campus of one to two stories. As campus density increases, opt for building taller buildings rather than larger floor plates that take up open space.
- Set back portions of the buildings to work within the existing campus context.
- Avoid simple monolithic buildings; breakdown the building mass to articulate the functional program elements within.
- Integrate buildings into the natural terrain of the site and avoid extensive regrading.

Buildings should fit within the campus context of one to two stories and existing pedestrian scale.

Reduce the impact of larger buildings on campus by modulating the overall building massing through set backs and balconies.
The GUIDELINES
ACADEMIC NEIGHBORHOODS

Roof Lines

- Use shed or pitched roofs to match the predominant style on campus.
- Accentuate exterior corridors with deep roof eaves that are harmonious with the existing buildings.
- Roof heights should be scaled relative to the building height and the surrounding conditions.
- Provide variations in the roof line to reflect variations in the building massing.
- Avoid mansard, domed or overly sculptural roofs.
The GUIDELINES
ACADEMIC NEIGHBORHOODS

Facades & Glazing

- Provide variations in glazing size to relate to the pedestrian scale of campus.
- Modulate the building facade to denote interior building use.
- Use clear or grey tinted glazing; do not use mirrored, green, bronze, rose or blue tints.
- Avoid placing blank walls along pedestrian paths.
- Avoid monolithic curtain walls and long uninterrupted bands of windows.
- Vary the building facade with architectural features that create shadow and visual interest such as sun-shading devices.

Selective use of window wall treatments can create visual interest to the facade and offer visibility to activities on the inside.

Locate active edges along pedestrian paths.
Building Entries

- Provide a hierarchy among entries, clearly identifying the main entry with special architectural elements.

- Use canopies, porticoes and breezeways to mark multiple entries to a single building. Provide a gathering device at existing buildings with clusters of entries, such as an exterior plaza or lobby.

- Provide a clear path from the neighborhood common space or quad to each building entry within the neighborhood.

- Use breezeways and exterior corridors with roof overhangs for circulation.
Academic Neighborhoods Checklist

- Concentrate development to create academic neighborhoods and pedestrian friendly spaces between buildings. Given the mild Monterey climate, these spaces can be used year round.

- The current building vernacular includes covered breezeways and exterior corridors which are appropriate to the historical Monterey Style. New buildings should have a modern interpretation of this language.

- Develop an overall cohesion to the campus without creating a rigid formality that loses the charm of the distinct academic neighborhoods and natural environments.

- Spaces shared by the campus, such as bridges, open spaces and the College Center, should have equal value as buildings which are “owned” by a specific academic or administrative group.

- Recognize that the physical master plan and academic plan are interconnected. The physical master plan creates opportunities to enhance academic goals.

- Use surface parking lots on the east side of campus for future building sites. Consider increasing building density by building taller buildings prior to developing new building sites.

- Avoid locating a building on the nicest part of the site as that portion of the site becomes lost. Rather, locate a building to overlook the nicest site and preserve the existing beauty for all to enjoy.

- Much of the existing building vernacular uses exterior corridors with no central lobby. Consequently many of the buildings have multiple or hidden entries. When renovating buildings, add an entry component leading pedestrians to the true entry. Such an element could be a landscape feature or designed within the architecture.
The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
INTRODUCTION

Academic Neighborhoods
The concept of Academic Neighborhoods is fundamental to the physical master plan. It creates a campus wide organizational system for locating buildings and academic program elements. Academic Neighborhoods will encourage synergistic relationships and enrich the campus experience. The following reports address each proposed neighborhood at MPC. These reports identify how the guiding principles should be implemented to best meet the needs of the program areas located within the neighborhoods.
Performing Arts Center
Performance constitutes an important component of the Theater, Music and Dance academic programs. These programs also provide popular cultural offerings to the college and local community. Music and Theater both share well established reputations on campus and in the community. Dance currently has a smaller outreach, offering only six annual performances. Creating a unified Performing Arts Center will help develop synergy among the three programs.

Neighborhood Plan Keynotes
(Not all items listed will appear on each plan)
1. 12’-16’ wide pedestrian path.
2. Maintain view to the ravine.
3. View to Amphitheater.
4. Passenger drop-off zone.
5. Pedestrian link.
6. Truck access.
7. Faculty, staff and accessible assigned parking.
8. Convert grassy mounds into native plantings; provide integral seating.
9. Provide outdoor seating and landscaped areas when Administration building is removed.
10. Outdoor seating.
11. Student Services Lot; reserved for short term parking only.
13. Ticketing and/or information kiosk.
14. Future building site.
15. Neighborhood quad.
17. Screen existing mechanical equipment from site and to mitigate noise.
18. The character of the pool enclosure is critical to improving the neighborhood.
19. The South Plaza steps down to meet the ravine, connecting the built environment with the distinctive natural environment; provide terraced seating at perimeter.
20. Assigned parking with Child Development Center pick-up and drop-off.
22. Special event parking; consider permeable paving materials.
23. Provide access for emergency vehicles to athletic fields.
24. Hold parking lot and access road south of the Student Services building; use landscape to define the perimeter of campus.
25. Provide limited vehicular access for faculty and staff deliveries to the Math and Science Quad buildings.
Performing Arts Center Neighborhood Plan

LEGEND
- Building to be Removed
- Existing Building
- New Building
- Expansion Space
- Plaza / Hardscape
- Enclosed Workyard
- Central Green
- Campus Landscape
- Active Edge
- Views to Ravine
- Pedestrian Route
- Through Lobby Circulation
- Food Service Outlet
- Solvent Disposal
- Major Campus Gateway
- Minor Gateway
- Accent Tree
The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
PERFORMING ARTS CENTER

Existing Character
The Theater, College Center and the Amphitheater form an inward oriented complex. While they are designed to address the unique site and their scale is appropriate, they turn their back on the rest of campus, presenting many blank walls to the east and west. The public entry to the Theater from the west parking lots is difficult to find and appears to be the back door. In addition, the facade of the building fronting the parking lot is marred by a prominent loading dock.

Historically the Amphitheater has not been well used. It may have one time acted as a student commons. Over the years its use has declined and events are limited to the annual graduation and memorial services. Sound from the Amphitheater travels easily and disturbs classes and performances in the Theater. The Amphitheater is not equipped with sound equipment or lighting for performances. Additionally, the slope of the seats is quite steep and does not comply with current accessibility standards. Thus the Amphitheater has fallen into disrepair.

The Music program resides in three post and beam buildings slated for demolition due to their poor condition.

The Dance program is currently located in the Old Armory. Dance is a multidisciplinary program and part of the Physical Education Department and at present shares space with Adapted PE. Although recently renovated, the Old Armory location is remote from the other performing arts and physical education programs.
Area Improvement Plan

The topography at the ravine edge, the existing buildings and diverse program goals present a challenge for future development. The criteria outlined in this section apply to any building site selected for new construction in this neighborhood.

The Performing Arts Center will serve as a major public gateway to the campus. Parking aisles should facilitate easy drop off. Landscaped paths should lead directly to front doors and their lobbies inside. Locate building and program elements to augment collaborative learning. The architecture and landscape must be of a quality that signifies campus entry and attracts audiences from the discriminating local community. The design should heightened the sense of arrival and showcase the excitement of live performances.

Provide a new campus gateway and bridge over the ravine. This entry plaza acts both as a campus gateway and the neighborhood portal. Create a platform element along the east of the buildings leading to the new bridge. This podium should be developed as a shared lobby for the new music building and the Theater. Provide a ticketing pavilion linking the new music building with the Theater. Provide a public pedestrian way through or around the pavilion. If a separate pavilion is not feasible, consider a box office location in the new music building that can serve both Music and Theater.

The new bridge serves as a major link between the Performing Arts Center and parking on the west with the campus center. The new bridge integrates the entry procession into the landscape. The suggested location orients pedestrians to the low end of the Amphitheater, making it seem less imposing and steep. Provide a secondary path from the west bridge landing to the Amphitheater.

The physical master plan relocates Dance and the Adapted PE programs adjacent to the existing gymnasium and opposite the Theater. The proposed move reflects the bridge role Dance plays between the Physical Education and Performing Arts programs. A path leads from the Theater past the Amphitheater to a lower level entry to the new dance building. Furthermore, a pedestrian plaza is proposed to formalize the link between the two and integrate the Amphitheater into the neighborhood. This plaza serves as a minor campus gateway. The Amphitheater should be renovated to become more integrated into the landscape. Make improvement to seating platforms that are ergonomically correct and create gentle grade changes.

Provide active pedestrian edges to all ravine facing lobbies of the Performing Arts Center. Consider massing for the new music building that places the choral room lobby and practice room along the new entry path. Locating Music adjacent to the Theater allows for shared use of the existing loading dock. In addition, use the new music building location to block views of the existing loading dock. Consider renovating the building facade facing the parking lot to include environmental graphics. These could be building integrated or signage elements announcing upcoming performances and provide visual interest along the blank walls at the Theater.
The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
PERFORMING ARTS CENTER

Performing Arts Center Guidelines
1 Clear Connections
   • Provide a new campus gateway. Develop a small plaza leading from parking to the Performing Arts Center entry plaza and to a new campus bridge.
   • Maintain a public right of way in front of the new lobby. Provide continuous public access in front of the Performing Arts Center with a twelve to sixteen foot wide minimum path at the pedestrian plaza.
   • Provide a pedestrian link from the Theater and Music lower levels to the dance building entry.

2 Academic Neighborhoods
   • Site the new music building next to the Theater to create a Performing Arts Center. Consider a new linked lobby element sharing both box office and concession facilities for Music and Theater.
   • Maintain active edges along the pedestrian route. Face building entries towards the main route. Develop a building massing that reflects the interior program.
   • Provide a shared loading dock for Music and Theater. Use the building shape and entry sequence to buffer visibility to the existing service yard.

Existing entry plaza site.

A podium lobby, similar to the existing outdoor seating at the old library, should connect to the new Performing Arts Bridge.
Performing Arts Center Guidelines

3 Promote Natural Features

- Integrate the Performing Arts Center entry plaza and new campus bridge into the landscape. The new bridge will bring pedestrians past the stage of the Amphitheater and bring pedestrians closer to the ravine.

- Introduce the ravine back into the spaces between the existing buildings. Provide landscape to make the Amphitheater a usable outdoor space.

- Integrate planting and renovated seating into the Amphitheater. Develop gradual level changes.

- Open views to the Amphitheater from the south. Reduce walls and or replace with more transparent guardrails. Provide a direct pedestrian link to the shared exterior lobby of the Music and Theater buildings.

- Preserve as many healthy oaks as possible at new gateway plazas and at new building sites.

4 Sustainability

- Cantilever the podium lobby element and locate the new bridge to minimize site disturbance in the ravine.

- Renovate the Amphitheater to fit naturally into the environment. Limit hardscape to allow for better water infiltration.
Creative Arts Promontory
The Creative Arts buildings are located on a beautiful site on a promontory overlooking the ravine. This is one of two academic neighborhoods located on the west side of campus. It is situated between the Art and Humanities parking lot and the Arts Bridge. General campus pedestrian traffic moves through this area to and from the campus center on a daily basis making it an ideal location to showcase the creative output of the art programs.

Neighborhood Plan Keynotes
(Not all items listed will appear on each plan)
1. 12'-16' wide pedestrian path.
2. Maintain view to the ravine.
3. View to Amphitheater.
4. Passenger drop-off zone.
5. Pedestrian link.
6. Truck access.
7. Faculty, staff and accessible assigned parking.
8. Convert grassy mounds into native plantings; provide integral seating.
9. Provide outdoor seating and landscaped areas when Administration building is removed.
10. Outdoor seating.
11. Student Services Lot; reserved for short term parking only.
13. Ticketing and/or information kiosk.
14. Future building site.
15. Neighborhood quad.
17. Screen existing mechanical equipment from site and to mitigate noise.
18. The character of the pool enclosure is critical to improving the neighborhood.
19. The South Plaza steps down to meet the ravine, connecting the built environment with the distinctive natural environment; provide terraced seating at perimeter.
20. Assigned parking with Child Development Center pick-up and drop-off.
22. Special event parking; consider permeable paving materials.
23. Provide access for emergency vehicles to athletic fields.
24. Hold parking lot and access road south of the Student Services building; use landscape to define the perimeter of campus.
25. Provide limited vehicular access for faculty and staff deliveries to the Math and Science Quad buildings.
The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
CREATIVE ARTS PROMONTORY

Existing Character
Even though the buildings were constructed over a twelve year period from 1958 to 1970 they share a common building style. Most are single story post and beam construction with board and batten siding and deep overhanging eaves. The exceptions are the Art - Dimensional building, the Art Gallery, and the International Center. Due to the size of the existing buildings, there is the potential for good quality natural light. Unfortunately, glazing has been concealed in some, most notably the Art - Ceramics building. All of the facilities are in need of repair.

The existing Art - Dimensional building, International Center and Art Gallery interrupt an otherwise cohesive academic neighborhood setting. The buildings in this area are not centered around a shared open space as on the east side of campus. Rather, pathways extend the length of the buildings, creating many smaller but appropriately scaled courtyards. Generally the spaces are rectilinear, sited perpendicular to the ravine, with exterior corridors and breezeways that take advantage of ravine views.

An oak grove creates a pleasant canopy for the area and enhances a feeling of an art colony. Currently there is no division between active workyards and shared gathering spaces.

The Art - Dimensional building is a single story stucco building with a shingled mansard roof. The rectilinear shape, high ceilings, concrete floors and access to courtyard space have worked well for their function. However, overall the building is due for a major renovation. Accessible upgrades and seismic corrections may be necessary.

The International Center is a two story concrete structure. The first floor of the International Center contains photography. The second floor contains half of the Nursing program. The other half of the Nursing program is housed adjacent to Drafting.

The Art Gallery is a small one story cube built with inexpensive and poor quality materials. Though constructed in 1997, the building has not worn well over time.

Creative Art courtyards are appropriately scaled to the surrounding buildings.

Workyards are not separated from common gathering spaces.

Existing buildings have deep overhanging eaves that shade adjacent paths.
Area Improvement Plan
The plan recommends a new Art - Dimensional building and relocates Nursing to the Old Armory. The entire Creative Arts Promontory should be addressed as a single construction project to allow for proper planning of neighborhood adjacencies throughout the buildings.

The existing music buildings are demolished and replaced with a new Art - Dimensional building. The proposed building site spans across the main pedestrian path of the neighborhood and should be connected by a breezeway similar to the existing music building configuration. This perimeter location would allow for easy truck access and the creation of a shielded workyard between Art - Ceramic and Art - Dimensional.

The International Center should be demolished. By removing this building it is possible to insert a gateway plaza for the Lecture Forum Bridge on the west side of campus. The general use classrooms that were housed in the International Center should be redistributed where needed most on campus. Photography should be co-located with the other Art programs. By relocating Nursing functions, all of the one story wood frame buildings can be used for Creative Art functions.

Develop a plaza on the north side of the Art Gallery. This plaza serves as the start of the procession to the Arts Bridge. Provide an outlet for food service in this area. Create distinct outdoor spaces for gathering and to promote collegiality.

Provide dedicated workyards segregated from the neighborhood common space. Locate workyards adjacent to buildings in fenced enclosures. The lockers outside of Art - Ceramic should be relocated so not to impede views to the ravine. Co-locate functions that need service yards such as solvent disposal. Screen service functions from main pedestrian paths.

If further expansion space is needed, build on the knoll outside Art - Ceramic.
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Creative Arts Promontory Guidelines

1 Clear Connections
   • Create a campus gateway plaza that connects to the existing bridge. Locate a pedestrian directory in the plaza and provide appropriate illumination.
   • Relocate the Art - Dimensional program to a new building on the old music building site opening up the parking lot for clear vehicular travel and the creation of additional parking spaces.
   • Create a twelve to sixteen foot wide path from the parking lot to the existing bridge.
   • Reinforce entries with accent plantings, lighting and site furnishings.

2 Academic Neighborhoods
   • Create distinct plazas within the Art Promontory.
   • Separate workyards from common gathering spaces.
   • Develop an internal neighborhood path that runs through building breezeways.
   • Style of new buildings should reflect existing character and work with the neighborhood context.

Use breezeways to define circulation paths at buildings with exterior corridors.

The new Arts-Dimensional building should maintain the positive characteristics of the existing building, such as roll-up doors, and provide high ceilinged studio spaces with ample natural daylight.
Promote Natural Features
- Promote views to the ravine, uncovering concealed glazing or adding new glazing to existing buildings.
- Open building edges to ravine at new construction.

Sustainability
- Utilize daylighting at all art buildings.
- Provide ample natural ventilation and energy efficient exhaust systems for the chemicals and solvents used.
- Provide a solvent disposal system that is centrally located and will not pose a threat to the nearby sensitive ravine.
The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
MATH AND SCIENCE QUAD

Math and Science Quad
The Math and Science Quad comprises the first buildings encountered from the new Science Bridge. It will become an important gathering element with much of the pedestrian traffic passing by from the new entry.

Neighborhood Plan Keynotes
(Not all items listed will appear on each plan)
1. 12'-16' wide pedestrian path.
2. Maintain view to the ravine.
3. View to Amphitheater.
4. Passenger drop-off zone.
5. Pedestrian link.
6. Truck access.
7. Faculty, staff and accessible assigned parking.
8. Convert grassy mounds into native plantings; provide integral seating.
9. Provide outdoor seating and landscaped areas when Administration building is removed.
10. Outdoor seating.
11. Student Services Lot; reserved for short term parking only.
13. Ticketing and/or information kiosk.
14. Future building site.
15. Neighborhood quad.
17. Screen existing mechanical equipment from site and to mitigate noise.
18. The character of the pool enclosure is critical to improving the neighborhood.
19. The South Plaza steps down to meet the ravine, connecting the built environment with the distinctive natural environment; provide terraced seating at perimeter.
20. Assigned parking with Child Development Center pick-up and drop-off.
22. Special event parking; consider permeable paving materials.
23. Provide access for emergency vehicles to athletic fields.
24. Hold parking lot and access road south of the Student Services building; use landscape to define the perimeter of campus.
25. Provide limited vehicular access for faculty and staff deliveries to the Math and Science Quad buildings.
The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
MATH AND SCIENCE QUAD

Existing Character
The Life Sciences building and the Physical Sciences building are both two story concrete structures with shed roofs. They have no formal building lobbies and are served by a combination of exterior stairs and interior through passages. Both buildings are in poor condition and in need of fire and life safety improvements.

Currently the second floors of the Life Sciences and Physical Sciences buildings are only accessed through exterior stairs. The stairs are either hidden behind a blank wall or orientated away from the courtyard between the buildings. Consequently there is little chance for casual encounters that foster collegiality.
Area Improvement Plan

A new Math and Science building is currently being designed for this area and is necessary for the creation of this neighborhood. The new building needs to be two-sided with access both from the northern gateway pedestrian path and the neighborhood courtyard to the south. Orient all other building access towards the courtyard.

The new Math and Science building may include a rooftop observatory. If the observatory program remains as part of the building, it should be designed in a manner that creates a signature landmark for this neighborhood.

Keep generous proportions at all areas surrounding this site as this is a main campus gateway. Use the existing forty foot setback between Physical Sciences and the Library and Technology Center for determining the smallest passage area.

Allow for a 12 foot to 16 foot wide pedestrian path north of the new Math and Science building. Provide active edges along the pedestrian pathway. Create a through lobby or breezeway in the new Math and Science building, facilitating student access to the neighborhood quad.

Mitigate the noise of the existing mechanical equipment at Physical Sciences. In order to create a pleasant walking experience at the north of the Math and Science Quad, use landscape to screen the vents.

The Math and Science Quad will be served by a double width loop road. The size should be sufficient for a passenger drop-off curb and fifteen minute parking at the curb, letting through traffic pass. This loop road should be located as far up the hill as possible to avoid excessive slope on pedestrian paths and ease accessibility. A very limited number of faculty and staff parking spaces should be provided adjacent to the ravine.

The existing greenhouses along the north side of Physical Sciences should be incorporated into the design of the new Math and Science Building. They should be brought inside the perimeter of the quad with considerations given to creating a working garden and outdoor teaching space.
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MATH AND SCIENCE QUAD

Math and Science Quad Guidelines

1 Clear Connections

• Provide a large landing for the new Science Bridge and clear access along the north side of the new Math and Science building.

• Provide a double sided entrance to the new Math and Science building from the north and south.

2 Academic Neighborhood

• Develop a neighborhood portal from the main north-south pedestrian promenade into the quad.

• Consider creating a workyard within the new quad for teaching and educational use. Provide a separate area for common gathering spaces within the new quad.

• Style of new buildings should reflect the existing buildings and work with the neighborhood context.
Math and Science Quad Guidelines

3 Promote Natural Features
   • Select a building site that preserves as many healthy oaks as possible.
   • Take advantage of Life Sciences’ location adjacent to the ravine and open up views where possible.
   • Incorporate opportunities for outdoor education including native plantings and the greenhouse program.

4 Sustainability
   • Design energy efficient mechanical systems.
   • Provide natural ventilation and appropriate exhaust systems for the chemicals used.
   • Design lab buildings that strive to exceed California energy requirements of Title 24 by 20%.
   • Choose lighting to limit night sky pollution with special attention to the needs of the proposed rooftop observatory.
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Business and Humanities Cluster
The Business and Humanities Cluster is located on the east side of the Central Green. It brings together three academic programs into one neighborhood. It is also located in close proximity to the existing Lecture Forum where many classes are held.

Three buildings in this neighborhood, fronting on Costanoan Drive, form the eastern edge of the campus. The neighborhood is located in the center of the campus directly off the Central Green. This location makes it one of the most prominent and easiest to find. It also contains the most historically relevant buildings on campus. As such, the development of this cluster is critical to the future character of the college.

Neighborhood Plan Keynotes
(Not all items listed will appear on each plan)
1. 12’-16’ wide pedestrian path.
2. Maintain view to the ravine.
3. View to Amphitheater.
4. Passenger drop-off zone.
5. Pedestrian link.
6. Truck access.
7. Faculty, staff and accessible assigned parking.
8. Convert grassy mounds into native plantings; provide integral seating.
9. Provide outdoor seating and landscaped areas when Administration building is removed.
10. Outdoor seating.
11. Student Services Lot; reserved for short term parking only.
13. Ticketing and/or information kiosk.
14. Future building site.
15. Neighborhood quad.
17. Screen existing mechanical equipment from site and to mitigate noise.
18. The character of the pool enclosure is critical to improving the neighborhood.
19. The South Plaza steps down to meet the ravine, connecting the built environment with the distinctive natural environment; provide terraced seating at perimeter.
20. Assigned parking with Child Development Center pick-up and drop-off.
22. Special event parking; consider permeable paving materials.
23. Provide access for emergency vehicles to athletic fields.
24. Hold parking lot and access road south of the Student Services building; use landscape to define the perimeter of campus.
25. Provide limited vehicular access for faculty and staff deliveries to the Math and Science Quad buildings.
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Existing Character
Both the Business and Computer Sciences building and the Humanities building are two story structures built at the same time and of the same architectural character, giving them a very prominent presence at the center of campus. Their most distinguished features are their gable roofs and exterior verandas. The exterior verandas act as the main circulation system of the buildings and pay homage to the traditional Monterey building style.

The Business and Humanities building and the Family and Consumer Sciences building are two of the remaining original buildings on campus. They are smaller single story buildings with simple pitched roofs and are appropriately scaled.

The Social Sciences building is located across the Central Green. Although it shares the two story height of the Business and Computer Sciences and Humanities buildings the architecture is more comparable to the Science buildings to the north. It has shed roofs and is one of the few campus buildings with an existing interior corridor.
Area Improvement Plan
A shortcoming of the Business and Humanities neighborhood is a general lack of classroom space. To alleviate this problem, new classrooms should be placed in the space that will be freed up when the administration functions, currently housed within the Business and Humanities buildings, are moved into the newly renovated administration building.

Although the existing exterior circulation concept works well with the mild climate of the Monterey Bay region, one drawback is that the many exterior entrances to the building lack a hierarchy, making wayfinding confusing. The stairs to the second level are critical for building circulation. As the neighborhood develops and grows, it is important that clear sightlines from the courtyard to these stairs are maintained.

Another concern with the exterior circulation is the lack of spontaneous interaction among faculty and students coming and going which is often found in buildings with central corridors. When the buildings are renovated a central indoor, as well as outdoor, gathering area should be created to increase interaction within the departments. These gathering areas should be scaled and designed to support department wide functions. In addition, the faculty offices should be clustered around the one central corridor the building does have to support informal interaction.

The single story Business and Humanities building and its smaller neighbor that sit along Costanoan Drive are in need of renovation or replacement. Since the buildings still have value to the campus, both as structures and as a link to the campus’ history, renovating and preserving the buildings is preferred. If they are replaced, it is critical that another building go back on these sites to maintain the eastern edge to campus. When renovating these buildings, better internal adjacencies should be introduced to the exterior exposures of the spaces considered. The western wing of the Business and Humanities building is in a very active area, making it better suited to a classroom use, rather than office space. Strategies for controlling direct solar exposure of the windows need to be addressed.

A number of the existing buildings along the south side of the Business and Humanities Cluster will become vacated due to design projects currently underway. The existing Student Services building should be removed after the new building is completed at the Student Life Hub. The former building site should subsequently be transformed into a landscaped area that is an extension of the Central Green.

The existing Child Development Center (CDC) and associated relocatable buildings should also be removed after the completion of the new CDC. This former building site should then be developed into the only new parking lot on the east side of campus. This new Business and Humanities lot, as with all east side lots, will be for assigned faculty, staff and accessible parking only. It will help offset the loss of parking spaces from the new Student Services building. Perimeter trees and planted medians should be used to define the edge of the lot and buffer views from the campus. Bioswales should be located within the lot to provide drainage for stormwater.
The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
BUSINESS AND HUMANITIES CLUSTER

Business and Humanities Cluster Guidelines

1 Clear Connections
- Provide east west connector paths from the main pedestrian promenade to all of the Business and Humanities buildings.
- Maintain clear sightlines to all existing exterior stairwells.
- Shave off mounds to reinforce close visual connections.

2 Academic Neighborhoods
- Develop a neighborhood portal from the main pedestrian promenade.
- Create individual quads and/or exterior plazas to compensate for the lack of central corridors in the existing buildings. These plazas will encourage opportunities for chance encounters and impromptu gatherings.
- Consider creating small internal lobbies in existing buildings or common spaces near mail rooms and department offices for interior gathering places.
- Consider building on the former Student Services building site for expansion space.

The Humanities building illustrates the classic Monterey Style found on campus.
3 Promote Natural Features
- Preserve healthy heritage oaks within the neighborhood.
- Convert existing grassy mounds into native plantings and water conserving landscape with integral seating.

4 Sustainability
- Develop strategies to control direct solar exposure to the large expanses of existing east facing glazing. Consider the use of sunshading devices.
- Utilize bioswales for stormwater drainage at the new Business and Humanities lot.
- Use landscape at the parking lot to reduce heat island effect.
Student Life Hub
The Student Life Hub is prominently located at the south side of the Central Green. It consists of the College Center, the new Student Services building, and a new South Plaza. The Student Life Hub concentrates student activities and services into one location on campus and becomes a vital crossroads linking the east and west. In addition, it will anchor the south end of the Central Green.

Neighborhood Plan Keynotes
(Not all items listed will appear on each plan)
1. 12’-16’ wide pedestrian path.
2. Maintain view to the ravine.
3. View to Amphitheater.
4. Passenger drop-off zone.
5. Pedestrian link.
6. Truck access.
7. Faculty, staff and accessible assigned parking.
8. Convert grassy mounds into native plantings; provide integral seating.
9. Provide outdoor seating and landscaped areas when Administration building is removed.
10. Outdoor seating.
11. Student Services Lot; reserved for short term parking only.
13. Ticketing and/or information kiosk.
14. Future building site.
15. Neighborhood quad.
17. Screen existing mechanical equipment from site and to mitigate noise.
18. The character of the pool enclosure is critical to improving the neighborhood.
19. The South Plaza steps down to meet the ravine, connecting the built environment with the distinctive natural environment; provide terraced seating at perimeter.
20. Assigned parking with Child Development Center pick-up and drop-off.
22. Special event parking; consider permeable paving materials.
23. Provide access for emergency vehicles to athletic fields.
24. Hold parking lot and access road south of the Student Services building; use landscape to define the perimeter of campus.
25. Provide limited vehicular access for faculty and staff deliveries to the Math and Science Quad buildings.
The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
STUDENT LIFE HUB

Student Life Hub Neighborhood Plan
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The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
STUDENT LIFE HUB

Existing Character
The College Center is currently shielded from view by the existing Administration building to the north and parking lots to the east. It is a single story concrete building built at the same time as the Theater and the Amphitheater. It is a large imposing building with blank walls facing the adjacent pedestrian paths. The College Center contains the bookstore, copy center, food service, the Job Center and Financial Aid along with student activities space. The front door is set back in a niche from the rest of the facade and in some cases former entries have been blocked off. Picnic tables are located on the west side of the building facing the Amphitheater.

The existing Student Services building is located opposite of Humanities. The current building is not large enough to house the entire program and consequently these services are located in various spaces throughout campus.

A number of small scale plazas surround the existing College Center but parking dominates the open space at the south end of the campus center. Hence there is no true area for student gathering. High retaining walls and the existing tennis court fences form a visual barrier to the PE Complex.

Looking north across the proposed Central Green.

Renovate the blank walls of the College Center to include windows offering visibility into active uses inside the building.

The existing outdoor seating is hidden behind the College Center.
Area Improvement Plan

A new Student Services building is proposed for the south end of the Central Green. The new building should be located on a portion of the existing parking lot and provide a built edge to the campus center. This building should be sized to consolidate all the Student Services under one roof. One general assignment computer classroom should be housed in the new building as well. The building massing should reflect the transitional character of the site; the northern half should be two stories reflecting the scale of the surrounding Humanities and Social Sciences buildings, the southern half should step down to address the pedestrian scale of the new plaza.

The proposed Student Services building takes advantage of close proximity to one of the remaining parking lots on the east. The Student Services lot should contain short-term parking and accessible parking only. As Health Services will be located within Student Services, a clear vehicular route must be maintained for emergency vehicles access in case of health emergencies. The design of the building should provide a pass through or lobby space that leads from the parking to the new plaza beyond. The building should maximize views to the ravine wherever possible.

A new plaza is book-ended between the new Student Services building and the existing College Center and should become the hub of student activity on campus. Its location serves as a counterpoint to the library plaza at the north and completes the Central Green. This new plaza should integrate hardscape and landscape plantings to create a welcoming environment.

As the plaza crosses the main pedestrian promenade and meets the ravine, a less formal landscape should be used with transitional native plantings. Some seating should be integrated into the landscape. As noted in the Individual Campus Improvement section (Section 3), Administration should move to the old library building. The relocation of Administration to the old library creates an opportunity to foster appreciation of the ravine without disturbing the delicate environment. After the existing Administration building is removed, the site should be transformed to a landscaped area with outdoor seating. Removal of the existing Administration building also advances the idea of clear connections by providing a direct line of sight from the Central Green to the College Center.
**Student Life Hub Guidelines**

1. **Clear Connections**
   - Create a new south gathering plaza that acts as a crossroads for the main pedestrian promenade. A twelve foot to sixteen foot wide pedestrian path should be maintained that leads west to the Performing Arts Center and north through the center of campus.
   - Provide a pedestrian route through the Student Services lot that links to the Child Development Center across Costanoan Drive.
   - Provide a double sided entrance to the new Student Services building facing the ravine on the west and parking on the east.
   - Remove the existing Administration building to create a clear sightline from the Central Green to the College Center. Modify existing mounds that limit views across the center of campus.
Student Life Hub Guidelines

2 Academic Neighborhoods

- Style of the new Student Services building should reflect the existing buildings. Consider a building massing that signifies the transition from the two story buildings around the Central Green to the pedestrian scale of the Student Life Hub.

- Site the new Student Services building on a portion of the existing parking lot at the south end of the Central Green to create a new neighborhood.

- Maintain active edges along the main pedestrian promenade. Face building entries toward this main route. Consider renovating the blank walls on the existing College Center facade to include glazing at the South Plaza.

3 Promote Natural Features

- Provide a new plaza on the east side of the College Center with outdoor seating. The new South Plaza should include a combination of landscape and hardscape elements to zone student activity in this area.

- Open up views to the ravine from the new Student Services building and the new South Plaza. Lower or remove short walls that block views.

- Convert the existing Administration building site into a landscaped area with outdoor seating.

- Use landscape and plantings to define the edge of campus and soften the edges of the parking lots.

4 Sustainability

- Use landscape at the parking lots to reduce heat island effects.

- Consider using bioswales at the planted medians to limit stormwater runoff.

- Maximize the use of natural ventilation and daylighting at the new Student Services building to minimize energy use.
Physical Education Complex
The Physical Education Complex is located at the southeastern corner of the campus. It contains the gymnasium, a fitness building, the swimming pool, sports fields and tennis courts. A complete redesign of the Physical Education Complex is currently underway and is nearing completion of the construction documents phase. The physical master plan team met with the PE design team met for coordination purposes and to encourage the incorporation of the guiding principles into the PE project.

Neighborhood Plan Keynotes
(Not all items listed will appear on each plan)
1. 12’-16’ wide pedestrian path.
2. Maintain view to the ravine.
3. View to Amphitheater.
4. Passenger drop-off zone.
5. Pedestrian link.
6. Truck access.
7. Faculty, staff and accessible assigned parking.
8. Convert grassy mounds into native plantings; provide integral seating.
9. Provide outdoor seating and landscaped areas when Administration building is removed.
10. Outdoor seating.
11. Student Services Lot; reserved for short term parking only.
13. Ticketing and/or information kiosk.
14. Future building site.
15. Neighborhood quad.
17. Screen existing mechanical equipment from site and to mitigate noise.
18. The character of the pool enclosure is critical to improving the neighborhood.
19. The South Plaza steps down to meet the ravine, connecting the built environment with the distinctive natural environment; provide terraced seating at perimeter.
20. Assigned parking with Child Development Center pick-up and drop-off.
22. Special event parking; consider permeable paving materials.
23. Provide access for emergency vehicles to athletic fields.
24. Hold parking lot and access road south of the Student Services building; use landscape to define the perimeter of campus.
25. Provide limited vehicular access for faculty and staff deliveries to the Math and Science Quad buildings.
The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
PHYSICAL EDUCATION COMPLEX

Existing Character
The buildings and facilities of the Physical Education Complex are used everyday of the week year-round so adequate visibility and access from the main campus is essential to this neighborhood. The existing buildings were all built around the same time and are in need of renovation. There is currently no clear main entrance to the Physical Education Complex. Paths and circulation are complex, circuitous and often hidden behind large concrete walls. Safety for all who use this area on campus is a primary concern. The ball fields, track, pool and changing rooms are also in need of renovation.

The swimming pool is being replaced.

The existing track and field is planned to be renovated.

The existing pool changing rooms are planned to be removed and replaced with a new building on the east side of the pool.
Area Improvement Plan

Much of the Physical Education Complex is in the process of being renovated under a separate project that addresses fire and life safety as well as accessibility upgrades. The PE project, nearing completion of construction documents, includes making revisions to all of the sports fields, replacing the pool building and the swimming pool, replacing the fitness building with a new building, renovating the bleachers, providing a concessions outlet, and creating a new neighborhood entry portal at the west side of the gymnasium. The entry will include a landscaped island of single species trees that leads visitors from the PE lot to the Physical Education Complex and a new paved plaza with landscaping. Besides the above mentioned work currently under design, the physical master plan proposes some additional improvements to this neighborhood.

Dance and Adapted PE, both under the auspices of the Physical Education program, should relocate from the Old Armory to a new two-story building in front of the gymnasium. This move brings both programs from their current isolated location into the core of the neighborhood. The new building should be situated between the Physical Education Complex entry plaza and the minor campus gateway to the north of the gymnasium. The proposed building site highlights the bridge role Dance plays between Physical Education and Theater.

The entrance to the existing gymnasium should be emphasized. Consider creating a new front door and lobby at the second level. An exterior accessible ramp at the west side of the building should be provided that leads to the proposed lobby. A new elevator is being installed as part of the PE project on the opposite side of the building.

Refinements should be made between the campus and the Physical Education neighborhood portals. Specific attention should be paid at the junction between the Physical Education path and the South Plaza at the College Center, emphasizing the pedestrian route leading to Physical Education Complex. Use landscape elements and plantings to soften the view of the existing fences and large retaining walls. Furthermore, a pedestrian path connecting northwards to the Performing Arts Complex should be added. This path is discussed in greater detail under the Performing Arts Complex Neighborhood Report.

Dance and Adapted PE should relocate to a site in front of the Gymnasium.

Looking south to future Physical Education Complex neighborhood portal.

The Fitness building should be replaced.
The NEIGHBORHOOD REPORTS
PHYSICAL EDUCATION COMPLEX

Physical Education Complex Guidelines

1  Clear Connections
  •  Provide a new neighborhood portal at the Physical Education lot. A small plaza leading from parking to the Physical Education entry plaza on the west is being developed as part of the current PE project.

  •  Emphasize the northern neighborhood portal located adjacent to the South Plaza. Consider locating a ticketing pavilion or information kiosk at this junction.

  •  Provide a drop-off zone North of the new Adapted PE and Dance building that connects to the accessible entry and limits need for pedestrians to cross auto traffic.

2  Academic Neighborhoods
  •  Locate Adapted PE and Dance in a new two story building next to the gymnasium to integrate these programs into the Physical Education Complex.

  •  Improve the entry to the gymnasium and provide a lobby on the second level.
Physical Education Complex Guidelines

3 Promote Natural Features

- Utilize landscape to reinforce the neighborhood portals.
- Incorporate landscape elements and planting to soften athletic fencing and large blank retaining walls.
- Preserve as many healthy trees as possible at the north neighborhood portal.

4 Sustainability

- Incorporate water conserving turf and efficient irrigation systems into the sports field designs.
- Design drainage for the parking lots and sports fields that dissipates water flow in a manner to prevent erosion.
Site furnishings and hardscape features should be reflective of the Monterey Style - casual and park-like and yet durable and appropriate for the campus setting. The furniture should be timeless, enhancing the campus identity without overwhelming the natural setting. A list of campus standard items follows.

**Bench**
Manufacturer: Landscape Forms (Phone: 800-430-6209)
Model: Scarborough
Finish: Bronze

**Backless Bench**
Manufacturer: Landscape Forms (Phone: 800-430-6209)
Model: Sonoma Backless Bench
Finish: FSC Certified Redwood
Leg Finish: Bronze

**Picnic Table**
Manufacturer: Landscape Forms (Phone: 800-430-6209)
Model: Gretchen
Finish: FSC Certified Redwood
Leg Finish: Bronze

**Main Path Light**
Manufacturer: Architectural Area Lighting (Phone: 714-994-2700)
Model: Universe Collection-UCM
Hood: Flared Hood- SLFH22
Light Type: Metal Halide
Arm: SLA7
Pole Base: DB6
Pole: 4R-12, 12-foot pole height, banner arm optional
Finish: DBZ (Dark Bronze)
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SITE FURNISHINGS

Parking Lot Light
Manufacturer: Gardco Lighting (Phone: 800-227-0758)
Model: Gullwing G18
Light Type: Metal Halide
Pole: 18’-20’ tall pole
Finish: DRP (Dark Bronze)

Bollard Light
Manufacturer: Shaper (Phone: 925-242-0111)
Model: 982
Light Type: Compact Fluorescent
Finish: Oxidized Bronze

Trash Receptacle
Manufacturer: Landscape Forms (Phone: 800-430-6209)
Model: Scarborough Litter Receptacle
Slat: Flat
Finish: Bronze

Ash Urn*
*Locate only in parking lot designated smoking areas
Manufacturer: Landscape Forms (Phone: 800-430-6209)
Model: Scarborough Litter Receptacle
Slat: Flat
Finish: Bronze

Bike Rack
Manufacturer: Landscape Forms (Phone: 800-430-6209)
Model: Pi Bike Rack
Finish: Bronze
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APPENDIX
SUGGESTED SIGN TYPES

Campus Entry
- Locate on both sides of the new campus entry.
- Provide directed lighting for signage that is night sky friendly.

Driving Directory
- Situate at North and South campus entry points.
- Locate at a vehicle pull-out and combine with information kiosk containing campus maps and parking permit machine.
- Include directional arrows.
- Provide directed lighting for signage that is night sky friendly.
- Use a font that is both large enough and clear to be visible when driving, recommend using sans-serif font.

Parking Lot Banners
- Attach to light poles.
- Designate parking lot name for zoned access to campus.

Pedestrian Directory and Kiosk
- Keep at a pedestrian scale in height and size, should be under 6’ tall. Design should allow pedestrians to see around, over and past.
- Situate at bridges, bus stops and key pedestrian gathering places.
- Include directional arrows.
- Provide directed lighting for signage that is night sky friendly.
- Provide dedicated tack space for student flyers.
- Include a permanent campus map with a “you are here” locator.
- Utilize a multi-directional sign in lieu of single sided; consider a circular or triangular shaped sign.
- Recommend using sans-serif font.

Building Sign
- Situate a freestanding sign in the landscape at the start of the building entry sequence.
- Maintain a consistent font size throughout campus; switch to multiple lines of text for longer building names in lieu of reducing font size or changing the sign size.
- Utilize a sign that does not obstruct views, sign should be under 4’ tall.
- Recommend using sans-serif font.

Donor Sign
- Incorporate into the building or structure to differentiate from the building signs.

Interpretive Sign
- Differentiate from directional signage yet complementary to campus wide signage designs.
- Provide small informative plaques highlighting topics of note including but not limited to: Sustainable strategies Historical significance Areas of native plant restoration
- Locate discretely and close to the ground. Consider this sign type an object to be discovered within the landscape rather than distracting from the surroundings.
- Recommend maximum size of sign to be 12” square.
- Choose a material that is appropriate for the task.

Neighborhood Sign
- Only to be used in the future as building density increases on campus.
- Situate a free standing sign in the landscape at the neighborhood portal; use to designate the entry to a group of buildings such as the Math and Science Quad.
### Trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acacia stenophylla</td>
<td>Shoestring Acacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia subporosa ‘Emerald Cascade’</td>
<td>Emerald Cascade Acacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer palatum</td>
<td>Japanese Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agonis flexuosa</td>
<td>Willow-Leaved Peppermint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus x ‘Marina’</td>
<td>Hybrid Strawberry Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus unedo</td>
<td>Strawberry Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betula nigra ‘Heritage’</td>
<td>Heritage River Birch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinus betulus fastigiata</td>
<td>Columnar European Hornbeam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia leptophylla</td>
<td>Gold Medallion Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>Deodar Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercis canadensis</td>
<td>Eastern Redbud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cercis occidentalis</em></td>
<td>Western Redbud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitalpa faskentensis ‘Pink Dawn’</td>
<td>NCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chionanthus retusa</td>
<td>Chinese Fringe Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cornus nuttallii</em></td>
<td>Pacific Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus phaenopyrum</td>
<td>Washington Thorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cupressus macrocarpa</em></td>
<td>Monterey Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraxinus americana ‘Autumn Purple’</td>
<td>Autumn Purple Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginkgo biloba ‘Fairmount’</td>
<td>‘Fairmount’ Ginkgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymenosporum flavum</td>
<td>Sweet Shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacaranda mimosifolia</td>
<td>Jacaranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koelreuteria bipinnata</td>
<td>Chinese Flame Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia indica</td>
<td>Crape Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia x ‘Natchez,’ ‘Tuscarora,’ ‘Muskogee’</td>
<td>Hybrid Crape Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia denudata</td>
<td>Yulan Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia x ‘Susan’</td>
<td>‘Susan’ Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus sp.</td>
<td>Flowering Crabapple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maytenus boaria ‘Green Showers’</td>
<td>‘Green Showers’ Mayten Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaleuca linariifolia</td>
<td>Flaxleaf Paperbark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaleuca quinquenervia</td>
<td>Cajeput Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaleuca styphelioides</td>
<td>Prickly Paperbark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metasequoia glyptostroboïdes</td>
<td>Dawn Redwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrosideros excelsus</td>
<td>New Zealand Christmas Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olea europaea ‘Swan Hill’</td>
<td>Swan Hill Olive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus thunbergii</td>
<td>Japanese Black Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanus x acerifolia ‘Columbia’</td>
<td>Columbia London Plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus sargentii</td>
<td>Sargent Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus calleryana ‘Chanticleer’</td>
<td>Chanticleer Pear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus kawakamii</td>
<td>Evergreen Pear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quercus agrifolia</em></td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus bicolor</td>
<td>Swamp White Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabebuia chrysotricha</td>
<td>Golden Trumpet Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxodium distichum</td>
<td>Swamp Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilia americana ‘Redmond’</td>
<td>‘Redmond’ Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristaniopsis laurina ‘Elegant’</td>
<td>Swamp Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristaniopsis laurina ‘Elegant’</td>
<td>‘Elegant’ Swamp Myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus x ‘Frontier’</td>
<td>Frontier Hybrid Elm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**PLANT PALETTE**
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**PLANT PALETTE**

### Shrubs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shrub</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abelia grandiflora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agave species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloe arborescens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus unedo ‘compacta’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Arctostaphylos species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddleja davidii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calamagrostis x acutiflora ‘Karl Foerster’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callistemon x ‘Perth Pink’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callistemon viminalis ‘Little John’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calocephalus brownii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenteria californica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceanothus x ‘Concha’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceanothus x ‘Frosty Blue’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ceanothus species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choisya ternata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistus species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus kousa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correa x ‘Ivory Bells’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Corylus cornuta californica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotinus coggyria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendromecon harfordii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietes vagata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echium fastuosum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaeagnus pungens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriogonum aborescens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriogonum giganteum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feijoa sellowiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fremontodendron californicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvezia speciosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Garrya elliptica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grevillea lanigera ‘Coastal Gem’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Heteromeles arbutifolia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holodiscus discolor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leptospermum scoparium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Loropetalum chinense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lupinus species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahonia aquifolium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mimulus aurantiacus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrica californica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrsine africana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtus communis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandina domestica ‘Gulf Stream’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphus virginalis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phormium tenax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photinia fraser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbago auriculata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus ilicifolia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus laurocerasus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus lyonii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhamnus californica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhamnus californica ‘Mound San Bruno’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus integrifolia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus ovata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ribes species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romneya coulter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa banksiae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rosa californica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosmarinus species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubus parviflorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvia species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvia microphylla grahamii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphoricarpus albus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teucrium fruticans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Woodwardia fimbriata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shrubs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shrub</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glossy Abelia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Bush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Lilac (Blue Blossom)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockrose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kousa Dogwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Bells Australian Fuchsia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Hazelnut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokebush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Bush Poppy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnight Lily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride of Madeira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorny Elaeagnus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Island Buckwheat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineapple Guava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flannel Bush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Bush Snapdragon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Silttassel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Spray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Grape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkey Flower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Wax Myrtle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Boxwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Flax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photinia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Plumbago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Leaf Cherry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Laurel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Cherry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffeeberry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemonade Berry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Bush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilija Poppy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Banks Rose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Californica Wild Rose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Rose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thimbleberry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowberry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush Germander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant Chain Fern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vines
Bougainvillea species
Clematis species
Ficus repens
Jasminum polyanthum
Lonicer species
Parthenocissus tricuspidata
Rosa banksiae
Vitis californica
Wisteria species

Grasses
*Calamagrostis nutkaensis
*Carex species
*Festuca californica
Festuca idahoensis ‘Siskiyou Blue’
Festuca ovina glauca
Helictotrichon sempervirens
*Juncus species
*Muhlenbergia rigens

Groundcover and Perennials
Achillea species
*Arctostaphylos species
*Artemisia californica
Artemisia californica ‘Powis Castle’
*Baccharis pilularis ‘Twin Peaks’
Ceanothus griseus horizontalis
Ceanothus herstiorum
Ceanothus impressus ‘Vandenberg’
Ceanothus maritimus ‘Frosty Dawn’
Ceratostigma plumbaginoides
Coprosma kirkii
Correa species
Cotoneaster congesta ‘Likiang’

Groundcover and Perennials
Bougainvillea
Clematis
Creeping Fig
Flowering Jasmine
Honeysuckle
Boston Ivy
Lady Bank’s Rose
California Grape
Wisteria

Pacific Reed Grass
Sedge
California Fescue
Siskiyou Fescue
Blue Fescue
Blue Oat Grass
Rush
Deer Grass

Yarrow
Manzanita
California Sagebrush

Coyote Bush
Carmel Creeper

Dwarf Plumbago
Creeping Coprosma
Australian Fuchsia

*Identifies native plants and plants appropriate for oak woodland and ravine edge plantings.
APPENDIX
PRELIMINARY BOND ALLOCATION

At the time of this writing MPC has successfully applied for and obtained state bond money for individual campus projects and infrastructure improvements. A separate effort is currently underway to develop a Bond Implementation Plan (BIP). The BIP will address how the bond money should be allocated as well as determining the individual project budgets, schedules and phasing.

A preliminary diagram showing the proposed first phase of projects to implement the principles of the Physical Master Plan is included here for reference only. This document represents the campus projects currently slated for Phase I implementation. For a complete picture of the allocation of the bond money please see the Bond Implementation Plan to be published by Bogard & Kitchell.
Preliminary Bond Allocation Diagram

LEGEND
- Infrastructure Improvements
- New Building
- New Building in Construction Document Phase
- Existing Building
- Building to be Removed
The current academic plan forecasts no growth (Space Quantification and Facilities Master Plan, Maas, January, 2004). In the course of developing the physical master plan, the design team studied an option that could address future growth on campus past the 20 year limit of the physical master plan. This study considers the campus condition if enrollment surges beyond expectations and more facilities are needed. The Study for Long Range Development highlights zones for future development and long term building placement. It takes the guiding principles put forth herein and develops them to the next level.

Classrooms should be placed within the academic neighborhoods they serve rather than located in a separate classroom building. Dedicated classrooms will allow for greater customizing of the classrooms to their specific academic use.

The Math and Science Quad expands southward. All new buildings should be sited to create a true neighborhood portal. Arrange classroom buildings around faculty offices.

The Library and Technology Center remains the gathering hub at the north of campus. Humanities would become a large anchor hub at the south side of the Central Green. The Student Services building, comprised primarily of offices, should ultimately be converted to faculty offices for Humanities.

The original campus buildings along Costanoan Drive act as a historic edge and could contain the President’s Office, the Foundation Office and an alumni center. The Faculty Club could be relocated here as well should expansion space be needed in the Library and Technology Center. Business and Computer Sciences would split from Humanities and become an independent Academic Neighborhood. The existing Business and Computer Sciences building would serve as a Conference Center, classroom space or as the Administration building.

The Creative Arts Promontory spans the ravine across the Arts Bridge, bringing art instruction into the main campus. The planned renovation of the old library into Administration could subsequently be converted into additional classroom and gallery space.

Student Services would move adjacent to the main entry and become the first building visible on campus. This prominent location provides easy access to both first time visitors and for student appointments. As needed, a single level raised deck parking garage can be added adjacent to the Student Services building.

Eventually the campus will reach an enrollment capacity where the size of current buildings are too small. Instead of adding a series of ad hoc additions, demolish small buildings and rebuild larger structures in their place.
1. New multi-story Student Services and Administration building with short-term parking. This building is prominently located at the campus entry for easy access and the site takes advantage of ravine views.

2. Creative Arts Promontory should develop into two-story buildings as the campus grows.

3. Bring Creative Arts into the center of campus. Renovate the Administration building into a gallery and exhibition space.

4. Concentrate loud student gathering activities at the Central Green and south gathering hub.
Creative Arts Promontory Adjacencies
APPENDIX
BREAK OUT SESSION DIAGRAMS

Humanities Adjacencies

Diagram showing adjacencies:
- Faculty Offices
- Lobby/Indoor Gathering
- Outdoor Gathering
- Division Office
- Classrooms

Legend:
- Solid line = REQUIRED ADJACENCY
- Dashed line = MINOR ADJACENCY
- Dotted line = CLOSE PROXIMITY
YELLOW GROUP

- There needs to follow-through after this presentation
- Good to create traffic flow and connect west campus
- Historical issues with amphitheater, student oriented place, architectural design competition
- We need an amphitheater either existing or new that is connected to the ravine (same area)
- Concern about fiscal responsibility to Community re: demolishing buildings – International Center and Art Dimensional buildings
- Adequate parking at access
- Iris Canyon entrance
- More tram service (pathways)
- Staff parking
- Swing space
- How much is needed?
- When is it required?
- Humanities Division needs an academic cluster

At present, the Division does not meet the criteria established by the planning group. There are few clear connections, and there is no obvious academic cluster. The Division office and most of the faculty offices are not in the Humanities building, so students wander through and around the Humanities building with the expectation they will locate the office or instructor relevant to their needs. Students are often surprised to learn that the Division office is in what appears to be a little building by itself (BH 101), and that faculty offices may be located in one of two wings of the BH building, or in Social Science or Music.

- The academic cluster concept seems appropriate; unfortunately, the Division does not have a natural partner as does Physical Science with Life Science. Social Science is too far away and does not give one the cluster feeling. Of course, the Division is large enough that it could comprise its own cluster, but that would require similar buildings. The Humanities and Business-Humanities buildings are currently not similar.

- Another concern relates to a proposed parking lot where the Children's Center is now located; it may be too close to a proximity to the Humanities building. Traffic noise tends to detract from teaching and learning.

GREEN GROUP

- Current Amphitheater is considered an asset. Should a building go in this location or should it be left as is? If left, the Amphitheater could be improved by adding shade covers and add uses to neighboring buildings to encourage more use
- Quality of nursing space? Duplicable?
- Art appears to be the only academic cluster without a quad. An Art quad should be considered
- Where should the hi-tech computer lab be located? What are the academic and programmatic issues related to this?
- Cluster concept was favorably received
- How will Divisions be engaged? i.e. jewelry/nursing/sculpture
- Nursing could move to Science cluster
- There needs to be a connection between the Education Plan and the Physical Master Plan.
- Do not reduce number of parking stalls
- Art Dimensional needs truck access for deliveries
- Art Dimensional is noisy and should be located away from quite classroom space
- Consider drop-off / pick-up areas throughout campus
- Overall the group felt there were great ideas and improvements being proposed
BLUE GROUP

Positive aspects of the Proposed Plan:
1. Good to correct way finding problems
2. Outdoor gathering places
3. Heading in right direction
4. New bridge to Science Quad
5. New entrance on Fremont would be especially useful if a left turn can be made from the campus onto Fremont

Items to consider:
- Nursing could be located in Life Science /Physical Science area
- Road and loading dock required for Music, Life Science /Physical Science
- Question: How to provide swing space for Theater (potential idea to consider – use outside amphitheater or existing Music building)
- Outdoor gathering area for performances
- Art Dimensional facility is currently very functional with welding facilities, venting, roll-up doors etc; separation from other art buildings appropriate due to noise - if relocated these characteristics need to be incorporated
- Consider switching new Student Services building with Campus Center
- Improve bike and pedestrian access to campus
- Maintain some natural (wild) landscape areas
- Restore ravine vegetation to native state, and utilize as an interpretive/educational site and trail

Before the group discussion ended, there was a request for a show of hands of those who believed the plan was basically good and that the District was heading in the right direction. The response was overwhelmingly positive.

RED GROUP

Suggestions
1. Organizational charts that describe the bond implementation groups need to name the firms involved (in the chart itself).
2. Look at transportation alternatives and provide incentives not to drive on campus.
3. Establish walking and bike paths.
4. Circuitous routes may be appealing vs. what is being proposed. Maybe take this into consideration.
5. Library landscaping is attractive but extensive; there may be wasted water. For the public, should consider places to sit and enjoy and a curved drive to drop people off.
6. Signage would be the quickest fix to solve some of the problems. It is imperative at this point to communicate soon with those involved with signage if changes are being considered.
7. If most parking is provided on one side of the campus, it would be useful to provide increased tram service from the parking lots to campus buildings.
8. Need to address parking for dropping by the Library and Technology Center.
9. With parking so far away from campus buildings, we would need increased lighting, especially on the bridges.
10. Earlier parking “plan” was not well planned and designed and did not consider the existing topography or landscape. How will this planning coordinate with that study?
11. Concept may be a good one to place parking mostly on one side.
12. Visitor parking must be available near Student Services building and tram services should be available from student services building to other part of the campus.

Questions
1. In the plan presented, what is the difference in ASF as compared to current square feet? And as compared to the MAAS plan?
2. Why not create an interior loop road?
3. Have we considered unique attributes of programs to determine their best locations?
4. Why not renovate the quad between the International Center, Art Dimensional and Nursing to be an academic cluster rather than create a new quad?
5. How is Fort Ord considered in this plan? Is there a separate plan for Fort Ord? What are the implications here? For example, will we move any programs to Fort Ord thereby eliminating need for space and parking on campus?
6. Supportive Services labs are now in Art Dimensional? When will discussions for these labs be facilitated?
7. In terms of the phases, what guides position of projects? How much beyond the bond ($145 million) does the Educational Facilities Plan that Maas prepared cost to be implemented?
8. How much would this plan cost?
9. Will we create a signal light entrance?
10. Is it envisioned that the third bridge across the ravine would have a slight incline?
11. How does this plan coordinate with the MAAS plan?
12. Who is responsible for attaining input and give the college feedback if changes are made to our Educational/Facilities Master Plan?
13. Why take nursing and place it in the most congested part of the campus?

General Comments:
- Consideration should be given to alternative modes of transportation, not only automobiles, such as bicycle lanes, pedestrian pathway connections to off campus, increase and additional use of trams. UCSC cited as an example of on-going improvements to alternative modes of travel.
- New intersection off of Fremont may pose concerns with City.
- Nursing relocation should be carefully considered.
- Concern about fiscal responsibility to Community re: demolishing buildings – International Center and Art Dimensional buildings.
- General support of student parking on west with improved and new pedestrian bridge connections. Bridges must have good visibility and night lighting.
- Clarify how the Physical Master Plan process will integrate/interface with the Curriculum Master Plan (Maas Plan).
- Concern for creating linear pathways and flattening the berms and modifying the historical landscape character and feel of moving through the campus.
- The PMP group should be working with the Signage Committee. The general consensus is to avoid spending money on sign improvements that will be removed or no longer needed under the Master Plan design. The group begins meeting again next Thursday, August 26, at 1pm.
- The landscape should be water conserving and include native plants when appropriate.
- The lawn planting north of the Library is an inappropriate “Front-door” statement and does not provide for seating or use.
- Buildings should have a small amount of close-in parking, especially the Library since it is well used by the community.
- Consider a drop-off at the north side of the Library for easier access by the elderly.
I. Response to Master Plan proposal:
A. Like the idea of the academic cluster
B. Parking: across bridge ok as long as adequate lighting addressed. Parking at existing Child Development considered “odd” and would be better as more classrooms.
C. Have a need for more general assignment classrooms adjacent – now have to use rooms as far away as the athletic facility
D. Classroom utilization: Peak classroom use is in the mornings and evenings; the classrooms are underutilized during the rest of the day. This affects state funding for more classrooms however use at peak times is more than 100%.
E. Mounds are a nice feature

II. Comments on Existing Buildings
A. Humanities Building
1. Like “smart classroom”
2. Consider building to be like a “mausoleum”; dirty, dark, cold, colorless, devoid of human scale
3. People have difficulty locating the bathrooms, division office, and ESL
4. The outside access to all classrooms from the ring-like exterior corridors prevents any sense of cohesion that a lobby or central corridor provides.

B. Social Science Building
1. People are satisfied with this building generally, and like the interior corridor
2. Offices easily found by students

C. Business/Humanities Building
1. The location of business offices in what is otherwise strictly a humanities building creates confusion for students
2. Building in bad repair
3. Like classrooms, but they tend to get hot due to large expanses of glass – sunshades, trellises etc. could improve
4. When asked whether the existing Child Development building or the existing Business/Humanities building was more useful to them, the faculty responded in favor of the Business/Humanities building. They also recognised they were not familiar with the Child Development Building.

III. Program
A. Social Sciences 102 is tiered, with theater seating would comfortably fit approx 50
B. Need classrooms of varying sizes from 30-35 to 50-60.
C. Women’s studies to stay in Social Sciences with a satellite counseling office in Student Services.

IV. Adjacencies
A. Social Sciences noted the need to be adjacent to Lecture Forum where a number of their classes are held
Response to Master Plan proposal:

A. Concern with how to accommodate swing (surge) space during renovation of labs.

B. New bridge from parking considered a good idea
   1. Interest in re-locating the math/science end of the bridge to allow for easier access to the new Library, and to allow for directing campus wide pedestrian traffic away from the math quad.

C. Consider creating a working garden with greenhouse, vivarium and outdoor class space within the science quad

D. Route from bridge to new library:
   1. Considered detrimental to have public circulate through Physical Science Building corridor to the library. This is a pattern now employed. Concern with noise, cold (doors left open on both ends), and security (valuable equipment in these buildings).
   2. Walking to the north of Physical Sciences is currently unpleasant due in part to the noise of the mechanical system and that no paved path is provided.

E. Parking /Loading/Drop-Off/Garbage
   1. Some concern for displacing faculty parking, however it was also noted that the parking lot is too small to accommodate the entire faculty.
   2. Short-term parking considered very important in order to be able to unload teaching materials etc.
   3. Hazardous Materials pick-up happens only twice a year, in June and December.
   4. Small tracks utilized for delivery
   5. Providing a drop-off and turn around would be very helpful for the Math/Science area, the new Library and general campus use.

VI. Comments on Existing Buildings

A. HVAC has been redone, but is inadequate
B. Floor to floor is approx 15'

VII. Programs

A. Nursing: Prerequisites to nursing program are held in Math/Science Buildings, nursing is an independent program housed separately
B. Astronomy: desire for a planetarium located either on roof or in form of shared planetarium/lecture hall for +/- 100 students.
C. Dental Assisting/Medical programs considered integral to department, and should remain in cluster
D. Program is for teaching not research labs. Current labs accommodate 48 students. Faculty feel that is too large.

Additional Suggestions from Faculty
1. Provide a "leafy shed" field station in the ravine to store materials with which to study ravine
2. Provide 100sf outbuilding for a Vivarium for algae, mice and invertebrate. (smaller than a rabbit)
   Plant sales and composting held at the nursery. Greenhouse is most important to keep if space is an issue.
I. Response to Master Plan proposal:
   A. Master Plan proposal showed nursing adjacent to Child Development – nursing considers this is an irrelevant adjacency

II. Comments on Existing Buildings
   A. Enjoy Nursing Building 8 due to its access to the outdoors, that it is a one-story building, and see potential in adjacency to Art Dimensional. Have previously developed designs to improve courtyard between two facilities.
   B. Hospital donor is ok with move as long as new facility is functional.

III. Program
   A. Work with full time students for 2 years
   B. Prerequisite courses are held throughout campus, and science prerequisites are held in math/science buildings, however when a student enters the nursing program their courses are held exclusively in the nursing department and in the hospital.
   C. The program is quite high stress, therefore calm location/disposition is desired for facility
   D. Approx 1,000 students come through in short time periods for hospital training.

IV. Location and Adjacencies
   A. Nursing does not need to be adjacent to math/science or any other building on campus in order to fulfill curriculum needs as it is an independent program.
   B. Student and faculty make numerous visits to the hospital, therefore easy access to the hospital is desired – locations on the southwest corner of campus are considered desirable. Utilize van shuttle system, so adjacent to west parking lot considered important.
   C. The nursing faculty expressed preference of being located in one building - and their top preference would be to occupy both wings of building 8, (vacating International Center, and displacing Art Studio).
   D. Cross-pollination between unrelated academic clusters can be nice.
   E. Provide campus gathering spot on the East with food services.
The Admin Building already blocks the view to College Center. As the Student Services building will be even bigger, it will have an even greater impact on blocking this view, and impeding pedestrian flow to the south end of campus.

Admin location will block view of general campus to the ravine

Admin location does not allow for a building to block the parking from view

Admin location does not create a built end to the main quad, a primary tenet of the masterplan proposal

III. Proposed new Building
A. Size: 22,400 GSF
B. Ideally Student Services are housed under one roof. Exception is instructional services currently housed in Art Dimensional. New location or needed adjacency not identified.
C. Building houses very different programs from registration to counseling, some involve long lines and can be quite noisy, others require quiet and confidentiality. These variations in program suggest a building with several entrances, and potentially two stories, or one story with more than one wing.
D. Ambulance access needed for health emergencies
E. Student Services is the most utilized building on campus

IV. Programs to be housed in new Student Services Building
A. Admissions and Records
B. Counseling
C. Dean of Counseling
D. Health Services
E. Career/Transfer Center
F. Matriculation
G. Articulation
H. Job Center (now in College Center, room 110)
I. Financial Aid (now in College Center, room 108)
J. EOPS/CARE/CalWorks (now in Humanities Building, rooms 209, 209A, B, C, D)
K. TRIO (College Readiness, Upward Bound, Math Science Upward Bound (now in 2 trailers near Int’l Distribution)
L. International Students Program (now in International Center, rooms 108 and 109)
M. Assessment Center (now in Humanities Building, rooms 207, 207A)
O. Supportive Services Testing (now in Old Library, room 101; only the back portion of a very large room, and all of 101C)
P. Women’s Center for counseling purposes (now in Social Science, room 204)
Q. Ideally a general assignment computer classroom should be added to the building.

V. Location and Adjacencies
A. Parking: Important to be adjacent to easy parking. Need short term (30-minute) parking immediately adjacent to building. Assumption is that current number of short term parking spaces is adequate if enforced.
B. Need for close adjacency with College Center
C. Proposal to consider locating Student Services in existing amphitheater site – meets criteria for adjacency to College Center, close to easy parking for students,

VI. College Center and Amphitheatre
A. College Center to have a student activity coordinator and security oversight in building.
B. College Center to be a student gathering space. Specific programs not identified.
C. An expanded program is being considered for an amphitheatre type space to include music and movies.
I. General

The conclusion of this meeting was that at least one additional interim meeting be held with the Art Department to discuss needs, expectations, and planning issues. This meeting has not yet been scheduled.

Tuesdays and Thursdays after 4pm work well for faculty to meet.

Diane Eisenbach, Art Department Chair volunteered to be the contact person for the group – phone: 831-646-4203

II. Response to Master Plan proposal:

A. Art Dimensional

1. Art Dimensional is extremely concerned with idea of demolishing and rebuilding their facility in a new location. The existing building functions extremely well for them, and they are concerned that a new facility could not meet their needs as well as what they currently have. Many upgrades have been done relatively recently to the building, as well as faculty initiated improvements.

Specific aspects of the building that work for them:

- high ceilings
- easy access by vehicle and for loading
- outdoor work spaces with roll up doors to studio space
- concrete floor
- high walls, high windows
- noise isolation from other buildings
- gas lines throughout
- easily reconfigurable studio space
- fume and exhaust hoods

However, it would be helpful if an independent grinding room was added.
### I. Response to Master Plan proposal:
- **A.** Linden’s initial concern with master plan was that it seemed to obscure the PE buildings and he was concerned about losing adequate visibility and access to the athletic facilities.
- **B.** Acceptable to locate a new building to the north of PE at amphitheater so long as access to the new fitness and to playing fields is not compromised; particularly concerned with path from College Center to Fitness.
- **C.** Height of new building is also of concern – this will be ultimately tested by the building type located in this spot.
- **D.** Variations on the flex day version of the master plan were shown, including clear access from both the east and west side of college center. A gatehouse or entry piece was added on the east. The master plan guidelines will address this entry.

### II. Proposed Changes to Existing Building
- **A.** New front door and Lobby at second level
- **B.** Exterior ramp to lower level provided at main entrance (elevator located at opposite side)
- **C.** Basketball entrance will be through the new front door, and exiting will be through north doors, elevated exterior corridor and ramp. Stairs at north-east corner of this area are planned to be removed, although it seems further study of basketball exiting is required before this is final.
- **D.** Equipment room is relocated to west side of level one – with no direct ability to drop off equipment

### III. Proposed New Fitness Building
- **A.** 2 levels, same size.
- **B.** Exterior corridor cuts through middle of lower floor as access to tennis courts and football field

### IV. Ceremonial Landscape Stair
- **A.** Intention with this stair is to provide clear entry to the Fitness center for public

### V. Pool
- **A.** Pool is located in a relatively visible place, and the wall and landscaping around it need to be carefully designed. Master plan guidelines will delineate nature of design.
- **B.** Bleacher location is not fixed

### VI. Security
- **A.** Buildings are used all year, every day of the week
- **B.** Gates indicated on plan are intended to help protect artificial turf on football field
I. Adaptive P.E.

A. Adaptive P.E. would ideally be incorporated closer into the heart of campus, it is now in a remote location, not easily pedestrian accessible, and not visible.

B. Utilize 20-25 van drop-offs in a day, ultimate location of adaptive P.E. will need a van drop off.

C. Pedestrian and auto traffic cross paths at Adaptive P.E., safety is a concern – and could be improved.

II. Plant Services

A. Garbage: 93 garbage cans distributed throughout campus, utilize trams and carts to haul. Dumpsters now located at College Center, Library, Cafeteria. Some recycling.

B. Deliveries: big rigs come to Physical Plant building, and turn around in the yard. Rigs cross paths with student parking. Tree canopies need to be high.

C. Landscape Maintenance: seven foot wide mower needs a route through campus.

III. Amphitheater

A. Significant events include:
   a. Memorial Services (1,000 people; this number a rough approximation)
   b. Theater summerfest: built stage, lighting, very popular (theater department does not plan to recreate a summerfest; it was far too difficult for the department to undertake)
   c. Annual graduation (1,000 people; this number a rough approximation)

IV. Administration

A. Foundation requires short term parking adjacent to offices.

B. Ideally the Admin building should be visible from parking for visitors.

C. The IT move to Admin needs to be coordinated with the utilities master plan.

D. Admin should have a reception or lobby for greeting visitors.

E. An outdoor staff lounge area would be nice.
I. Music

A. Music Department desires a program that differs from existing. Some of those program items are noted below. Master Plan team will ask Music to further delineate program.

1. Prefer recital hall with 300 seats and 1-1/2 s ring out, now has 240 seats
2. Interior lobby useful as older population comprise audience
3. 2 rehearsal rooms; one for vocal, other for musical instruments, double as classrooms
4. Instrument storage
5. Library
6. General storage
7. Music lab
8. Practice rooms
9. Need to be able to load/unload 9’ concert grand pianos between music rooms and between music and theater.
10. Current music building is funded for less than 10,000 sf. Staff needs to work with architect to determine if program requirements fit within that space.

B. Location of a new building: current location works well, as does the amphitheater site identified in the proposed master plan.

C. Music acknowledges need to hire an acoustician in order to determine recital hall needs. Those recommendations will help determine if the amphitheater site is appropriate.

II. Theater

A. Theater is extremely concerned with their late position in the phasing plan. In order to move up in phasing, the theater department wants to be part of the Music improvements by linking the two buildings together as one. Their assumption is that if they are physically connected to Music they could be considered one building. They identified the need for both buildings to have a lobby and a shared box office. The desired location of these elements as delineated by Theater department is at the proposed new campus entrance identified in master plan. For these ideas to work together, the buildings cannot be linked by an enclosed lobby. It is not clear whether this arrangement would qualify as one linked building.

B. Swing space: performance anticipated off-campus, and classes held elsewhere on campus. The cost to rent off-site performance space needs to be considered as part of the overall budgeting by the campus. Theatre to speak with Joe Bissell.

C. Improvements to the building will include:
1. Mid-level loading dock
2. Hydraulic lift for orchestra pit
3. Some expanded lobby
4. Box office

III. Dance

A. Currently uses Theater two times a year for performance
B. Program is currently multi-use, dance as well as yoga, etc.
C. Locating dance near theater and music as well as PE considered a benefit.

IV. Amphitheater

Asked if the removal of the existing amphitheater was a concern to them, the Theater/Music Departments responded as follows:

A. Summerfest was too much work, unlikely to ever replicate
B. Amplified music in the amphitheater conflicts with Theater/Music programs as sound infiltrates their respective buildings
Items in *italic* have been added subsequent to the meeting.

### I. General

One additional break out session to be held with the Humanities Department to discuss needs, expectations, and planning issues. This meeting has not yet been scheduled.

### II. West Campus Break Out Group Response to Master Plan:

- **A. Agreed with Concept of New West Side Main Entry**
  
  1. Safety concerns need to be addressed with location. Faculty and staff would prefer a light at this entry. There is a precedent for multiple lights at the Del Monte Center. Master Plan Team spoke about Traffic Engineer who would develop plans before implementation and approval procedures with the City Traffic Engineer.
  
- **B. Agreed with Concept of New North and South Pedestrian Bridges**

- **C. Agreed with Concept of Path Hierarchy**
  
  1. Path through mounds needs to be straightforward for good north south circulation. The path should not be a clear-cut line through the mounds but also not meander so much as to make travel difficult.
  2. The path hierarchy should not be overly formal for the campus.
  3. Consideration should be given to cart traffic.
  4. An upper path along the west side of the ravine is proposed to connect all bridge locations.
  5. The mounds can be modified for visibility and can have various characters from planting to grass. The important feature of the mound is the open space.
  6. Integrate seating into the pathways.

- **D. Agreed with Concept of Campus Green**
  
  1. Students will use a Campus Green if the environment is comfortable. Current grassy areas have inadequate drainage and are often wet and muddy.
  2. MPC is a commuter campus. Many students do not spend long stretches of time on campus.
  3. Any gathering spots should be easy to use.

- **E. Agreed with Concept of New Building Sites**
  
  1. The long-term solution of building locations was well liked. Adaptive PE preferred the location near PE. Art liked the integration of Interior Design and Fashion. Nursing had no objection to the Armory Building if it was fully renovated. Art Dimensional was in an appropriate spot for service yards and access, though there may be further discussion regarding building shape once the design team is selected. Music and Theater prefer the attached building.
  2. There are considerable questions about short-term solutions. For instance, Nursing would not be happy if they were required to move twice over the time of the bond. Currently plans for different Creative Arts buildings fall into different phases. Lyndon described the phased design approach to the PE facility and suggested a similar approach may help the Creative Art decisions.
  3. With PE all design decisions were made at the front end of the project and then the project phases were divided out.

### F. General Comments

1. The Master Plan Team needs to coordinate tree selection, light and other site furnishing selections with the PE design team.
2. Painting was not included in the bubble diagram and needs to be near 2-D Color.
3. Food at the Creative Art Promontory would be better located near the Gallery and along the path to the Bridge.
4. The Amphitheater as it exists is an eyesore and would need to be renovated. To become a useable space for performing arts it would require the costly addition of infrastructure.

### III. East Campus Break Out Group Response to Master Plan:

- **G. Most agreed with Concept of New West Side Main Entry**
  
  1. Safety concerns need to be addressed with location.
  2. The location would divide the current Farmer's Market location across the intersection.
  3. Consideration should be given to the new highway exit and flyway being planned and its impact on the South side of campus. *(The current master plan has Fishnet Road as a main thoroughfare, with a significant pedestrian entry at both the north and south of campus. If freeway traffic from the south becomes more important the Fishnet Road driving entry would need to be re-evaluated.)*

- **H. Agreed with Concept of New North and South Pedestrian Bridges**
  
  1. Bridges should be implemented with sensitivity to heritage trees in ravine.
  2. The path hierarchy should not be overly formal for the campus.

- **I. Agreed with Concept of Path Hierarchy**
  
  1. Consider established short cut routes when placing new central path.

- **J. Agreed with Concept of Campus Green**
  
  1. Effects of Canadian Geese will need to be mitigated.

- **K. Overall Agreement with Concept of new Building Sites**
  
  1. The Humanities area has specific questions about their buildings, the possibility of replacement buildings and outdoor gathering areas. A subsequent planning session has been added with this group.

- **L. General Comments**

  1. The Master Plan Team will coordinate with the Math/Science project design team regarding parameters for site selection. The key master plan issues are:
    a. Adequate landing area for pedestrian bridge
    b. Adequate pedestrian pathway at the North of the new Math Science Building
    c. Mitigation of the existing mechanical equipment along the North pedestrian pathway
    d. Active edges at the bridge landing and pedestrian pathway
    e. Preservation of healthy Oak trees where possible
1. There was discussion regarding the IPP/FPP and project design process which includes:
   a. building renovation
   b. interior adjacencies
   as opposed to the Physical Master Plan process which includes:
   a. pathways and pedestrian bridges
   c. roads and parking
   d. building sites and neighborhoods

2. The Environmental Impact report will address specific water conservation issues. The master plan has sustainable practice guidelines for projects.

3. There is a desire for an expanded bus route into campus.

4. Childcare parking capacity is approximately 78 spots as shown. The design project team for Child Care will further refine the parking layout.

5. The current Administration, Student Services and Child Care may be used as swing space.
I. Introduction

A. Dr. Avery presented opening remarks on the progress of the master plan. He stated that the draft document is the result of planning efforts that began last summer and is the first step towards a new MPC. He said that in the past a number of studies had been done, but lacked an overall site plan and holistic view to the campus. He noted that the master plan team worked with the campus community and challenged the campus to see MPC with fresh eyes.

B. D. Tanza said the Physical Master Plan team has received a lot of campus input to date and we are here today to make sure that we correctly heard what has been said and we want to gather the campus' support for the Physical Master Plan. D. Tanza briefly discussed the relationship of the Physical Master Plan with the Facilities Master Plan and the Bond Implementation Plan. The Physical Master Plan is based on the information in the Facilities Master Plan but does not specifically address schedule or budget. D. Tanza added that the Physical Master Plan focuses on the overall character of and nature of the MPC environment.

C. D. Tanza introduced the Physical Master Plan team and presented the workshop goals
   1. To review the Physical Master Plan and guidelines
   2. To receive input and document the campus concerns and issues
   3. To achieve understanding of and campus support for the Physical Master Plan

II. Review of the Physical Master Plan

A. Overall Plan
   1. C. Davis began by noting that Monterey is a unique place and MPC was until very recently in a set status. He observed that the predecessors made some good decisions and established a framework for the future of the campus. They respected the beautiful natural environment found at MPC and built like buildings near like buildings. C. Davis stated that the Physical Master Plan team observed this framework and have made choices for the future of the college that reinforce the existing conditions and strive for overall improvements to the campus. He added that the Physical Master Plan looked at the existing transportation and circulation on campus, at the age and condition of campus infrastructure and the appropriate sites for new buildings on campus.

   2. C. Davis summarized the main elements of the Physical Master Plan.
      a) A new campus entry on Fremont Street and relocating parking to the west side of campus is the biggest move of the Physical Master Plan.
      b) A new Music building will be added adjacent to the Theater.
      c) A new Arts – Dimensional building will be built.
      d) A new Math and Science building will be added between the existing Physical and Life Sciences buildings.
      e) A new Student Services building will be built at the south end of the Central Greens.
      f) Designs for a new Child Development Center and Fitness building are currently under way.
      g) A new building for Dance & Adapted PE is proposed at the west entry to the Physical Education Complex.

   3. C. Davis stated that the Physical Master Plan is a policy document adding that it is a broad brush look at MPC and a framework for all future design decisions on campus.

   C. Davis said that the Physical Master Plan is based on a policy of no-growth, noting that future growth could be accommodated if needed by increasing density on campus.

B. Academic Neighborhoods
   1. S. Krevsky and A. West summarized the elements of the Physical Master Plan for each neighborhood, highlighting the proposed revisions and improvements based on the four guiding principles of the Physical Master Plan.
      a) Performing Arts Center: A new Music building is colocated next to the Theater and the Amphitheater is renovated to create a true neighborhood. The Amphitheater renovations should promote the natural beauty of the ravine. A new campus gateway is proposed northwest of the new Music building leading directly to a new bridge across the ravine and to the center of campus. This major gateway plaza is accented by a strand of trees in a reconfigured parking lot. The trees will provide a visual cue and assist in identifying campus entry points from the parking lots. An exterior podium lobby off the bridge is proposed that would include a common ticketing/concession stand for performances, this space and the others in the neighborhood should emphasize views into the ravine.
      b) Creative Arts Promontory: The International Center and existing Arts - Dimensional building are proposed to be removed to increase the area dedicated to parking and improve parking lot circulation. A minor campus gateway is proposed for the western landing of the existing Lecture Forum bridge as well as along the north side of the Gallery. The plaza at the Gallery becomes a neighborhood quad and gathering space. A participant inspired why Nursing is not identified on the Neighborhood Plan. S. Krevsky noted that the program is currently split between two buildings and that the Physical Master Plan proposes relocating Nursing to the Old Armory.
      c) Math and Science Quad: In conjunction with the new Fremont Street entry this neighborhood develops into a primary pedestrian entry point for campus. A new major gateway plaza is created that connects to a new bridge. The new Mathematics building is placed between the existing buildings to create a...
distinct academic neighborhood. Existing greenhouses should be relocated within the neighborhood quad to create an exterior educational space.

d) Business and Humanities Cluster: The existing mounds should be shaped and reduced in size to provide a clear line of sight to building entries and across campus. Furthermore, the neighborhood includes some of the original campus buildings which should be renovated to maintain a historic connection to the campus past. The creation of the Central Green and a main Pedestrian Promenade through the heart of campus frames the west side of the neighborhood.

c) Student Life Hubs: A new Student Services building is proposed at the south end of the Central Green as a counterpart to the Library at the north. The new building will be needed as a student community area in an open space. In addition, the new Student Services Building will be a new South Plaza in between the new building and the College Center. This plaza will be the center of student activities on campus and an active place with outdoor seating similar to the existing well-used plaza outside of the Library. This plaza stretches across the south leg of the main Pedestrian Promenade and steps down to meet the ravine, bringing the natural environment up into the built campus environment and promoting the distinct natural features found in the ravine.

f) Physical Education Complex: This project will be well into construction documents, includes improvements to the playing fields, bleachers, concession stands and a new fitness building. It incorporates some of the ideas of the Physical Master Plan, including a new entry plaza on the west side with signature strands of trees within the parking lot. The Physical Master Plan proposes improving the neighborhood portal on the east side and providing a clear pedestrian connection from the South Plaza. A new building for Dance and Adapted PE is proposed directly adjacent to the Gymnasium that will integrate these two programs into the center of campus.

III. Open Discussion

This section documents the questions asked by the workshop participants. The Physical Master Plan team’s responses follow each item in italics.

A. How can the campus be assured that the Physical Master Plan is implemented and is it practical to do so?

D. Tanza replied that the Physical Master Plan presents neither a budget nor schedule for implementation but rather a holistic approach to campus development. While based on the date of the facilities master plan, each project should have its own budget and schedule and be considered independently. C. Davis added that full implementation is possible but will require discretion on both the program and budget sides of each individual project.

B. Is it feasible to make all the proposed infrastructure improvements?

D. Tanza said that like the individual building projects, the cost of the infrastructure improvements need to be revisited at a later point. However, coordination of the infrastructure improvements with the Physical Master Plan will create beneficial opportunities to save money. D. Tanza presented the example of the proposed main Pedestrian Promenade can be built for little extra cost if done in conjunction with the regrading the obsolete utility trench. A. West also pointed out the benefits of locating utility lines under campus paths will improve access for future maintenance. D. Tanza also cited the existing Lecture Forum bridge as another example. This bridge currently has utilities hung from below it and as these outdated services are improved the bridge and path leading to it can also be improved. D. Tanza concluded that some of the infrastructure costs may also be covered within the scope of individual construction projects.

C. What is the timeline for completion of the Bond Implementation Plan?

D. Tanza asked for Donkeys of Bogard+Kitchell to respond. J. Demko replied that the Bond Implementation Plan is based on the schedule and budget put forth in the Facilities Master Plan (Mast Plan). The Bond Implementation Plan will use the information presented in the Master Physical Plan as a guide for the development of the bond funded projects. The Bond Implementation Plan will also develop ways to reduce the cost of swing space and/or provide alternate interim space solutions. If costs can be reduced, it might be possible that they will be reallocated to construction projects. Funds for individual projects will be kept separate. This is required as the funds budgeted for projects at the end of the schedule will not be used for projects already on the drawing boards. J. Demko noted that the Board will approve the Bond Implementation Plan.

D. Why is the new entry shown at the middle of the “A” Lot instead of along the east side? Is there money available to create the new entry?

A. West responded that the location had been discussed and reviewed on site with a City Traffic Engineer. The location shown was considered safest due to the grade constraints, visibility and its distance from the existing stoplights. S. Krevsky added that the proposed entry location reinforces the clear connection principle in feeding into the realigned Fishnet Road. D. Tanza noted that there is funding available for parking lot improvements and that if planned accordingly the new entry may be incorporated into that project scope.

E. Has the parking been eliminated from Costanoan Drive?

S. Krevsky pointed out that the perpendicular parking on the east side of Costanoan Drive remains, noting that all east side parking will be assigned parking for faculty, staff and accessible. Short term and visitor parking is provided at the Student Services Lot.

F. John Anderson, Chair of Creative Arts Division, presented prepared remarks on both the Performing Arts Complex and the Creative Arts Promontory. J. Anderson noted that the Physical Master Plan shows the building on a difficult and steep site to the north of the Theater, the division prefers the south side that has recently been presented in the project’s schematic design. The south site allows for the building to provide a shared accessible elevator without the loss of office and shop space. J. Anderson also said the south side site is preferred because it creates a continuous active edge, one of the tenets of the Physical Master Plan, along the ravine. S. Krevsky reiterated that the Music building’s location the new entry Plaza should remain as proposed and noted the merit an info kiosk could provide at this location. J. Anderson also said that while the current Art-Dimensional occupants are fond of their existing building they are not opposed to the proposed move to a new building on the old Music site. The new building must be built to the standard of quality of the existing building including the special equipment and machinery space. J. Anderson also said there should be no loss of teaching space with adequate area to accommodate accessible workspaces. Finally J. Anderson noted that the new building must be built prior to the demolition of the existing building.

G. What was Nursing’s opinion about moving to the Armory?

No member of Nursing was present at the workshop to respond directly. A. West answered that in the past workshops the program representatives agreed with the move and especially liked being consolidated into one building. In addition, the Old Armory location provides convenient access for the hospital shuttle.

H. Why is the Math and Science Building shown in a different location than the current schematic plans? How will loading and deliveries be made to the Science Quad buildings?

D. Tanza and that the new buildings depicted on the Physical Master Plan are intended to be diagrammatic in nature, identifying primary building sites. He added that they should not be interpreted as actual representation of the buildings to be built. A. West identified the location of the plaza near the library.
parking lot on the Physical Master Plan and noted that limited vehicular access can be provided to the Science Quad via this area. C. Davis suggested that the Math and Science Building Design Team seek input from the City of Monterey Design Review Board as soon as possible for their proposed building scheme, noting that there was a lot of city concern about where the library was to be located.

I. How come the astronomy observatory and science lecture hall are not shown on the neighborhood plan?
   D. Tanza noted that these program elements are anticipated to be incorporated into the new Math and Science Building. S. Kervick noted that the Neighborhood Report notes the multipurpose observatory and its specialized lighting requirements. D. Tanza said that a separate building was not previously known to be required but might be addressed in the Long Range Development Plan.

J. Why is the Business and Humanities building now shown as existing to remain when it had been previously depicted as slated for demolition?
   A. West said that while many options had been explored in the past, the current neighborhood plan reflects the results of past workshop discussions. D. Tanza requested a copy of the faculty/staff survey discussed at the last Business and Humanities workshop when it is completed.

K. Does the relocation of Nursing and Dance/Adapted PE creating a “snowball effect?”
   A. West stated that these elements of the master plan are interrelated, a new Dance and Adapted PE building must be built prior to moving these programs out of the Old Armory to accommodate Nursing which in turn must be vacated for use by Art. She added that this petition of the Physical Master Plan may be implemented over a period of time and may also be facilitated with swing space.

L. How will construction impact the campus?
   J. Demko of Bogard & Kitchell responded that all construction on campus will be sensitive to the instructional needs and that MPC is an active campus with student use year round. He noted that some of the proposed building sites lend themselves better to isolating construction from the daily campus activity whereas other sites may require contractor staging areas remote to the actual building sites. Either way all construction sites would be clearly delineated and off limits to students, faculty and staff for safety. He added that if necessary phasing and/or modified construction schedules (limiting noisy construction to certain times, for example) could be used to coordinate with the academic needs of the campus.

M. No comments were presented on the Student Life Hub or the Physical Education Complex.

IV. Conclusion and Next Steps
   A. D. Tanza requested that any additional comments be forward to his attention via e-mail no later than 5pm on Wednesday, May 25th.
   B. The campus comments will be gathered and reviewed with the P/VP for incorporation into the final document.
   C. The final Physical Master Plan will be presented to the Board of Trustees for review and approval in late June.

V. Enclosures
   A. Arts Dimensional new building requirements

Unless the Architect is informed, in writing, within 10 days of receipt of these minutes, the minutes will stand as written. It will be assumed that all in attendance and those receiving copies understand and agree to the accuracy of the statements and information herein.

Please offer revisions as follows: To EHDD or JLJA via David Tanza, Bogard & Kitchell.
Dr. Tunney, Chair of the Board of Trustees, called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. Roll call was taken by Ms. Phillips. Dr. Tunney declared a quorum present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Jim Tunney, Chair
Mr. R. Lynn Davis, J. D., Vice Chair
Dr. Robert Infelise
Mr. Charles H. Page, J.D.
Dr. Loren Steck

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. David Gesinger, Student Trustee

STAFF PRESENT: Dr. Kirk Avery, Superintendent/President
Mr. Carsbia Anderson, Vice President for Student Services
Mr. Joe Bissell, Vice President for Administrative Services
Dr. Carole Bogue-Feinour, Vice President for Academic Services
Dr. Bill Cochran, Dean of Instruction, Liberal Arts
Mr. Michael GilMartin, Dean of Occupational & Economic Development
Mr. Richard Montori, Public Information Officer
Mr. Steve Morgan, Director, Facilities, Planning & Management
Ms. Vicki Nakamura, Assistant to the President
Ms. Victoria Phillips, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent/President and the Governing Board
Mr. George Reed, Audio Visual
Dr. Helen Stemler, Director, Development & Institutional Advancement
Ms. Mary Anne Teed, Director, Library & Technology Center
Mr. Bruce Wilder, Instructional Technology Specialist

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. Chuck Davis

Dr. Tunney asked if there were any items which needed to be considered for addition to the Agenda for this meeting. No one replied in the affirmative.

Dr. Tunney read the Closed Session statement. Topic for discussion:

1. Public Employee Negotiations:
   - Unrepresented Employee.

Dr. Tunney reported the following from the Closed Session: “On the basis of the Superintendent/President’s recent positive evaluation, the MPC Board of Trustees has adjusted his salary compensation to reflect the advancement of the college during his tenure. We congratulate him on the achievements of full accreditation, the balanced budget, collective bargaining settlements, the Fort Ord land transfer, the bond program, and the stability of our financial reserves.”

Dr. Avery provided the context for the development of the Physical Master Plan. He said the District had the Educational Facilities Master Plan completed by Maas Companies with an approved funding plan, timelines, budgets and budgets for implementation of the bond program. Also, he noted over the past ten years, the District has submitted initial project proposals and final project proposals for various projects, such as the Library and Technology building, the Plant Services building, the Math Science wing, and the Child Development Center. However, the District did not have an overall site plan. He assigned David Tanza, Bogard + Kitchell, the task of development of such a plan and to take an unfettered look at the campus. The Physical Master Plan provides an overall framework for future development of the campus and improves access and wayfinding as well as strengthens the connections between campus and academic programs. The plan addresses several deficiencies noted in the Maas Plan such as the division of the campus by the ravine, the need for additional parking, and also that the campus lacked a "sense of place." Dr. Avery noted the physical Master Plan presents a vision for a “new” MPC. The planning team has held 3 workshops for the campus and the next step is for the trustees to consider the plan. Then, at the June 28th Governing Board meeting, the plan will be presented for adoption.

Dr. Tunney commented that the draft Physical Master Plan, which was sent to the trustees in preparation for today’s meeting, was beautiful. Dr. Avery introduced David Tanza, Chuck Davis, and Shani Krevsky from EHDD Architecture, and Joni Janecki and Amy West from Joni Janecki & Associates.
Mr. David Tanza reported that the goals of the study session are to present a summary of the Physical Master Plan; gather MPC Board input and revise the plan, if needed; provide an understanding of the document, and prepare for Board approval of the Physical Master Plan at the June 28th MPC Governing Board meeting. He reported that the process for gathering campus input was accomplished through campus-wide workshops and meetings. Workshop #1 was held during Flex Day on August 19, 2004. A large group presentation was held, followed by break-out sessions. Individual academic division workshops were held in October with Humanities, Social Sciences, Math/Science, Nursing, Business/Library, Student Services/College Center, and Art, Physical Education, Administration/Facilities, and Music/Theater/Dance. The second workshop was held on February 10, 2005. A large group presentation was held followed by break-out sessions. Workshop #3 was held on May 20, 2005. An electronic draft of the Physical Master Plan was made available to the campus community for download. A large group presentation was given to obtain feedback and to reach consensus.

Mr. Chuck Davis said that his company was the architectural firm used for design of the Library and Technology Center and that the physical master planning process has allowed his team to be further involved in the campus in a more profound way. What they heard from the campus included the following: develop the existing neighborhoods and foster new ones that encourage collegiality among academic groups; promote pedestrian use through improved circulation routes, wayfinding, and signage; review parking needs and vehicular use on campus; support and cherish the unique natural environment found on campus; promote green design and sustainable solutions; provide infrastructure renewal and replacement; respect the informal character of the campus while providing a hierarchy to structure campus organization. He stated that the Physical Master Plan team looked at precedents in the existing conditions found on campus and examined areas in need of improvement as the basis for design. They noted conditions which discouraged pedestrian use; that a shortage of parking was a common complaint despite underutilized lots on the west side of campus; existing building design; and natural features on campus that should be maintained. The Physical Master Plan advocates using sustainable solutions and sustainability should be a priority for the future of long term development on campus.

Mr. Davis also spoke about the guiding principles used in the Physical Master Plan: 1. Make clear connections. Create simple orientation throughout the campus with a system of roads, paths, bridges, entries and signage that clearly links all features of the college. 2. Create academic neighborhoods. Cluster similar or complementary academic and support functions in adjacent buildings to create a synergy among the uses. Locate new buildings to create pedestrian friendly academic neighborhoods within the larger campus structure. 3. Promote natural features. Utilize the distinctive natural environment found on campus to enrich the academic experience. Open building views to the ravine, campus open spaces and distant vistas. Respect the oak woodland interwoven through campus. 4. Sustainability. Sustainable solutions should be based on the unique Monterey environment. Use climate responsive solutions that adjust to the site micro-climates. Use naturally available energy sources, such as the sea breeze for night cooling. Use water responsibility. Educate students and the community through example.

Mr. Davis said key elements of the Physical Master Plan include the following: 1. Create a new entry on Fremont Street. 2. Realign Fishnet Road. 3. Relocate the majority of student parking to the west side of campus. 4. Maintain pedestrian and bike access at Iris Canyon Road. 5. Create two new campus gateways and bridges. In addition, he said there will be two new pedestrian bridges. The plan also recommends sites for the new Math/Science project, the Child Development Center, the Arts Dimensional building, Theatre Arts Complex, and incorporates the Physical Education project under design. The plan also addresses reorganization of circulation on campus and infrastructure renewal.

The next to speak were Joni Janecki and Amy West. They reviewed the elements of the Physical Master Plan focused on the following: 1) A new Fremont entrance and realignment of parking on Fishnet for student parking. 2) Maintenance of pedestrian and bike access at Iris Canyon Road. 3) Creation of two new campus gateways and bridges. 4) Reduction of the height of mounds and creation of a clear sight from north and south on campus. 5) Creation of lit pathways and paved walkways. 6) Creation of clear entrances to areas.

Ms. Shani Krevsky talked about the Performing Arts Center and discussed the new campus gateway to the Performing Arts Center, with easily identifiable entry points from parking into campus; the new pedestrian bridge over the ravine; renovation of the Amphitheater to fit naturally into environment; enhancement of pedestrian connections to the P.E. Complex; and the paths along the parking lot edge.

Ms. Krevsky then moved to the Student Life Hub. She said the Physical Master Plan locates the new Student Services building on the south side of the campus to frame a new south plaza. She reviewed the following elements: 1) Terraced seating along the north side of the South Plaza connecting the built environment with the district’s natural environment. 2) Provision of through access between the new Student Services building and the parking lot. 3) Enhancement of connections between P.E. Complex and College Center. 4) Provision of active edges along the main pedestrian promenade at the new Student Services building and at the College Center. 5) Improvement of visibility across campus by removing the Administration building and converting to a landscaped area with outdoor seating.

At this time in the meeting a 5-minute break was taken.

The next topic was the Creative Arts Promontory with open views to the ravine. In this area the Physical Master Plan provides a neighborhood plaza with a food service kiosk; separates gathering spaces from active workyards; enhances pedestrian access to existing bridges; relocates Arts-Dimensional to the site of old Music building; removes the International Center and old Arts-Dimensional building to increase parking; and uses landscaping at the proposed parking lot to prevent heat island effects and limit storm water run-off.

The next area of focus was the Math and Science Quad. Ms. Krevsky reviewed the following elements: creation of a new campus gateway and a new bridge across the ravine; creation of a one way loop road off of Via Lavanderia to include a passenger drop-off zone; provision of through access at new Math and Science building; and integration of outdoor teaching spaces in the new neighborhood quad.
The next area of focus was the Business and Humanities Cluster. Items discussed included addition of a building entry through landscape features or building architecture; promotion of the Monterey style architecture; use of outdoor space as a gathering space; and conversion of the grassy mounds into water conserving plantings and the provision of integrated seating to encourage use.

The final area of focus was the Physical Education Complex. Ms. Krevsky reviewed the recommendations to provide a neighborhood portal adjacent to the P.E. lot; change the location of Dance and Adapted P.E. programs; and improve the pedestrian connections north to the Performing Arts Center.

Mr. Chuck Davis said that the campus is entering a period of change. The Physical Master Plan is to serve as a guide for future development. This plan has a maximum life of twenty years; and should be revisited in six to seven years. There is a projection of “no growth;” but that could change. Mr. Davis strongly suggested that the district set up a Design Advisory Board made-up of a landscape designer, a planner, and an architect. This group would be an advisor to the administration and the Board.

Mr. Davis thanked the trustees for the opportunity to develop the Physical Master Plan.

Mr. Tanza asked the trustees if they wished anything changed in the presentation for Tuesday’s Board meeting.

Dr. Tunney asked the trustees what they desired for Tuesday’s Board meeting. It was the consensus of the trustees that they wanted a brief overview and a question and answer period.

Trustee Lynn Davis asked about the cost of the proposed new entrance to campus from Fremont Street. The answer was $200,000 to $2 million. Mr. Davis asked what Plan B was if there was an obstacle that prevented the new campus entrance. The response was the existing entrances would be reconfigured. It was also noted that it was important to indicate which projects would be covered with bond funds and which projects would not. Also, it was noted that the new entrance to the campus was discussed with Monterey city planners and they were favorable to the plan.

Dr. Steck reminded the trustees that he would not be in town for the June 28th Governing Board meeting and mentioned his concerns about the Music building replacement and campus support of the plan.

Dr. Tunney concluded the meeting by saying the document was great and he appreciated the efforts of everyone involved.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Kirk Avery
Secretary to the Board
**Accessibility**  
The combination of elements in a building or area that allow access, circulation and full use of a building or area by persons with physical disabilities. Elements include ease of approach and entry that is safe and free of barriers as well as ease of orientation and communication of information.

**Active edge**  
An enlivened edge of outdoor space including paths, roadways, parking lots, courtyards, grassy areas and natural features such as ravines. These spaces and areas may be enlivened using various means including plantings, outdoor seating and art that encourage human engagement, use and appreciation. Also includes energizing the facades of buildings and creating a visual connection to activity inside. This can be achieved through thoughtful placement of windows and building entries.

**Bioswale**  
A graded sometimes grassy low tract of ground used to collect and divert the flow of surface runoff away from critical parts of a site. Bioswales may be used instead of curbs and gutters to encourage water to flow across vegetated areas.

**Class II bike lane**  
As defined by the California Department of Transportation’s *Highway Design Manual*, a striped bike lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway.

**Daylighting**  
The controlled admission of natural light through glazing with the intent of reducing or eliminating the need for and use of artificial light during the day. Benefits include energy savings, improved quality of light and an enhanced, more comfortable environment for occupants.

**Educational master plan**  
A document that defines the educational goals of the college as well as the current and future curriculum to achieve these goals. The educational master plan precedes and guides the facilities master plan.

**Environmental graphics**  
The visual aspects of wayfinding, communicating identity and information, and shaping the idea of place. Includes signage, wayfinding systems and architectural graphics.

**Facilities master plan**  
An inventory and evaluation of the condition of all campus owned facilities, including the site, buildings, equipment and systems. The facilities master plan identifies regulatory impacts and deficiencies to those facilities and defines the plan to correct them. It also identifies the adequacy, capacity and use of those facilities, deficiencies of those criteria and defines a plan of correction. Based on the educational master plan.

**FSC certified**  
Certification by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) of wood that originates from sustainably managed sources. Chain-of-custody documents, used to track the movement of wood from forest to vendor, provide verification that the wood is in compliance with FSC guidelines.

**Heat island effect**  
Solar energy retention by and heat diffusion from constructed surfaces. The principal surfaces that retain this heat and increase ambient temperatures include paved streets, sidewalks and parking lots.

**High albedo**  
High surface light or solar reflectance.

**High performance envelope**  
Energy and resource efficient building exterior. Goals include maximizing operational energy savings, improving occupant comfort, health and safety, and limiting detrimental impacts of building construction and operation on the environment.

**LEED**  
Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) green building rating system developed by the U.S. Green Building Council. The Council (a consortium including architects, engineers, contractors, governmental agencies and others involved in building design and construction) developed the LEED rating system as a tool to introduce, promote and guide comprehensive and integrated green building design and development.
Light trespass  Light trespass is unwanted and obtrusive light that causes annoyance, discomfort, distraction and loss of visibility. A related term is light pollution that is caused by stray light from unshielded light sources and light reflecting off surfaces where it illuminates and reflects off of dust, debris and water vapor causing an effect known as “sky glow”. Both light trespass and light pollution limit visual access to the night sky and needlessly consume energy and natural resources. Night sky friendly lighting provides sufficient light for safety and security while conserving energy, providing a comfortable atmosphere and environment, and allowing visual access to the night sky.

Long range development plan  A plan to identify general patterns of land use and that provides a framework to guide future growth.

Major gateway  The physical master plan identifies two major pedestrian gateways, each with a plaza, to the campus. These are entrances from parking to the campus; one is at the recommended new Science Bridge and the other at the Performance Arts Center. The major gateways are distinguished from the minor gateways as well as other pedestrian paths by their width, scale, landscape and materials.

Minor gateway  The physical master plan identifies five minor pedestrian gateways. These access nodes to the campus are of a smaller scale than the major gateways.

Permeable pavement  Pavement structured to allow rain and other water runoff to drain freely through the pavement and aggregate base to penetrate the ground below.

Physical master plan  A framework to implement campus improvements for current and future development that meets the goals defined in the educational master plan and as identified in the facilities master plan. Provides direction on suitable building sites to accommodate immediate program driven needs for new campus facilities.

Sunshading  Use of fixed or movable devices to block, absorb, reduce, redirect and/or diffuse penetration of direct sunlight into a space or building. Sunshading assists in controlling unwanted heat gain and glare thus providing energy savings as well as a comfortable environment for occupants.

Sustainability  A balanced approach to addressing human needs within the context of maintaining the health and productivity of natural systems. Sustainable design has economic as well as environmental and human benefits including conservation of energy, water and other resources, and improving the environment and atmosphere for occupants.

Title 24  While Title 24 refers in general to the multi-part California Building Standards Code, Title 24 within the physical master plan refers specifically to Part 6, the California Energy Code. The Energy Code establishes energy efficiency standards to reduce California's energy consumption. All new buildings in California must meet these standards.
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Physical Master Plan
A reduced version of the physical master plan is reproduced at left for reference. This plan brings together all the elements and site plans presented in the physical master plan into one drawing. Refer to inside back cover for the full-size 1:100 scale drawing.
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- New Building
- Existing Building
- Building to be Removed
- New Bridge
- Road/Parking Lot
- Plaza
- Tree Canopy
- Accent Tree
- New Campus Landscape
- Central Green
- Athletic Field