LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT/SUPERINTENDENT

Welcome to the 2012 College of Marin’s Facility Plan! The information compiled in this document is a critical component in our overall planning effort to address the future needs of the college and our students. I am extremely grateful and would like to personally thank all members of our college community who have dedicated their time and energy into this planning effort. We are very fortunate to have a dedicated group of faculty, staff and administrators who have contributed to this and other projects above and beyond their normal responsibilities to make this a better place for everyone. I would also like to acknowledge the students for their invaluable contribution in the development of this plan.

The future of the College and fulfilling our mission is not only dependent upon outstanding people but also a solid planning process that is transparent and inclusive with all segments of the college positively contributing to the process. Only with that high level of involvement and a continuous planning process with regular review and self-evaluation, can we achieve the College’s full potential. The 2012 Facilities Plan will assist College of Marin in building a future that we can all be proud of and will benefit our current and future students and provide them with the skills to be successful in their educational goals and dreams.

president’s signature

David Wain Coon, EdD
President/Superintendent, College of Marin
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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2012 Facilities Plan provides an account of the latest planning and construction at the College of Marin. Section Two, An Introduction to the College of Marin Planning: Processes and People, begins with the College’s Planning Team, Mission, Vision and Values. An overview of each campus is provided followed by an outline of the people (faculty, staff, administrators and students) and governance structures and processes involved with facilities planning.

Section Three, A History of Facilities Plans (1924 through Measure C), provides background to the historical planning and construction undertaken at College of Marin since its inception in 1924. Most recently, the District is amidst the final planning, design and construction phases afforded by the 2004 Measure C Capital Facilities Program, funded largely by a locally supported facilities bond. Completed construction and projects still in progress are highlighted with greater detail.

Facilities planning has been developed in support of the District’s Educational Master Plan (EMP). Section Four, the 2012 Facilities Plan, links planning to the EMP, to State standards, and to WASC standards. Supportive space requirements and justifications as well as future capital planning are detailed here.

Section Five, Sustainability of College of Marin’s Facilities, details the Maintenance & Operations processes and procedures, and provides a description of a new software database system. As the District seeks the greatest attainable efficiencies in planning and operations, new software and processes are being implemented. Through direct linkage with the State Chancellor’s Office FUSION database, the campus facilities can be assured of alignment with current facilities information and annual submittal requirements. Additionally, building and site information will be recorded and accessible for timely maintenance requirements. As a first step, the District is implementing a greater level of detail on two pilot projects. The system is scalable and future buildings will likely be added to this database.

Appendices of additional data and graphics can be found in Section Six. As the District continues its development of facilities in support of its Educational Master Plan, this document will be a guide for continued institutional effectiveness and collaboration in planning facilities, maintenance, and day-to-day operations.
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INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

College of Marin’s commitment to educational excellence is rooted in our mission to provide excellent educational opportunities for all members of our diverse community by offering:

- Preparation for transfer to four-year schools and universities;
- Workforce education;
- Basic skills improvement/English as a Second Language;
- Intellectual and physical development; and lifelong learning; and
- Cultural enrichment.

The College of Marin is committed to responding to community needs by offering student-centered programs and services in a supportive, innovative learning environment with a strong foundation of sustainability, which will instill environmental sensitivity in our students.

(Mission approved by the Marin Community College District Board of Trustees on April 20, 2010)
2.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE COLLEGE OF MARIN PLANNING PROCESS & PEOPLE

COLLEGE VISION

College of Marin will be a premier educational and cultural center that provides programs of the highest caliber to meet the needs of an increasingly interconnected global society. Our vision will be guided by our values.

COLLEGE VALUES

Student and Community Centered Education: We promote student success by providing programs and services that are learner centered and reflect the changing needs of our students and surrounding community.

Academic Excellence and Innovation: We are dedicated to academic excellence and encourage innovation. We foster intellectual inquiry by encouraging critical thinking, information literacy and technical competence. We continually evaluate the effectiveness of our programs.

Collaboration and Open Communication: We cultivate a culture of mutual respect, open communication, collaborative working relationships and participation in decision making among students, faculty, staff and the communities we serve.

Diversity: We cherish a learning environment that celebrates diverse backgrounds and recognizes the knowledge and experiences among its students, faculty and staff. We will provide open access and strive to remove barriers to student success.

Sustainability: We will apply environmentally sustainable and green principles in our college community to ensure the future of our planet.

Accountability: We will be accountable for our decisions and actions on behalf of the students, college and community. Our decisions will be academically, fiscally and environmentally responsible.

(Vision approved by the Marin Community College District Board of Trustees in January, 2006)
Since its beginnings, the College of Marin has provided educational services to Marin County and the neighboring regions. The primary center of population in the County extends north and south along Highway 101. Included are the cities of Novato, San Anselmo, San Rafael, Fairfax, Ross, Larkspur, Mill Valley, Corte Madera, Tiburon, Sausalito, Belvedere and other communities in mostly urban areas. The district service area, and the county, extends westerly to the Pacific Ocean but topography, distance, and a sparse population limit participation from the more remote areas in the western region.

Demographics
Total population for Marin County was estimated to be about 254,700 persons in 2011. The percentage of population change from January 2010 to January 2011 is estimated to be 1.0%. The county’s population growth is projected to be minor during the term of the District’s Educational Master Plan. Additional information on the District’s demographics can be found in the 2012 Educational Master Plan.

Access and Traffic
Access to both campuses from North and South is through use of Highway 101. The traffic congestion along Highway 101 is a continuous and growing problem for the County. In the morning students traveling from northern and central Marin experience heavy traffic commuting to Kentfield while in the late afternoon to evening, it is students from the southern areas that have commuting issues to Kentfield and to IVC. Public transportation to the District is accessible, but quite limited, especially to the Indian Valley Campus.
## One Campus, Three Sites - Background History

When first established in 1926, the original name for the college was “Marin Junior College”. It offered its first Associates Degrees in 1929. The College was renamed College of Marin in 1947. The District expanded in 1975 with the opening of a second college in Novato, referred to as Indian Valley College. In 1985, the two Colleges known today as Kentfield Campus and Indian Valley Campus, were merged together, compiling the College of Marin into one entity that operates over two campuses. At the time that Measure C was passed by Marin voters in 2004, the physical campuses had seen very little change over the previous 40 years. The Kentfield Campus had 14 facilities on 77 acres (401,904 Gross Square Feet-GSF), all constructed prior to 1977. The Indian Valley Campus in Novato, with 333 acres (1176,820 GSF) has 8 facilities/complexes constructed between 1975 and 1977. By the end of the renovation and new construction afforded by Measure C, the Kentfield campus will have demolished seven (7) buildings (or portions thereof) and built four (4) new, replacement facilities, modernized two (2), and updated site accessibility and parking facilities. The Indian Valley Campus received a modernization and addition to the Transportation Complex and a new Main Building Complex on the North side of the creek.

The Bolinas Bay Marine Center, acquired from the US Coast Guard in 1956, was the third site that made up the College of Marin. This field station, located about 30 miles from the Kentfield Campus, contains a house built c. 1924 and a research laboratory constructed in the 1960’s. Over the years, COM Marine Biology classes were conducted at the site and youth groups used the facilities for summer programs. A number of issues associated with the property (adjacency to steep slopes and close proximity to San Andreas fault) prevented continued utilization. Classes have been suspended pending the outcome of strategies to revitalize the site. In order to restore use of the facilities in Bolinas, the District would need to develop a plan of action that takes into consideration the complex issues associated with the condition and location of the property.
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BACKGROUND OF THE FACILITIES PLAN

The College of Marin is nearing completion of its 2004 Measure C Bond Program. Through use of its $249.5 million dollars, the District has planned for, and executed the modernization and new construction of buildings critical to providing educational opportunities to its students and to the community. Nearing completion, the District is in need of documenting the new space that has been added to the campus, how it and remaining spaces on campus are utilized, how they meet the educational needs of its programs, and what are their on-going operational and maintenance costs. The District has also initiated development & implementation of a live-data tool that can capture on-going data adjustments and serve long-range needs for facilities planning and maintenance, in support of the District’s Educational Master Plan.

FACILITIES PLAN SCOPE AND INTENDED RESULTS

In support of the College of Marin’s Educational Master Plan, updated in February 2012, the 2012 Facilities Plan provides a guide for future campus development through documentation of:

- Post-measure C facilities;
- Systematic evaluation and response to other institutional data;
- Shared Governance participation throughout the process;
- Evaluation of current Maintenance and Operational data and costs with opportunity for continued growth in metrics to facilitate efficiency and effectiveness;
- A course of action for future planning; and
- Space utilization and fulfillment of programmatic need within existing and new Measure C facilities.
2.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE COLLEGE OF MARIN PLANNING PROCESS & PEOPLE

INTEGRATED PLANNING AND THE FACILITIES PLAN

The College of Marin’s Integrated Planning Model begins with the college Mission which informs the Educational Master Plan which then informs the Strategic Plan. From there the more specific master plans are developed and implemented. In the model below the Facilities Plan is seen after the Strategic Plan and is informed by internal and external research. It then, in turn, informs Program Review and Resource Allocation.

College of Marin: Integrated Planning
College of Marin’s governance system is guided by the California Education Code as specified in the Education Code section 70901(b)(1)(E) which reads: governing boards of community college districts will “ensure faculty, staff, and students the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, and the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration, and the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards as well as other academic and professional matters as are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.” Further, the College of Marin governance system aspires to establish and practice transparency in decision-making.

The 2012 Facilities Plan (FP) has been developed under the leadership of the District’s Facilities Planning Committee (FPC), a participatory governance committee. As a participatory committee, the FPC is composed of members of the faculty, staff, and students.
The Facilities Planning Committee (FPC), an on-going governance subcommittee of the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC), operates to assure faculty, staff and student involvement in the planning, design, construction and upkeep of College-owned facilities, as defined in Appendix D. One of the FPC’s responsibilities is to make recommendations to the PRAC on facility planning and deferred maintenance needs.

**PLANNING DEFINITIONS**
Facilities planning encompasses various types of work typically undertaken in a college facility:
- Capital construction: large single projects to construct or modernize facilities, typically in excess of $500,000
- Deferred (also called scheduled) maintenance: smaller projects to repair or upgrade facilities, typically not accomplished until funds are available, but prioritized and planned
- Preventive maintenance: tasks completed by maintenance departments specifically to avoid the need for future repairs (e.g., filter replacements, equipment tune-ups, painting)
- Routine maintenance: tasks completed to repair or replace broken or outdated items (e.g., changing light bulbs, repairing broken windows)

**FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**
Capital construction is currently being handled by the Measure C bond modernization team, while the Maintenance & Operations (M&O) Department is responsible for deferred, preventive and routine maintenance. Requests for facility improvements come from the following sources:
- Work requests sent to M&O
- Repair or maintenance issues observed on site by staff, faculty, students, and visitors
- Work recognized or planned by M&O staff during routine maintenance activity
- ADA Transition Plan developed by Accessibility Work Group
- Instructional program review
- Administrative program review

**FUNDING SOURCES**
Funding is categorized by source:
- Regular M&O budget, prepared and administered by M&O department
- Measure C bond modernization program for capital projects
- Energy savings realized from completion of bond projects (earmarked by the Board of Trustees for preventive and routine maintenance on bond-completed facilities)
- State funds often requiring matching general funds, grants, rebates and other outside sources
- New general funds allocated for facilities
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DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to reach a specific recommendation for deferred maintenance funding by the PRAC, the Facilities Planning Committee:

- Collected and collated all known requests for facilities work
- Removed requests that are
  - Bond-funded
  - Routine in nature and can be accomplished within existing M&O budget
  - Related to technology and therefore will be handled separately
- Categorized remaining projects (recognizing that any given project can be cross-categorized according to definitions, above)
- Sorted remaining projects in various configurations to develop a list of ranked projects. The list became the heart of the 2012 Facilities Plan, see page 45.
FACILITIES PLANNING PROCESS

The following sections describe both past planning efforts and the process utilized for this specific FP. ARCHITECTURE/vbn utilized a Process Plan (or map) to identify the participants, schedule, and required outcomes of the FP project. Within this plan, process participants are identified along the left column with a timeline near the top of the page. Mapped through the process, then, are the tasks or required output of the involvement of the indicated stakeholders. In this project, the FP was completed by July 1, 2012 with the regular involvement and leadership of the District’s Facilities Planning Committee (FPC).

The process plan defined structured meetings, deliverables, and timelines, but ARCHITECTURE/vbn was available to the District as needed, to ensure accuracy of District-provided data, to address questions of stakeholders, and provide interim information supportive of the District functions, meetings, and presentations.

The Facilities Plan deliverable was affirmed by the Facilities Planning Committee and the President’s Cabinet before being presented to the Board of Trustees for approval and implementation.
3.0 HISTORY OF FACILITY PLANS 1924 THROUGH MEASURE C

2002 FACILITY ASSESSMENTS

OVERVIEW The Marin Campuses were largely without modernization since construction of each facility. Notable deterioration of site and facilities needed to be defined. The desired outcome was to define utilization of facilities and magnitude of renovation.

DATA DRIVEN The College of Marin prepared the 2002 facilities study in response to needed updates to accommodate changes in program and large extent of deferred maintenance.

OUTCOME In recognition of the necessary facilities upgrades, maintenance, and potential new construction, the District determined a need to define a plan that would support opportunity for state and local funding support. Additional research and data would be required to adequately define the current conditions and desired outcomes.

2003 FACILITY ASSESSMENTS

OVERVIEW Having completed facility assessments and utilization studies in 2002, the District developed a high-level Facilities Master Plan to document recommendations for upgrades and potential new facilities. The desired outcome of the Planning was to prepare justification for state and local funding.

DATA DRIVEN In 2003, The College of Marin hired consultants to prepare Facility Assessments, Space Utilization, and Campus Planning studies that identified the required renovation and new construction to support the Educational Master Plan of College of Marin.

OUTCOME In July 2004, the District completed a facilities plan that included organizing principles, long term goals for development, and a recommended projects list (see following pages) which became the basis for the Measure C Bond Campaign. Within this report came acknowledgement that additional research and planning would be required to define the complete identification of needs and proposed campus master plans (see 2005 Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan).

In November of 2004, the District successfully passed Measure C, a locally supported, $249.5, 55% general obligation bond.
In early 2004, the Board of Trustees developed a list of desired projects based upon discussions with stakeholders and the 2002 and 2003 site and building assessments. Then Board member, Harry Moore led the charge in defining many of the projects. To-date, this list of projects is commonly called, “Harry’s List”. Select projects from this list later became part of the Measure C Bond Spending Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.01</td>
<td>Site Roadways / Infrastructure Development Plans and Impact Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.02</td>
<td>Modernization of Learning Resource Center, Conversion to Technology Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.03</td>
<td>Modernization of Harlan Center ***Now included as part of NAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.04</td>
<td>Modernization of Fusselman Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.05</td>
<td>Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.06</td>
<td>Fine Arts Center (Fine &amp; Performing Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.07</td>
<td>Modernization of Student Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.08</td>
<td>Diamond PE Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.09</td>
<td>New Campus Accessibility Improvements***scope performed in major project site boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.10</td>
<td>Fire Alarm Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.11</td>
<td>ADA, Fire- and Personal Safety building and path signage***limited scope performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.12</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.13</td>
<td>Child Care /Development Center***Current BSP proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.14</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.15</td>
<td>New Facilities Management Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.16</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Academic &amp; Support Facility (NAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.17a</td>
<td>Landscape, construction mitigation and replacement***scope performed in major project areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.18</td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.19</td>
<td>New Learning Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.01</td>
<td>Site Roadways / Infrastructure Development Plans and Impact Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.02</td>
<td>Modernization of Pomo Cluster***Pomo 1&amp;2 only Trans Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.03</td>
<td>Capital Preservation of Ohlone cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.04</td>
<td>Capital Preservation of Miwok cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.05</td>
<td>Admin/Children’s Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.06</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.07</td>
<td>Capitol renewal and expansion of Central Plant***Plant #2 only and geothermal loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.08</td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.09</td>
<td>Fire safety system project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.10</td>
<td>Gas Main Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.11</td>
<td>Campus accessibility improvements***limited scope performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.12</td>
<td>ADA, Fire- and personal Safety building and path signage***scope performed in major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.13</td>
<td>New pedestrian bridges (3), entrance gates, pedestrian safety, lighting, etc*** limited scope performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.14</td>
<td>Enhanced entrance road landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.15</td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.16</td>
<td>Commons/Quad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.17</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.18</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.20</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.21</td>
<td>Wildfire Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC.22</td>
<td>Erosion Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.01</td>
<td>Technology Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.02</td>
<td>Bolinas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP (2004)

OVERVIEW

Of particular interest to the District in 2004, was the practice of environmental stewardship initiated by the US Green Building Council’s LEED™ (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) program.

DATA DRIVEN

The USGBC had documented evidence of energy and water conservation, sustainable operation methodologies, and benefits of supportive learning environments.

OUTCOME

In 2004, with the passage of Measure C, the Board of Trustees enacted a Resolution to “design, deconstruct, renovate, operate, and maintain District Facilities and infrastructure that are models of energy, water, and material efficiency while providing healthy, productive, and comfortable indoor environments and long-term benefits to students, faculty, and staff.” With this Resolution, all new or renovated facilities are required to incorporate sustainable design criteria consistent with the USGBC LEED™ Rating System, achieving what was then a LEED™ minimum of 26 points. All projects undertaken by the District with Measure C funds have achieved LEED™ accreditation or contributed towards campus-wide energy efficiency.

CAMPUS ACCESSIBILITY ASSESSMENT (2004)

OVERVIEW

With building code updates, the College of Marin’s site and building accessibility required review and analysis to ensure the ability of all students to access the programs at College of Marin.

DATA DRIVEN

Several building code updates defined standards for universal accessibility that suggested that the College of Marin campuses would require updated accommodations; professional analysis was needed.

OUTCOME

In April of 2004, the College of Marin enlisted consultants to prepare Accessibility Assessments at the Kentfield and Indian Valley Campuses. The result of these assessments provided valuable insight into opportunities to increase the accessibility of the District sites and facilities. Scope from the report continues to be identified in the District’s modernization and new construction projects to ensure equitable access of all persons to the educational opportunities at the College of Marin.
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3.0

CAMPUSS PLANS
(DEPICTED IN 2004)

Kentfield Campus

Largely unchanged since the construction of the Learning Resource Center in 1973, the Kentfield Campus did have some minor additions. Prior to the 2004 Measure C Bond Program, several temporary (portable) buildings were introduced to the site to support needed teaching, student services, and maintenance. Many of these facilities still exist on the campus today. It is through the maintenance of these facilities that they have served the college so well, most of them now beyond their serviceable life.

Indian Valley Campus

Except for a brief closure in the 1980’s for water damage repair, the Indian Valley Campus did not see any sizeable renovation or new construction. Oversized for its student body, several of the buildings were leased to community organizations (schools) or remained empty. The rural location contributed to much of the decay of the facilities; high temperatures, hillside water runoff, creek and bridge deterioration, hillside/road deterioration, and aged underground infrastructure. That said, it is through the care of the campus administration and M&O team, that the facilities have been able to support the education of the Northern Marin community since 1977.
2005 COMPREHENSIVE FACILITIES MASTER PLANNING

OVERVIEW
With the passage of Measure C, the District was ready to undertake documentation of the required data and information that would define the implementation of projects to be afforded with the Measure C bond.

DATA DRIVEN
Through the preparation of the aforementioned studies, including the 2003 Facilities Master Plan, the District was ready to develop the greater data to support determining Measure C projects.

OUTCOME
In 2004, with the passing of Measure C, the Board of Trustees enacted a Resolution to “design, deconstruct, renovate, operate, and maintain District Facilities and infrastructure that are models of energy, water, and material efficiency while providing healthy, productive, and comfortable indoor environments and long-term benefits to students, faculty, and staff.” With this Resolution, all new or renovated facilities were required to incorporate sustainable design criteria consistent with the USGBC LEED™ Rating System, achieving what was then a LEED™ minimum of 26 points. All projects undertaken by the District with Measure C funds have achieved LEED™ accreditation or contributed towards campus-wide energy efficiency.

DEFINING THE VISION FOR COLLEGE OF MARIN; MEASURE C
On 09.20.05 at the Indian Valley Campus the Board of Trustees and District Administration took part in a Visioning Retreat to define elements of the future Master Plan for the Marin Community College District. Recorded here, are the results of the Goals and Objectives Brainstorming session and a Planning Exercise done to broaden the understanding of the complex needs of the college campus environment. Several of these early ideas were then shared in subsequent meetings with the campus and community stakeholders, who developed and supplemented the elements, then solidified the College’s vision. The themes defined in the Visioning session continue to define the bold new vision for the future College of Marin.

Common Themes
- Unique programs
- Vocational training
- Organic agriculture and culinary programs
- Partnerships; 4-year colleges, community
- A stronger entry to immediate campus
- “Education Park”
- Health and wellness center
- Commercial vendor activities: bookstore, coffee shop
- Amphitheater with community use, possibly located near other community uses
- Housing – Older Center and student
- Athletic / recreation development
- The demolition of most existing buildings
- Solar: photovoltaic array, solar farm, solar heating
- Preservation of open space
Following the successful passage of Measure C, the District Modernization Committee was established to guide the Measure C Capital improvement Program. The intent of this committee was to:

- Set the guiding principles and ensure compliance with the District’s Facilities Master Plan and the Board of Trustees resolution on environmental stewardship.
- Put in place a mechanism for controlled implementation of the Capital Improvement Program and a review process to ensure work products comply with the District’s Facilities Master Plan.
- Provide recommendations to the Board of Trustees following established protocols.
- Establish project priorities and budgetary management processes in coordination with the Board of Trustees and the Facilities Department for the Capital Improvement Plan consistent with the program schedule and budget.
- Ensure that the direction and guidance given is consistent, unambiguous and represents the mandates of the Measure C Bond Initiative.

Primary functions were defined as follows:

1. Ensure plans and documents are established to depict the desired architectural themes and site development strategies for each campus
2. Ensure development of district building equipment and material standards
3. Ensure development of district design guidelines
4. Ensure development of district furniture, fixtures and equipment standards
5. Review and comment on project specific design submittals, as required
6. Review construction bid summaries, as required
7. Monitor program and project schedules

Subcommittees were established as needed to participate in detailed reviews of the work described above. Subcommittee chairpersons were empowered to make recommendations for actions to be taken on issues within their defined scope of responsibility to the District’s Modernization Committee and the President’s Cabinet. The President, or designated representative, periodically updated the Board of Trustees regarding the work of the District’s Modernization Committee.
Through careful implementation of the Measure C Modernization funds, the College of Marin has been able to address priority projects, aligned with the needs defined in the 2005 Educational Master Plan.

Projects defined in the 2005 Facilities Master Plan and funded through Measure C include:

Kentfield Campus
- Diamond PE Complex Renovation
- New Fine Arts Building
- New Kentfield Bridge
- Geothermal Heat Exchange Infrastructure
- Photovoltaic Parking Canopies

Indian Valley Campus
- Transportation Technology Renovation and Addition
- Creek Renovation
- New Main Campus Building
- Greenhouse Construction, Organic Farm
- Geothermal Heat Exchange Infrastructure
- Power Plant and Gas Line Renovations

Bond Spending Plan Projects in Design or in Construction include:
- Child Care Center (2012)
- Austin Science Center Alternations Project (2012)
- Science, Math, and Central Plant (2012)
- Accessibility Improvements (2013)
- Performing Arts Modernization (2013)
- New Academic Center (2014)

Project Design and Construction is managed by a District consultant that reports directly to the District’s Modernization Director. The District provides monthly reports to the Board of Trustees and Bond Oversight Committee. Similar project updates are provided to the College students, staff, and faculty.

Project Descriptions and imagery are provided on the following pages.
The following Case Studies are provided as evidence to the process and stakeholder involvement through out the planning and design of Measure C Projects.

CASE STUDY: Science, Math, and Central Plant

One of the projects identified as highest priority for modernization in pre-Measure C college and community surveys was the Austin Science Center, which houses the college’s math and science programs. As a result of facility condition assessments in conjunction with campus-wide master planning goals, the District Modernization Committee and the Board of Trustees decided to approve the construction of a new replacement science center as one of the first few projects in the Measure C modernization effort. The new Science Math Central Plant (SMCP) complex would house not only the math and science programs from Austin Science Center, but also the Nursing and Anthropology programs (aligned in terms of having laboratory facility needs), as well as the college’s new central plant and data center.

At the beginning of the programming phase, application of the Title V space standards indicated a drastic reduction in the number of lecture and laboratory classrooms relative to the existing Austin Science Center. This was primarily due to the inherent contradiction between these antiquated standards and those of modern architectural and educational practice. It was quickly determined after engaging faculty and staff user groups that the current educational programs could not be delivered in such a scenario. As a result, a detailed utilization analysis was conducted in order to determine the appropriate number, size, and type of classrooms that would balance the desire for improved space utilization efficiency with the educational needs of the programs. The final result (see Appendix E) succeeded in decreasing the number of lab classrooms by 20% (15 to 12) and lecture classrooms by 25% (8 to 6) relative to Austin Science Center, and in ensuring an average utilization level for lab rooms of 37 hrs/wk, even greater than the guideline value of 27.5 hrs/wk suggested by state standards. At the same time, the college could preserve its existing math and science major transfer, General Education, and basic skills programs in a scheduling format that would both serve evening students and recognize the complex scheduling constraints embodied in the STEM Majors Master Schedule (see Appendix F).

Although the lecture room usage under these scenarios fell short of the 48 hrs/wk suggested in state standards guidelines, it was reasoned that these general purpose classrooms could be used by other disciplines at the college and become part of a larger campus-wide effort at improving the efficiency of room utilization.
CASE STUDY: New Academic Center

The last major construction project funded by the Measure C bond involved the replacement of several older buildings (Admin, Business Center, Harlan Center, and Olney Hall) by a single complex housing both academic and administrative programs. One of the most notable features of this New Academic Center relative to the previous projects at the Kentfield Campus (PE, Art, Science), was its emphasis on general-purpose lecture classrooms. Due to both this chronology and emphasis, programming of the NAC played a pivotal role in determining the long-term status of lecture room availability for the entire campus.

Consequently, a special core advisory group was formed with representation from faculty, staff, and students (all endorsed by their respective senates), as well as administrators and modernization staff, in order to evaluate the campus-wide lecture room utilization and provide recommendations regarding the programming of the NAC project. In order to produce the final recommendations, the group met 2-4 times per month over a six-month period, while incorporating feedback obtained from presentations of the ongoing analysis (see Appendix G) to a wide range of governance and stakeholder groups, including: Faculty Academic Senate (May 6, 2010), Board of Trustees (May 18, 2010), Student Learning Council (June 22, 2010), College-wide Flex presentation (August 12, 2010), Faculty Academic Senate (September 16, 2010), Board of Trustees (September 21, 2010).

Recommendations were informed by state standards guidelines, room utilization data, class size distribution data, the campus-wide Master Schedule, and strategic priorities to serve evening students. One of the greatest challenges in achieving greater utilization efficiency is that the evening program serving working adults is currently one of the peak periods of lecture room usage on the KTD campus, thereby limiting opportunities for re-scheduling of classes into the “off-peak” afternoon periods. However, by the time the NAC project is completed in 2015, the college will have achieved an 18% reduction in its overall lecture classroom inventory (from 51 to 42), thereby making substantial progress toward its utilization efficiency goals. Although this reduction in classroom inventory does require re-scheduling of some classes, an inclusive and transparent process using the Master Schedule as a framework should result in minimal adverse impacts upon students. From a longer-term perspective, if the college devises viable solutions in the future to further “smooth out” scheduling of its lecture classes, this can yield further gains in utilization efficiency by retiring portable classrooms.
CASE STUDY: Responding to Community Demand by providing General Education classes at the Indian Valley Campus:

In April, 2009, College of Marin faculty, staff and administrators embarked on a project to establish a master schedule for the Indian Valley Campus that would provide a two-year rotation of classes designed to satisfy the general education requirement to transfer to a CSU, UC four-year program and/or acquire an Associate’s Degree. This project was initiated by the Dean of Workforce Development and College-Community Partnerships in response to community demand by Northern Marin County residents that the Indian Valley Campus be better utilized, and that a more comprehensive program of general education courses be offered. That resulting general education master schedule launch began in Spring 2011.

Defining and Researching the Target Markets: The first step segmented the markets and identified the specific needs of each target population. The second step identified the most common needs shared by all. The last step was to develop a program that met a demand for the greatest number of students. Surveys were conducted with local high school students, their parents and current IVC students. By defining the populations and researching their needs, it was determined that the master schedule should offer General Ed classes on weekday evenings. That recommendation included adding a lab science that would be offered in the evenings and weekends in the summers.

Target Market: The target market was defined as working adults and students in career classes interested in transferring and/or getting an Associate Degree. A second target market was the local high school student seeking college classes to either: a) accelerate college advancement, b) pick up needed credits for graduation, and/or c) get career skills to make part-time work more lucrative and related to ultimate career goals.

Weekday nights would be for General Ed classes and focused weekend offerings for career classes: The master schedule developed provides the required general education courses on weeknights, career intensives on the weekends and a steady diet of pre-college Math and English on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday weeknights. This rotation pattern meant that even though someone may not be at college-level in Math and/or English, there was still opportunity to gradually pursue some GE classes during the week, and career classes on the weekends. On-going facilities needs at the Indian Valley Campus must take into account having enough classroom space available at these times to accommodate the general education offerings.
3.0 COMPLETED MEASURE C PROJECTS, KENTFIELD

DIAMOND PHYSICAL EDUCATION CENTER KENTFIELD

The upgrade included the pool area, locker rooms, team rooms, and indoor and outdoor classrooms. Natural lighting, efficient heating and air circulation systems, as well as solar panels for heating the pool and energy-producing photovoltaic umbrellas (carports) in the parking lot, led to achieving LEED® Gold.

NEW FINE ARTS BUILDING

The new Fine Arts Building takes advantage of its narrow width to operate on natural ventilation during the temperate season, improving indoor air quality. Large windows allow for natural daylighting. Native, drought-tolerant landscaping has been planted on and around the building. LEED® Silver Certification.

NEW KENTFIELD BRIDGE

The new Kentfield pedestrian bridge has provided a connection between the parking lot #9 and the new Science & Math Complex. A new bio-swale was installed as part of the creek restoration, capturing all north-campus run-off.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS: PHOTOVOLTAIC PARKING CANOPIES

The photovoltaic system was installed as part of the PE Project to provide 50% of the project’s electrical demand, inclusive of pool heating.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS: GEOTHERMAL HEAT EXCHANGE SYSTEM

The Ground Source Heat / Geothermal system on the Kentfield Campus feeds Student Services, Fusselman, and Fine Arts. The system is capable of serving the remainder of the campus in the future.
The Transportation Technology Complex experienced a transformation that includes a newly constructed “link” building between auto technology and collision. Interiors have been refurbished including new state-of-the-art equipment, information systems, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing. LEED® Silver Certification.

The Main Building Complex houses a variety of workforce development programs in medical and dental assisting, court reporting, and multimedia studies, among others. A new library and Internet Café also reside in the building. The building, completed in spring 2011, received LEED® Gold Certification.

A number of critical infrastructure projects have taken place across both the Kentfield and Indian Valley Campuses. The addition of geothermal heat pumps (GHPs) on both campuses is of particular significance. GHPs are a ground-source pumping system that takes advantage of the stable temperatures underground to heat buildings in winter and keep them cool in summer. Instead of creating heat by burning fuel, GHPs move heat from one place to another, making them a cost-effective renewable energy source. At the Indian Valley Campus, the scope of work also included installation of site utilities such as a new gas main and 12kv service, as well as extensive storm drain repairs, campus-wide landscape fire mitigation, and erosion mitigation at Ignacio Creek. The latter, large-scale project was completed in fall 2008 and included creek bank stabilization and installation of erosion control blankets on bank-graded areas with new native riparian species plantings.
3.0 MEASURE C, IN-PROGRESS

SCIENCE, MATH AND CENTRAL PLANT COMPLEX KENTFIELD (2012)

A new 77,000 square-foot building housing Science, Math, Anthropology, Nursing programs, and the College’s internal IT department. A new Central Plant will be built adjacent to this project to accommodate electrical and mechanical equipment for the campus. Designed LEED® Gold.

CHILD STUDY CENTER (2013)

A new 6,200 square-foot, modular facility will house office and support areas, a new outdoor deck, play yard and organic garden as well a parking lot and drop-off area. The building will accommodate the Child Development Center and Early Childhood Education program. LEED® Certification planned.

PERFORMING ARTS MODERNIZATION (2013)

A new 8,800 SF dance addition adjoins the existing performing arts building. The addition will include two dance studios, a fine arts gallery, lobby areas, as well as a new elevator. A new exterior arts plaza will connect the new Fine Arts Building with the new Performing Arts Building.

NEW ACADEMIC CENTER (2015)

A new academic facility will be erected at the corner of College Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. At 43,000 square feet with 16 general purpose classrooms, the project will cost about $23 million. Sustainable building practices are concomitant with submission for LEED® Certification.

AUSTIN SCIENCE CENTER ALTERNATIONS (2017)

ASC will be utilized as swing space through 2015 and then undergo a voluntary seismic upgrade. Final use of this building is yet to be determined.
The 6,200 SF Child Study Center is located off the map, to the South of the PE Complex on Magnolia Avenue.
The College of Marin Educational Master Plan 2009-2019 projected the future of College of Marin and made general recommendations that addressed current and foreseeable challenges. The document outlined who was being served and what services were being provided; and also projected growth and change in those areas. The plan was grounded in an analysis of the college’s current internal systems and programs, as well as external influences, such as demographic trends, and the community’s educational interests.

The following priorities were articulated in the plan:

- **Student Access**: to provide appropriate facilities to enable student access to College resources and services.
- **Student Success**: to improve student-learning environments on a continuous basis.
- **College Systems**: to provide facilities that support faculty and staff work requirements, enhance services and operational efficiency through improvements to student support, instructional, and administrative systems and to maintain reliable facilities.
- **Community Responsiveness**: to promote communication with the community, encourage community involvement, and facilitate community access to information about the College and its educational programs.

These priorities are demonstrated throughout this facilities plan.
4.0 FACILITIES PLANNING: 2012 FACILITIES PLAN UPDATE

EMP CALLS FOR FACILITIES PLAN

The plan was updated in 2011-2012 and the priorities for the next three-year strategic plan were refined based on extensive review and input from the college community. Data from these surveys suggested that future facilities planning include the preservation of views, a strengthened “sense of place” and informal gathering spaces.

The updated Educational Master Plan reiterated the need to complete and implement a new Facilities Plan. In addition, it was requested that there be processes developed that would address accountability for timelines and accurate deliverables related to facilities updates, and while in 2009, the focus was on the development of the Indian Valley Campus, in 2012 it has been redirected to include both campuses. These priorities are demonstrated in this facilities plan in the following sections.

These new directions have been incorporated into the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Systems</td>
<td>Update facilities and develop processes for accountability, including adherence to timelines and accuracy of deliverables. Develop, complete and implement the COM Facilities Plan 2012 that addresses the physical plant, educational use, and district support of both campuses. (Including CS1*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPACE INVENTORY AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT (FUSION DATA)

In order to understand the required facilities and space to support the College of Marin programs, the District approached analysis of space needs in two ways. First, assignable square footage was determined by State standard calculations, utilizing curricular program square footage justifications defined in California Title 5. The outcome of these justifications were compared against the available space at both Kentfield and Indian Valley campuses.

Significant discussion in the FPC meeting transpired regarding State standards for space as defined by WSCH data. Ultimately, it was documented that COM’s unique programs, services, and delivery methods (as articulated in the program space needs, see Appendix B) make the state standards a benchmark, but not necessarily the goal.
4.0 Facilities Planning: 2012 Facilities Plan Update

The comparison data is provided in section 6 of the FP for reference. The plan is therefore driven by factors which directly contribute to effective utilization and quality of COM’s facilities, specifically, projects that achieve the objectives of the EMP by:

- Increasing Student Access to facilities (SA)
- Creating teaching environments which support and increase Student Success (SS)
- Improving the College Systems (CS)
- Responding to the external Community (CR)

Envisioning facilities needs of the future will continue to be matched with educational projections and priorities expressed in the Education Master Plan. While there is no anticipated need for significant capacity increase in any area except perhaps in new career education programs, basic skills and distance education, future facilities planning will endeavor to:

1. Provide facilities with adequate condition and capacity to accommodate current programs and distribution of class offerings (SA, SS, CR)
2. Maintain sufficient classrooms to meet scheduling needs of critical pathways and evening programs (SA, SS)
3. Provide lab and lecture classrooms that support modern educational best practices (SS)
4. Provide state-of-the-art equipment and technology for students and instructors (SS, CS)
5. Within constraints above, reduce overall space capacity to improve utilization and efficiency (CS)
6. Wherever feasible, upgrade systems, facilities, and landscape to improve access, safety, security, and health (SA, CS)
7. Incorporate sustainability considerations when making facilities improvements (CS, CR)
8. Ensure that facilities can be maintained at high quality level in future by considering total cost of ownership (CS, CR)
SPACE JUSTIFICATION AND PROGRAMS

2011 enrollment data was selected for analysis of the required space needs. At the time of this analysis the College offered approximately 64 curricular programs to 7,800 credit students at both the Kentfield and Indian Valley Campuses.

The tables on the following pages identify the curricular programs offered in the Fall of 2011. Both campuses are required to provide complete support services for degree and certificated programs, basic skills, and community education. Services at Indian Valley Campus are expanding to serve enrollment that is growing in General Education and other areas. A vast majority of the Career Technical Education (CTE) programs are located at the Indian Valley Campus. We have documented completed and future projects with reference to their connection to the four Educational Master Plan objectives outlined above.
## CURRENT COLLEGE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Discipline (Program)</th>
<th>FTES Fall ’11</th>
<th>FTEF Fall ’11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Accounting &amp; Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Collision Repair Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine and Metals Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/Film</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td>368</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>339</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Assisting</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CURRENT COLLEGE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Discipline (Program)</th>
<th>FTES Fall ’11</th>
<th>FTEF Fall ’11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Medical Technician</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Assisting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nursing Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life &amp; Earth Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>328</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>361</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern Languages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Sign Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performing Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drama</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Education &amp; Athletics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Astronomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemistry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disabled Students Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Facilities Planning: 2012 Facilities Plan Update

Capital Projects Planning

The adjacent Capital Projects Priority List, prepared by the District’s Facilities Planning Committee, identifies the Projects key to the continued operation and facilitation of the College’s programs and operation.

The buildings identified in the adjacent Capital Projects Priority List require comprehensive modernization, but until which time programmatic need justifies the scale of expenditure, the College is prioritizing maintenance of existing facilities to ensure longevity of current condition and to serve the needs of college programs.

Capital Projects Definition

The following definitions, identified in the Facilities Planning Manual for the California Community Colleges, are utilized herein to classify justification for the identified projects in the adjacent table.

Capacity
Used to express the amount of enrollment that can be accommodated by an amount of space. Projects with this classification have some inadequate space.

Condition
Demands go beyond the capability of operations and maintenance departments and require phased capital outlay improvement projects. Projects with this classification have some deficient condition.

Adequacy
Demands must be evaluated to see if they are educationally adequate for the specific learning outcomes that they are to enable, given better understanding of what kinds of experiences and facilities are essential to these outcomes. Projects with this classification have some inadequacy for the programs taught within the facility.

Cost Efficiency
The addition of ‘cost efficiency’ as a category of need to capacity, condition, and adequacy allows for greater innovation to cope with the reduction in both operations and capital outlay funding and to more effectively make use of public funds overall. Projects with this classification may be inefficient to operate or maintain.
# FACILITIES PLANNING:
## 2012 FACILITIES PLAN UPDATE: CAPITAL PROJECT PLAN

## CAPITAL PROJECTS PLANNING OVER $1,000,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Reference to Ed MP</th>
<th>Reference to Standards</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Adequacy, Capacity, Condition, Cost Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>KTD</td>
<td>Renovate Student Services Center (Student Union) includes ADA</td>
<td>6,842,661</td>
<td>SA, SS, CR</td>
<td>B1a, B1b, B2</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
<td>Adeq., Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>KTD</td>
<td>New Facilities Management Center (M&amp;O)</td>
<td>6,982,574</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
<td>Adeq., Cap., Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KTD</td>
<td>ADA scope not covered by Measure C project</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>SA, SS, CR</td>
<td>B1b, B2b</td>
<td>2021-2025</td>
<td>Cond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>ADA scope not covered by Measure C project</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>SA, SS, CR</td>
<td>B1b, B2b</td>
<td>2021-2025</td>
<td>Cond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CAPITAL PROJECTS PLANNING UNDER $1,000,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Reference to Ed MP</th>
<th>Reference to Standards</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Adequacy, Capacity, Condition, Cost Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Pomo 3 Re-roofing</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Pomo 5 Re-roofing</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Pomo 6 Re-roofing</td>
<td>286,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Pomo 7 Re-roofing</td>
<td>364,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Building 17 Re-roofing (Library)</td>
<td>312,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Miwok 13 Re-roofing</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Miwok 14 Re-roofing</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Miwok 15 Re-roofing</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Miwok 16 Re-roofing</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Building 22 Re-roofing (corp yd)</td>
<td>182,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Covered Walkways</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Ohlone 18 Re-roofing</td>
<td>312,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Ohlone 19 Re-roofing</td>
<td>312,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>Ohlone 20 Re-roofing</td>
<td>286,000</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>B1b, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond., Cost Effic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Smart Classrooms (not covered by Bond)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>SS, SA,CS</td>
<td>B1a, B1b, B2</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Adeq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>2nd Greenhouse/Land to teach conventional (non-organic) plant</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>SS, SA,CS</td>
<td>B1a, B2</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Adeq., Cap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>KTD</td>
<td>Campus Green renovation (NAC/Fine Arts area)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>SA, CR, CS</td>
<td>B1a, B2a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 2 projects are prioritized and planned to be executed in this order based on available funding according to the facilities operational plan, currently under development.

Received on 6/13/2012
5.0 SUSTAINABILITY OF COLLEGE OF MARIN FACILITIES

**INTENT / PURPOSE**

The District will be implementing the use of live-date linkage to the State FUSION database, through software entitled, Onuma. Onuma has recently been identified by the State Chancellor’s Office in several pilot projects linking District data with the State’s robust facilities database. This existing database embodies the State’s understanding of the District programs, student demographics, space inventory, and facilities condition. Onuma is a scalable system, allowing the district to add information to the database as that data is collected. Some facilities may have more information than others, depending on what is on-hand or can be collected. By mapping information and data to and from the FUSION network, the College of Marin will facilitate greater ability to affirm alignment between the State and District databases. Facilities planning is fostered by linkage of time-sensitive data related to annual requirements of the Chancellor’s Office; e.g. 5-year Capital Plans, M&O planning, Space Inventory Updates, Facilities Condition Updates, and future submittals for state capital funding. Additionally, the District will be able to ensure consistency of curricular information that defines the appropriate space inventory in support of the District’s programs.

The District has selected two (2) Kentfield buildings as pilot facilities for the initial implementation of the Onuma System. The existing Library Resource Center (LRC) and new Science Math & Central Plant (SMCP) were selected. By analyzing both an existing and new facility, the District hopes to identify the required approach, initial and on-going effort, and the developed value.

**PILOT FACILITIES**

The Indian Valley Campus Site Plan and Buildings shown in the Onuma Interface. Facility color is identifying the Facility Condition Index (FCI), directly linked from the State’s FUSION database.

**SYSTEMS / DATA SELECTION**

Not every building system needs to be tracked. The pilot projects will assist in identifying the most valuable data worthy of on-going tracking and analysis. The process will start by gathering multiple systems information. Through collection of this information and implementation within Onuma, additional data may be gathered while some data-points may be deemed less valuable and terminated.
FACILITY DEFINITION

SCIENCE MATH & CENTRAL PLANT
A digital building model of the Science, Math and Central Plant Complex has been developed from the 2D CAD files received from the Project’s design and engineering team. While this facility is still under construction, floor plans, systems data, and Maintenance & Operations information can be documented in Onuma.

LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER
A digital building model of the Science Math and Central Plant Complex has been developed from the original construction documents. The accuracy of the model is dependent on those original floor plans. This first step has allowed the virtual connection of the State-level information with that of the College.

SYSTEMS DEFINITION
The District is initially tracking systems and building components that have the highest and greatest value to the regular maintenance and operations of its facilities. These systems include mechanical equipment, electrical lighting, door and hardware information. Other Mechanical, Plumbing, & Electrical (MPE) systems data are being captured. Some may be later discarded as not valuable to the regular M&O practices, but this pilot project provides opportunity to understand the value of each data collected.

Interior building finishes are being defined so that M&O effort and costs related to the upkeep of these materials can be understood. It is the District’s intent to provide definition of budgets for staff, supplies, and regular maintenance of these materials and systems.

In the capture and use of this information, the District is ensuring alignment with industry standards. The industry standard is COBie. As defined by Building SMART Alliance, “COBie, (Construction Operations Building Information Exchange) is an information exchange specification for the life-cycle capture and delivery of information needed by facility managers. COBie can be viewed in design,
construction, and maintenance software as well as in simple spreadsheets. This versatility allows COBie to be used in all projects regardless of size and technological sophistication." First initiated by The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy in 2005, COBie now serves as an industry standard in the tracking or building systems.

Immediately upon implementation of the Onuma database, the District’s master planning architect has begun entering mechanical and plumbing systems data. Boilers, chillers, air handlers, exhaust fans, and more have been entered into the database, located within the building floor plans, and are linked to the facility master plan database. By being located within the digital floor plan of the building, staff can
identify and locate equipment before seeking the actual unit in the building.
Below, a list of initial Mechanical systems documented and located in the building:

- Closed Circuit Cooling Tower
- Boiler
- Pump
- Geothermal Water Source Heat Pump
- Toilet Exhaust Fan
- General Exhaust Fan
- Gravity Ventilator
- Split System Air Conditioning and Heat Pump
- Packaged Rooftop Air Conditioning Unit
- Plumbing Fixtures

ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS
While the above mechanical systems are a large component of the district’s electrical demand, additional data can be gathered in understanding the lighting and plug loads within a single building or across the District. Initially lighting in the SMCP will be documented. Energy consumption can be understood, but additionally, tracking of fixture lifespan and replacement needs can be tracked.

BUILDING SYSTEMS & FINISHES
Through the identification and analysis of type, location, and condition of building finishes, staff can analyze the time, resources, and costs associated with the appropriate maintenance or replacement.

Interior finishes in the buildings are identified and in the facility database. Initially, all flooring materials in the LRC and SMCP buildings will be identified and graphically available in the database. Future, additional finishes will be identified and entered.

In looking at a building, or across the District, staff can identify the costs of having more or less of these finishes. Should alternatives be desired, replacement with more cost effective materials may make sense.
5.0 SUSTAINABILITY OF COLLEGE OF MARIN FACILITIES

ENERGY DEMAND
The Onuma database is able to document historic energy demand. To facilitate this analysis, the District has been monitoring and collecting the electrical service demand of the Library Resource Center (LRC). Additional data will continue to be collected so that the value of future modernization or upgrades to the facility and its systems can be understood. It is through this type of analysis that the District will be able to determine Return on Investment (ROI) for future projects on the LRC or other district facilities that will eventually be added into the database.

The District has invested in photovoltaic panels on several buildings and in parking lots. As these systems are added to the Onuma database, the energy production can be tracked and savings communicated to District stakeholders. Future investments in energy production may be analyzed against known savings.

ONUMA WORK TICKETING
The College of Marin is researching multiple platforms for campus-wide work order submittal and tracking. Onuma has recently released a Work Order function within the standard platform. The District is in the process of evaluating options.

The Onuma interface is completely customizable. The submittal interface can request and document as much, or as little detail as is desired. Administrative levels can be defined so that existing, or preferred college processes and communication methods are followed. Specific details can be added or edits, then assign to a technician. Onuma can automatically email the work order to the assigned tech, providing all of the necessary information, including a plan of the building and the location where work is required. The M&O administrators can view the entire campus backlog, a single building, or the browser can be sorted by request date, status, trade, or any other variable desired.

Because the Onuma database can have every campus, building, room, or system within its database, work orders can be tagged to any level of system component; a sidewalk at Kentfield, or a specific room in building 2 at Indian Valley, or Pump #2 at the Central Plant in the new Science and Math Facility. Photos, images, written documents can all be attached to work orders for an even greater level of detail. Work Order status can be graphically indicated. And, because Onuma is web-based, all of this can be accessed by desktop computer, laptop, tablet, or smart phone.
5.0 SUSTAINABILITY OF COLLEGE OF MARIN FACILITIES

EXISTING FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

The District’s Maintenance and Operations Department is responsible for the planning, operation, and maintenance of all district sites and facilities. With a Director and three (3) Supervisors, the District’s M&O team is headquartered on the Kentfield Campus. The Maintenance and Operations Department reports to the Vice President of College Operations.

The information and analysis below is documented in order to share the intentional planning and adjustments to Maintenance & Operational practices being developed by the District. It also shares the current practices of work order (WO) requests. This data will also be utilized to better identify and allocate resources needed to maintain sites and facilities in a significantly more sustainable state and enhance teaching conditions.

EXISTING WORK ORDER PROCESS OVERVIEW

All District/Campus faculty and administrative staff have the ability to submit work orders/maintenance requests. Currently, the M&O Administrative Assistant receives these request(s) via paper forms, voice mail and e-mail, with the majority of request(s) coming via phone/e-mail: sometimes upward of 30+ calls per day. These callers, depending on the problem, are directed to submit a paper work order. Upon receipt of the work order, the Administrative Assistant dates and forwards it to the M&O Director, who in turn assigns it to one of the (3) maintenance department supervisors, depending on the type of action required. Anything that has the potential for a significant cost impact is reviewed prior to the work being assigned. This provides for the assignment of a cost and special allocation if necessary. Priority is determined by the M&O Director.

Prior to Measure C, the District did maintain a Microsoft Access database of all work orders, though its use and practice was not consistent. The use of this application ceased at the initiation of the Measure C bond program due to the considerable increase in work load and staffing limitations. Very little digital recording or tracking of work has been completed over the past 6 to 8 years and the M&O office recognizes that there is no sufficient mechanism to acknowledge receipt and/or status of work orders. Additionally, there is no ability for the Administrative Assistant to provide a work order status update to inquiring submitters.

Research is currently being undertaken to evaluate opportunities for work order automation. Use of such a tool will enable faculty and staff to submit work orders electronically, track them and get updates. This system will also improve efficiency within the maintenance and operations department with online assignment of work, accounting for material cost/ labor time data, and providing a more effective use of resources available. The District intends to have a solution identified by September 2012.
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EXISTING GENERAL FACILITY ASSESSMENT

Through interviews with the Maintenance and Operations staff, the following general overview of the conditions and problem areas were noted on each campus. This level of information, along with work order analysis, and educational priorities feed directly into the District’s Facilities Planning Committee evaluation of Capital Projects.

KENTFIELD:
Kentfield facilities concerns include heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, leaks within buildings, unreliable elevator systems, plumbing, access barriers, and unacceptable site conditions.

INDIAN VALLEY:
Roof repairs and leaks are a constant effort on older buildings.
Main building: currently working through some heating/cooling issues
The Transportation Technology Building has mechanical issues that are being reviewed for resolution.

SUSTAINABILITY

One of the major goals of the College Of Marin’s Modernization Program was to improve energy efficiency and sustainability. To that end, the District has done a number of projects through the Bond Program which have been acknowledged in this document.

Over the course of the past year, we have taken advantage of the rebates available from PG&E that has enabled us to improve the lighting energy efficiency in a number of our older buildings. We have saved as much as 44%-52% with an average cost savings per year ranging from $6,002.04 in building #3 on the Indian Valley Campus (IVC) to $18,400.17 in the Performance Arts building on the Kentfield Campus. Based on other proposed electrical lighting upgrades at the IVC, the District is looking at an additional, minimum savings of approximately $38,000.00 per year.

The Saving by Design Program, another PG&E rebate program has provided over $400,000.00 which has been earmarked to be used for maintaining our new construction and renovated facilities. We are currently anticipating $315,975.00 in rebate from the Science Math Central Plant Project.

Another significant improvement with respect to energy efficiency and sustainability was the installation of the Geothermal Field at the IVC which completely eliminated our conventional Power Plant Two.

Through these past and on-going Projects, the District continues to demonstrate a commitment to reducing energy demand, thereby reducing the District’s energy costs and providing evidence of positive stewardship of the environment.
6.0 APPENDIX A

SPACE JUSTIFICATION

The inventory of District facilities is an important tool in the planning and management of college campuses. The Education Code mandates an annual inventory of all facilities in the District and this data is collected and maintained in the California Community College FUSION database. The database includes data on the buildings and rooms assignable square footage, total number of stations and laboratory capacity.

To understand a District’s space needs, one needs to look at the existing space capacity, future space capacity (for projects already planned and funded), current enrollment as well as future expected enrollment. Title 5 of the California Administrative Code prescribes standards for the utilization and planning of five categories of spaces on public community college campuses: lecture, laboratory, office, library and AV/TV (Audiovisual / Television). The calculations are based on WSCH (weekly student contact hours) for Lecture and Laboratory, FTEFS (full-time equivalent faculty and staff) for Office, and Day-Graded Enrollment for Library and AV/TV spaces.

Through analysis undertaken within the 2012 Facilities Plan, the College of Marin has defined a long-range plan for the alignment of programmatic need with available campus space. Analysis has been aligned with the California Title 5 space justification terminology, evaluating metrics in Lecture, Lab, Office, Library, and AV/TV categories. This analysis has facilitated a plan to reallocate existing space that can bring the District’s Lecture, Lab, and Office space within justification ranges, while ensuring increased support of Library needs.

The Space Capacity calculations for both the Kentfield and Indian Valley Campuses were based on the 2011 Space Inventory data in FUSION. The existing Space Needs were calculated by utilizing the FUSION Space Inventory Data and the WSCH, FTEFS and Day Graded Enrollment Data for the Fall Semester of 2011, provided by the District. Future projections are through 2019, matching with the recent Educational Master Plan update.

The future Space Capacity (post-Measure C Projects, through 2019) were calculated based on the existing Space Inventory, plus the changes resulting from Measure C projects, as detailed in the District’s 2014-18 Five Year Construction Plan. The future Space Needs calculations were based on a 1% per year growth rate in WSCH, FTEFS and Day Graded Enrollment, with the assumption that the percentage of lecture WSCH and laboratory WSCH would remain the same as Fall 2011.
**SPACE INVENTORY AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

At the Kentfield Campus, post-Measure C, the District will have significantly reduced its overages in Lecture and Laboratory capacity. Through the same projects, there will be an over-reduction of campus Office capacity. While it improves its deficiency in Library capacity, it still remains under capacity in this category and there is no change to the AV/TV deficiency.

Measure C projects at the Indian Valley Campus have been completed. Indicated, future increase to space needs are the outcome of WSCH, FTEFS and Day-Graded Enrollment growth projected at the 1% per year rate identified above.

Any space capacity change will be accomplished through reduction in space through taking facilities off-line or future demolition as deemed appropriate by the Board of Trustees.

---

### Campus Programmatic Need And Capacity Analysis

#### KENTFIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lecture ASF</th>
<th>Lab ASF</th>
<th>Office ASF</th>
<th>Library ASF</th>
<th>AV/TV ASF</th>
<th>All Other ASF</th>
<th>Total Campus ASF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 Kentfield 2011 ASF Capacity</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>71,134</td>
<td>41,904</td>
<td>19,126</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>39,843</td>
<td>237,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentfield 2011 ASF Needed</td>
<td>20,949</td>
<td>39,571</td>
<td>36,680</td>
<td>28,744</td>
<td>12,779</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF Difference</td>
<td>13,451</td>
<td>31,563</td>
<td>5,224</td>
<td>-9,618</td>
<td>-9,417</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Difference</td>
<td>164%</td>
<td>180%</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentfield 2019 ASF Needed</td>
<td>22,685</td>
<td>42,849</td>
<td>39,719</td>
<td>30,556</td>
<td>13,838</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF Difference</td>
<td>6,631</td>
<td>11,348</td>
<td>-4,102</td>
<td>-8,000</td>
<td>-10,476</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Difference</td>
<td>129%</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET CHANGES</strong></td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-53%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-13,338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INDIAN VALLEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lecture ASF</th>
<th>Lab ASF</th>
<th>Office ASF</th>
<th>Library ASF</th>
<th>AV/TV ASF</th>
<th>All Other ASF</th>
<th>Total Campus ASF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 IVC 2011 ASF Capacity</td>
<td>17,925</td>
<td>54,771</td>
<td>19,138</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>35,266</td>
<td>137,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC 2011 ASF Needed</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>25,074</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF Difference</td>
<td>15,090</td>
<td>29,697</td>
<td>12,898</td>
<td>-3,763</td>
<td>-1,151</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Difference</td>
<td>632%</td>
<td>218%</td>
<td>307%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 IVC 2019 ASF Capacity</td>
<td>17,925</td>
<td>54,771</td>
<td>19,138</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>35,266</td>
<td>137,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC 2019 ASF Needed</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>27,152</td>
<td>6,757</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF Difference</td>
<td>14,855</td>
<td>27,619</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>-4,153</td>
<td>-1,338</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Difference</td>
<td>584%</td>
<td>202%</td>
<td>283%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET CHANGES</strong></td>
<td>-48%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANALYSIS OUTCOME

At the completion of Measure C, both campuses will have excess capacity in the Lecture & Laboratory categories, and are under capacity in the Library and AV/TV categories. The Kentfield Campus becomes under capacity in Office, while the Indian Valley Campus remains over capacity in this category. Based on the above analysis, at the end of Measure C the District as a whole has space justifications for Library and AV/TV spaces, but not in the other categories.
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CHARGE OF THE FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE CHARGE

The Facilities Planning Committee operates as a subcommittee of the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee to ensure faculty, staff and student involvement in the planning, design, construction, upkeep and use of College owned facilities to foster student success.

RESPONSIBILITIES

› Recommend facility capital renewal and replacement needs and priorities.
› Recommend facility and scheduled maintenance needs and priorities.
› Participate in the planning of any major Capitol Facility Projects five hundred thousand dollars and above, in accordance with District Procedures.
› Deliberate and make recommendations in support of the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee Timeline.
› Ensure the creation of a Five Year Facilities Plan that includes facilities usage needs based on the Educational Master Plan.
› Make recommendations to the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee.
› Monitor the creation of a long term scheduled maintenance & preventative maintenance program.

COMPOSITION

› 2 faculty appointed by the Academic Senate
› 2 classified staff appointed by the official appointing body for classified staff.
› 2 students appointed by the Student Senate
› 2 managers appointed by the Superintendent/President
› Vice President of College Operations will serve as a non-voting staff resource.
› The Chair or Co-Chairs will be elected from the group.
## APPENDIX E
### PROJECTED ROOM USAGE OF SMCP

#### Lab Room Average Usage (Hrs/Week): 37

#### Lecture Room Average Usage (Hrs/Week): 39
### Master Schedule for STEM and Nursing Majors: Spring 2006

**Mon**
- Comp 150A
- E245 Lab
- M123
- M105(1)
- M121 (1)
- M223
- M224
- P207C
- C114 Lect (1)
- P108B
- B120 Lab (1)
- B224 Lab (1)
- C114D(1)
- C114 Lab(1)
- C110 Lab(1)
- C131D(2)
- C131 Lab (2)
- M124 (2)

**Tue**
- M123
- M105(1)
- M121 (1)
- P207A
- C132 Lect (1)
- C110 Lect(1,2)
- C114 Lect (2)
- C114D(2)
- C114 Lab (2)
- C110 Lab(1)
- C132D(1)
- C132 Lab(1)
- P108BC
- B240 Lab (1)
- E220
- Comp 235
- Comp 117

**Wed**
- M123
- M105(1)
- M121 (1)
- P207A
- C132 Lect (1)
- C110 Lect(1,2)
- C114 Lect (2)
- C114D(2)
- C114 Lab (2)
- C110 Lab(1)
- C132D(1)
- C132 Lab(1)
- P108BC
- B240 Lab (1)
- E220
- Comp 235
- Comp 117

**Thu**
- M123
- M105(1)
- C110 Lect(1,2)
- C114 Lect (2)
- C110D(1)
- C114D(1)
- C114 Lab(2)
- C110 Lab(2)
- C132D(2)
- C132 Lab (2)
- P207A
- C132 Lect (1)
- B240 Lab (1)
- E220
- Comp 235
- Comp 117

**Fri**
- M123
- M105(1)
- M223
- M224
- C232 Lect
- C232 Lab
- M122
- M105(1)
- E220
- Comp 235
- Comp 117

---

**Note:** Bio 115 includes 2 8-hour field trips:

- Biology
- Chemistry
- Comp Sci
- Engineering
- Math
- Physics

Note: for multiple lecture/lab sections, labs are tied to a specific lecture in Chem classes, but not in Biol classes.
# Occupied Lecture Rooms KTD campus Spring 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Block</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:10 - 9:30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40 - 11:00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 - 12:30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:40 - 14:00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10 - 15:30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:40 - 17:00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:10 - 18:00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:10 - 21:00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes Credit & Non-Credit classes in designated ‘Lecture’ classrooms
Does not include FA, BC101, BC102

## Number of Lecture Rooms at KTD

### Post-Modernization Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TB/PV/ASC</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>FH</th>
<th>NSC</th>
<th>Non-NAC Total</th>
<th>NAC</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permanent
(without these, would need 30 in NAC...not possible)

ASC = Austin Science Center
FH = Fusselman Hall
LC = Learning Center
NFSC = New Math/Science Center
PE = Physical Education
PV = Portable Village
TB = Temporary Bldg-1 (police)

### How many (and what size) classrooms in NAC?

- Will be used by many disciplines
- NAC is last Measure C project
- Will determine total classroom inventory at KTD

→ How many (and what size) classrooms needed at KTD?

## Peak Periods = 9:40-11am & Evening (6-9pm)

- Although constraints exist, morning peak can be alleviated to some extent by ‘redistribution’
- Evening peak needs drive room planning

... (as shown later) ... establishes target of

### Room Size Distribution Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Range (# students)</th>
<th>Tues eve Demand</th>
<th>KTD Total</th>
<th>non-NAC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KTD Total</td>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - 60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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