Facilities Master Plan (2018-2019)

Meeting Notes

NAME OF COUNCIL/TEAM: Facilities Master Plan (2018-2019)			
OBJECTIVE OF MEETING: Review and discuss design guidelines for facilities planning. Review and have discussion about the proposed projects			
DATE: 10/03/2018 **TIME:** 2:00pm		**LOCATION/ROOM #:** ARC Student Center Board Room **CALL-IN NUMBER:** **CALL-IN CODE:**	
FACILITATOR(S): Kuldeep Kaur, Jeff Bucher			
TIMEKEEPER:			
ASSISTANT: Annaliese Pennell			
MEMBERS PRESENT: Graham Smith, Kuldeep Kaur, Jeff Bucher, Andrew Brooks, Cheryl Sears, Marc Condos, Cheryl Watt, Richard Wood, Paul Bethel, Sarah Mattson, Michael Payne, John Coldiron, Rina Roy, Dan McKechnie, Jennifer Scalzi, Rick Stoker, Aileen Halseth, Annaliese Pennell, Jeffrey Stephenson, Rick Anderson			
SUPPORTING RESOURCES (ITEMS READ IN PREPARATION FOR AND/OR BROUGHT TO MEETING):			
UPDATES AND BRIEF REPORTS:			
Topic	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Notes**	
ACTION ITEMS:			
Question	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Notes and Decision(s)**	**Next Steps**
-Do the notes accurately reflect the September 19th meeting?	All	0	-Everyone approved last week's Meeting Minutes
DISCUSSION ITEMS:			
Question	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Notes and Next Steps**	
1. Introductions		-Brief Introductions as new members joined -This project team has been created to update and develop our Campus Master Plan	
2. Meeting #1 Recap - Review of Notes.	Gould Evans	Recap of Last Meeting: -Updating Master Plan and Revising 2012 Campus Master Plan -Dan provided some of the district rules -Vision of Document, which has been replaced by district-wide vision -3 Different Levels of Guidance within the plan: 1) Design Guidelines (Campus Wide Policies/Strategies for changing campus over time) 2) District Guidelines - Campus is broken up into 15 smaller sub districts 3) Projects in Detail - Defines and gives an image of specific projects across campus	
		-Think of these as broader objectives to help make decisions on modernizing campus -Master Plan addresses the physical improvements on campus -2012 Plan had 8 sub sections - we added two (Social Justice & Equity) Design Guidelines - Below includes suggestions to be included within the current Design Guidelines: 1. District/Areas/Zones Identification	

3. Draft Design Guidelines - Review and Discussion -Do the design guidelines capture the discussion from our last meeting? -Are there any additional design guidelines that the project team should be considering?	All	-How can you create unique aspects to the sub districts? -Carry common themes/elements -No longer using the term "district" -The team decided on using the term "zones" instead -Native American Land on ARC for which we need to include language in design guidelines for showing respect/acknowledgement 2. Site and Landscape Design -Take Environmental Issues into consideration (water conserving methods) -Vicinity of events near classrooms -Inclusion of beautification of "art scape" -Access pathways/sidewalks -Visually impaired considerations -Consideration to mid-point modernization (infrastructure entry points/flexibility) 3. Boundaries and Perimeter -Creating core educational space/distinct difference along the edge/separation between the areas 4. Signage, Gateways and Way-Finding -Specific/Multiple Drop Off Points across campus -Uniform in all signage (location on building) -Open to renaming Parking Lots with names that are constant/logical -Signs with braille/audio/directional capability 5. Plaza & Open Space -Art scapes fall under this category -Covered space in areas with little to no shade/solar canopy 6. Temporary Facilities -Tech Ed may be the only building that requires swing space during modernization -Admin building may require swing space during modernization -Future designated swing space zone (currently where CMC is located). This was discussed as a possibility as swing space. -Accessible restrooms near swing space -Identify boundary for keeping portable truly "temporary" -Swing space is a more applicable term rather than "temporary instruction space" because there might be spaces that are not instructional in nature (i.e. admin building modernization) 7. Transportation, Access and Parking -Car changing stations -Coordinate with outside agencies in connection with buses, bikes, etc. -Develop partnerships for the future -Sidewalks to accommodate different types of transportation -Combine Parking Lots (Such as A, B, C & D) 8. Architectural Design Guidelines -By 2025, 50% of state buildings need to be zero net energy -By 2030, 100% of new buildings need to be zero net energy -Reconfiguring classrooms to adapt to student capacity and technology 9. Social Justice & Equity -Accessibility to campus for students, disabled and/or disadvantaged students -Update title to "Inclusion, Social Justice & Equity" -Paratransit accessibility (bus/bikes) 10. Sustainability -Include charging stations -Shade structures on campus 11. Add "Infrastructure"
		Project Matrix -Dan explained that we need to first, capture broad picture of projects. Secondly, prioritize projects , but somewhat loosely. Dan to review Tech Ed plan and inform college on which portables are planned to be consolidated for the Tech Ed

4. Draft Campus Project List - Review and Discussion - Review of Comprehensive Project Matrix -Are there any additional project ideas/thoughts that the team has in addition to the ones submitted through basecamp?	All	construction. This will determine if the college has additional projects or not. All plans will get routed up through district leadership. These projects are also being examined at a district level, however, ARC recommended projects should be included in the Master Plan -One-Stop Center proposed to improve accessibility for students to everything they need when they start at ARC, as well as increase the follow through of applicants to ARC. Consolidate student services spaces, and move classrooms around, as long as ASF stays the same -Determine if it is possible to have both Science and Davies at the same priority level - It was determined that you cannot replace one need for another once it is already in the process with the state project proposal process. -Natomas Phase II & III, Tech Ed, Elk Grove, Folsom 2.1 are current projects in the state process -Gould Evans accounted for building pad adjacent to STEM. Gould Evans will communicate with the college if Science could fit into this pad (which may not require displacement or demolition of Raef Hall)
5. Next Meeting		-Basic Revision of Campus Map -Notify anything on Project Matrix that causes concern -Not everything on Matrix elevates to specific projects, so we will discuss which ones elevate to that standard - Will add any updates to matrix for next week's meeting

ITEMS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION:

Topic	**Contact Person**

OTHER INFORMATION: Dan to share Tech Ed Plan at Next Meeting