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PROJECTS SUMMARY

A  Student Services Expansion
B  Rodda Hall 3rd Floor Renovation
C  Performing Arts Complex Modernization
D  Lusk Remodel
E  Hughes Stadium Modernization
F  Lillard Modernization
G  Mohr Modernization
H  Mohr 2 New Construction
I  Transportation, Access and Parking Improvements (TAP)

See Section 5 of the Master Plan for details of these projects
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Introduction

Mission Statement
Sacramento City College is an open-access, comprehensive community college, serving a diverse student population. We provide a wide range of educational opportunities and support services leading to transfer, career advancement, basic skills development, and personal enrichment. Our commitment to continuous improvement through outcome-guided assessment, planning, and evaluation promotes student learning. Through these efforts, we contribute to the intellectual, cultural, and economic vitality of the community.

Vision
Sacramento City College seeks to create a learning community that celebrates diversity, nurtures personal growth, and inspires academic and economic leadership.

Core Values
* Working Together
* Pursuing Excellence
* Inspiring Achievement

Facilities History
Sacramento City College, (SCC), is the seventh oldest public community college in California, with academic buildings spanning from 1928 and during the WPA era in 1936 to the most recent building currently completed in summer of 2010. As the first college in the Los Rios Community College District, the campus acreage is the smallest of all the campuses in the District, creating a need for planning solutions to be compact and efficient. A goal paramount to the continued growth and development of SCC is the planned modernization, replacement or renovation of inadequate facilities required to enhance student learning and support progressive and innovative educational programs. The College is committed to expanding programs and services through the
continued construction of new buildings that provide superior quality teaching and learning environments for a variety of academic and career technical programs.

In recent years, SCC has achieved major accomplishments in both the renovation of older buildings and the construction of new facilities.

* 1998 — SCC opened its new Learning Resource Center (LRC), now viewed as the signature building for the campus. The LRC houses the library, tutoring services, open computer labs, technology-equipped classrooms, and a television broadcast studio. The addition of the new building had the secondary effect of opening up space for a 100-station computer lab as well as modernized classrooms in the Business building.

* 1999 — The former cold storage property was developed to increase lighted parking for students by 750 spaces. There are now 2,040 lighted student parking spaces on campus.

* 1999 — During Fall, SCC renovated underutilized space in the Lusk Center (originally constructed in 1938) for a new College Store, and remodeled existing aeronautics classrooms and engineering laboratories. This project increased the usable square footage of the campus facility by 8,000 sq. ft.

* 2000 — The space vacated by the College Store was renovated during the Spring into a bright and modern one-stop career center housing programs such as CalWORKS, Assessment, Workability, Early Start Program, Job Placement, and Work Experience.
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- **2002** — The Physical Education/Health/Athletics Division moved into bays 1 and 3 at Hughes Stadium (built in 1928) during Spring. These facilities now house the division office, seventeen faculty offices, and a large space for equipment storage. An over-sized locker room in the South Gym was remodeled to create additional faculty offices, a team room, a tutorial lab, storage, and a meeting room.

- **2002/2003** — Two new computer labs were installed in the Technology Building, a new softball complex was completed and the Campus Police building was expanded and remodeled to provide a vastly improved customer service area.

- **2003** — SCC Light Rail Station opened in September. Several projects completed around Hughes Stadium fully integrate the Light Rail station with the campus.

- **2002/2003** — Seven sets of restrooms were upgraded to meet ADA requirements. These restrooms are located in Lillard Hall, Mohr Hall, the Cafeteria, the North Gym (2), and the South Gym (2).

- **2003** — The Cafeteria retrofit and remodel project was completed in Fall, allowing SCC to restore outstanding food service to the students, faculty and staff.
Completed After the Original Master Plan

- **2005/2006** — Various *Transportation, Access and Parking Plan (TAP Plan)* projects were completed to improve safety and efficacy of vehicular access, circulation and parking. The projects included reconfiguration the west parking lot and realignment of the campus entrance to 23rd Street creating a 4-way signalized intersection. The Pedestrian Mall Phase 1 was also completed, eliminating conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles in the campus core and establishing a clear pedestrian path from the Light Rail station to the campus.

- **2005** — Modernization of the 11,034 ASF Technology Building was completed in the Spring. The building systems were upgraded and all levels of the facility are now ADA compliant allowing all students access to the latest technology.

- **2005** — The modernization of Cosmetology was completed in the spring. This upgrade improved the building systems and created a lab environment that reflects today’s real-world environment.

- **2007** — The new 1,950 space parking structure opened, completing an important step in the *TAP Plan*. The new structure dramatically increased the amount of parking available on campus. Accompanying this additional structure, many of the campus parking lots and entrances were reconfigured in accordance with the *TAP Plan*.

- **2007-2008** — Relocation of the tennis courts and expansion of the staff parking lot (F Lot) was completed.
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2008 — The North Gym renovations completed in the fall, created a multi-use space for yoga, kickboxing, adaptive, stretching and aerobics classes. Event seating and restrooms were also increased.

2009 — The H Lot was reconfigured to consolidate accessible parking as close to the campus core as possible and provide a drop off circle.

2010 — Spring Semester saw the opening of the new SCC-West Sacramento Education Center. The West Sacramento and Downtown Outreach Centers were relocated to this new facility on West Capitol Avenue. The joint use complex includes the West Sacramento Community Center and Library. City Hall for West Sacramento is across the street from the new Center. This Center will provide general education courses for this region of the City.

2010 — The new Fischbacher Fine Arts building opened for the Fall semester. This building replaced the original Fischbacher Fine Arts building and includes the square footage from Portable 25.

2010 — Following the construction of the Fischbacher Fine Arts Building, the pedestrian mall in front of the new building was constructed to complete the second and final phase of the pedestrian mall project.

The successful completion of these projects testify to SCC’s strength, determination and commitment to overcome obstacles in its effort to create a dynamic teaching and learning environment that is comparable to the college’s programs, faculty, staff and students.
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The Facilities Master Plan is a broad, long-term perspective. Implementation of the detailed planning occurs at the onset of a project. As SCC begins to plan for the next facilities project, the college will review the current and projected program and service needs in light of the opportunities provided by the specific project. Each project will be designed to meet the requirements of the programs and services that are in the best position to benefit from the specific circumstances of the project. Implications for human resources, equipment and information technology, and operating budgets will be considered and specified in the planning phase for each project.

**Scope**

In focusing on the long-term vision of SCC, the Facilities Master Plan provides a framework for current and future facilities work and is structured to insure a coordinated and cohesive context for future project development.

In considering with varying degree all of the facilities of SCC, the Facilities Master Plan:

- Identifies possible locations for future buildings
- Reinforces the architectural character of the campus
- Outlines best practices for the development of future projects
- Expresses SCC’s commitment to its role within the local community and to the larger community by developing projects that are environmentally responsible and sustainable

**Conceptual Foundation and Contexts**

This Facilities Master Plan is part of a larger family of plans, included in the College Strategic Planning System. The conceptual foundation of the Facilities Master Plan is that facilities must support the programs and services they house, that the nature and character of the facilities must reflect the goals and methods of those programs and services, and that the
facilities must express the mission of SCC. To reach this objective, modernizations strive first to provide modern, appropriate and safe infrastructure for the learning environment.

The Facilities Master Plan interfaces with the findings of the Transportation, Access and Parking Plan (TAP Plan), which were already being implemented when the process for the Master Plan began. In addition, the Facilities Master Plan serves as a tool for implementing the District’s Long Range Capital Needs Plan for SCC, providing guidelines and prioritization for the projects it broadly outlines.

**An Unconstrained Vision**

Examination of SCC’s programs and services served as the inception point for the master planning process. Many have been operating within a variety of facility limitations, ranging from lack of classroom availability to inadequate office space to old or outdated technology or other infrastructure. These non-program or service related issues have the capacity to restrict any particular program or service from fulfilling its full potential. A close examination of long-term needs was necessary to quantify the facilities required to support an unconstrained context for SCC to pursue its mission.

To gain a true sense of need, each Division was asked to review the data and provide input for the Facilities Master Plan as initially developed in the spring of 2003, and to analyze enrollment and facilities needs in an environment that did not have facility limitations. The results were reported in the Facilities Needs Tabulation, which shows a need of over 100,000 square feet of new/improved facilities. The quantification of facility requirements produced by this exercise was not necessarily met within the timeline and resources of the master plan. The objective was to quantify the unfettered potential of each program, establish facility goals to support that potential, and align the master plan with those goals.
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The TAP Plan

As a urban commuter campus, all students must travel to SCC from off-campus areas. A substantial number of students and staff use public transportation, including the City College Light Rail station, however, the majority of people drive to the campus. Thus, access to parking is a major factor at the SCC campus, affecting students, staff and the neighboring community. To address the many issues related to commuting to the campus, the Los Rios Community College District invested in the development of a Transportation, Access and Parking Plan (TAP Plan). TAP Plan recommendations were incorporated into the Facilities Master Plan along with the timeline for project implementation.

Major recommendations included the construction of a multi-level parking structure and significant road and intersection changes to improve access to parking. The new multi-level parking structure has had the biggest impact on increasing parking capacity. By building up, this structure preserves limited campus land while substantially increasing capacity. Built on what was surface parking, this structure’s location also supports events at Hughes stadium. The parking structure, lot reconfigurations and new or expanded parking areas increased available parking capacity to 3,057 student spaces, 599 staff spaces and 194 specialty spaces. This is a net increase beyond the previous capacity of over 877 parking spaces. The completion of the new south parking lot was the first installment of 350 new spaces. Reconfiguration of the surface lots north and west of the new parking structure also increased capacity and efficiency. Relocation of the tennis courts allowed expansion of staff parking Lot F, more than doubling the number of cars that can park in that location.

Improving traffic patterns to and from parking is another recommendation of the TAP Plan. The reconfiguration of two intersections on Sutterville Road provides efficient signalized access to parking areas. First, a major project at 23rd Street reconfigured the looping roadways with a more typical four-way signalized intersection, allowing access in all
directions and providing a more conventional and direct route to and from parking areas north and south of Sutterville Road, greatly improving convenience and access to the campus. This route has become the main access to student parking, while maintaining secondary one way access at 12th Avenue.

Second, reconfiguration of the intersection and traffic signal at 21st Street provides access to staff parking Lot F. Adding the fourth leg to this intersection gives safer and more efficient access to the expanded parking lot and eliminated the “uncontrolled” access. This entrance was also signalized for safer protected turns into the campus.

The *TAP Plan* also seeks to improve pedestrian experience on the campus as staff and students leave their parked cars or arrive via public transportation and walk to campus destinations. The new parking areas allowed the relocation of parking from areas in the heart of the campus creating pedestrian space. The extension of pedestrian sidewalks and landscape areas replaced parking in front of the North Gym and between the Auditorium and the Technology and Cosmetology buildings.

With the addition of the Light Rail station and the new parking structure, the portion of the campus that could be experienced on foot now extends to the eastern boundary of the site. Improvements have been made to the vast asphalt parking lot including walkways, lighting, trees, landscaping and other pedestrian features distinct from vehicular routes. Completion of the pedestrian walkway improvements was incorporated in the Fine Arts Building project completed in 2010. The area defined by the light rail station, Hughes Stadium and the parking structure is connected to the core of the campus by these improvements.
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Education Centers and Off Campus Facilities

Sacramento City College is actively expanding the use of the Educational Centers to provide greater access for students in outlying communities, and at the same time, reduce the need to travel to the main campus. Outreach and Educational Centers reduce the need for a new permanent College in the Los Rios Community College District.

Outreach Centers have been or are in the process of being developed into permanent Education Centers in Davis and West Sacramento. The Long Range Capital Needs Plan includes a second and third phase for each of these Educational Centers.

In Spring 2003, the SCC Davis Center moved to a temporary larger facility (from 5,000 sq. ft. to 10,000 sq. ft.) and as a result has expanded course offerings and enrollment. The College is collaborating with the City of Davis and UC Davis in the design of a new joint-use education complex. The Davis Center started construction and will be ready to occupy by Spring of 2012.

The West Sacramento Center was opened for Spring semester 2010.

Programmatically, the Education Centers provide primarily general education courses with specialized programs continuing to be offered at the Sacramento City main campus. Detailed plans for each center will be developed as their particular circumstances evolve. Any new Educational Center design should be compatible with the surrounding community in style and scale. Collaboration with other local entities may influence the nature of the programs offered, and thus the required facilities.

The partnership with Sutter Hospital and the SCC Nursing Department was developed off campus at the Gateway Oaks site.

McClellan Park houses aeronautics and railroad classes and will include Air Traffic Collegiate Training Initiative (AT-CTI) selection by Federal Aviation Administration in 2010.
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Project Sequence and Time Frame
The State typically funds one project per year on any given campus. When projects are undertaken in succession, at any one time one project may be in planning, another under construction, and a third in the “warranty period” of initial occupancy. This is about as many projects as can be efficiently managed while keeping the impact of “out of service” facilities to a minimum.

The Facilities Master Plan also identifies possible locations for future buildings. While programming these buildings does not occur immediately, reserving locations for future facilities is important to provide capacity to meet future needs and to coordinate ongoing work completed in the interim with all future work. Reserved locations will be utilized as their current function until program and funding are in place.

Funding Constraints
The Facilities Master Plan was developed and will be implemented within real-world parameters affecting scale and scope. Funding is the most obvious factor, as are the reality of the existing facilities and physical resources of the campus. The State of California has processes and policies for projects wishing to qualify for funding, while bonds and other funding raised by the District are subject to laws that govern spending of those revenues. The following sections review several major parameters that shape the character of projects and other facility improvements being considered in the master plan.

Many elements of the Facilities Master Plan are already in place or in progress, having been developed within the long-term processes of community college facility management. These projects are incorporated in the Facilities Master Plan and will continue to follow the schedule for funding and implementation.
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District Bonds

In 2002, the Los Rios Community College District passed a $265 million local general obligation bond for capital improvements to its four college campuses. As required by the bond, the Long Range Capital Needs Plan (LRCNP) outlines various projects, expected matching state funding, and an estimated timeline for the expenditure of the bond proceeds. For the Sacramento City College campus, several specific projects are scheduled including modernizations, TAP Plan projects, and development of center facilities.

In addition to the Measure A funds, Los Rios Community College District has passed Measure M. This $475 million general obligation bond will fund the next round of projects for the four colleges including Sacramento City College. The Facilities Master Plan identifies and prioritizes projects to utilize this funding for maximum benefit to the Sacramento City College campus.

State Programs

Local bond funding qualifies the District to apply for additional state funding. To distribute monies most effectively, the state has developed a funding program that analyzes the needs and justifications for each project submitted. State funding for new building or growth projects is based in part on projected growth trends and the capacity of existing facilities at any particular campus. Known as the Capacity/Load Ratio, or Cap-Load, facilities are graded to determine a reasonable level of use or capacity. Load values are derived from growth trends and used to project expected attendance and demand for facilities. These values are then entered into a ratio and assigned a ranking with other projects. The College must have existing on campus demand (students) to qualify for funding of new building projects. The Capacity/Load ratios for Sacramento City College indicates eligibility for new instructional, office and related spaces. This new space is shown in the New Instructional Building (Mohr 2) project and Student Services Building expansion project.
Capacity/Load ratios for the Education Centers in Davis and West Sacramento show that they are expected to qualify for new facilities with the increase in program offerings and student demand. The development of these facilities will be phased to match the pace of the projected growth.

Modernization projects do not require growth to qualify for state funding. Building components wear out, and changes in use or technologies can exceed their capacity. To extend the life of a building, modernization projects are funded to repair and upgrade building systems. The state issues a Facilities Condition Index (FCI) for most community college buildings as a means of ranking their need. In some cases when the building is so outdated as to make upgrading ill advised, funding to completely replace the building is justified. These projects cannot increase the building’s area; the replacement building must have the same total square footage, though it can be in a different location or configuration.

Process of Discovery

The development of the Facilities Master Plan began in the summer of 2003 with discussions exploring the scope, purpose, and definition of a facility master plan in the specific context of SCC. A master plan for the College had not been conducted in several years with many facility issues remaining undefined and unresolved.

The Facilities Master Plan addresses the physical plant and its role in supporting the educational mission of SCC. The type, nature and quantity of facilities are derived directly from the requirements of the students and the programs and services offered by the college. The Facilities Master Plan establishes a prioritized sequence of projects that reinforce and expand the function of the campus facilities in SCC’s mission.

The Facilities Master Plan also investigates various aspects of facilities management in pursuit of greater efficiency and utilization of SCC’s facilities. Examination of several areas was carried out with the purpose of gaining a greater understanding of existing conditions and to formulate solutions maximizing available resources.
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Age of Facilities

Building systems age (for example, the pipes of the plumbing system or the transformers and circuit breakers of the electrical system), become outdated, or simply no longer provide sufficient capacity to support current loads. Older buildings having older building systems are in greater need of modernization beyond those generated by changes in program. The age of buildings or the length of time since any major work was completed is one factor used in determining project priority.

Buildings ranked by age, oldest to youngest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Modernization Competed</th>
<th>Planned Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hughes Stadium</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gym</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusk Center</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013 (Limited Remodel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischbacher Fine Arts</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services (Administration of Justice)</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillard Hall</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohr Hall</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gym</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodda Hall North</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014 (3rd Floor Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodda Hall South</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facility Condition Index

The State of California has assessed most community college buildings across the state. Comparing estimated cost to repair deficiencies to estimated cost for total replacement determines a value for each building. The resulting percentage is the building’s Facilities Condition Index (FCI). Typically, a value of five percent or less indicates the building is in good condition. Up to ten percent is considered fair condition, and over ten percent is regarded poor condition. These categories represent the state’s goals for the general condition of community college facilities.

Space Utilization

A definition and methodology to quantify instructional space utilization at SCC was developed, as none existed in 2003 for the original Master Plan. The Research Office used a room scheduling software package as an analytical tool, entering enrollment and schedule data from the Fall 2003 term. This allowed a room-by-room analysis of the enrollment of every class section, and comparison to the capacity of the room in which the class was held.

The data was then run through a spreadsheet developed at SCC to incorporate the utilization targets set by the State of California for various room types. Utilization targets are determined by a combination of two factors: the time a room is occupied for instruction versus the time available; and the number of students occupying the room versus the computed capacity of the room. Utilization targets differ across room types, but for most lecture spaces occupancy 53 hours a week with two thirds of the seats filled is considered full capacity. The state’s utilization targets for all room types were used to calculate the final utilization values for each instructional room.
The results of the 2003 study, produced the initial prioritization of projects on the SCC campus. Since then, significant inroads have been made in improving the condition and utilization of the college facilities. Through the modernization and replacement efforts, buildings have been or are in the process of being updated to match the current and future need of the educational programs. In addition to the building projects, major improvements have been made to the site vehicular and pedestrian circulation in accordance with the TAP Plan. Beyond the main campus, the first phase of the West Sacramento Center has been built and the Davis Center is under construction.

The original prioritization in the 2003 Master Plan was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Phase of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP Plan</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Davis and West Sacramento Education Centers Phase 1 | 2004-05 | West Sacramento - Complete  
Davis - Under Construction |
| North Gym                                    | 2006-07    | Complete                                 |
| Fischbacher Fine Arts (with P25)             | 2007-08    | Complete                                 |
| Auditorium/Performing Arts                   | 2008-09    | In Construction                          |
| Mohr Hall                                    | 2009-10    | Final Project Proposal Completed         |
| Lillard Hall                                 | 2010-11    | Final Project Proposal Completed         |
| Davis and West Sacramento Education Centers Phase 2 | 2011-13 |                                           |
| Administration of Justice                   | 2011-12    |                                           |
| Business                                    | 2012-13    |                                           |
| Rodda Hall North                             | 2013-14    |                                           |
| Rodda Hall South                             | 2014-15    |                                           |
| Lusk Center                                  | 2015-16    |                                           |
| South Gym                                   | 2016-17    |                                           |
The current prioritization is as follows:

### Main Campus Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>ASF</th>
<th>Design Start</th>
<th>Occupy</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Complex (Auditorium)</td>
<td>34,628</td>
<td>Aug. 2007</td>
<td>Jan. 2012</td>
<td>$18,611,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes Stadium</td>
<td>470,000</td>
<td>Aug. 2009</td>
<td>Aug. 2012</td>
<td>$13,781,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>Dec. 2010</td>
<td>Nov. 2013</td>
<td>$12,036,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, C, G, H and J Lots</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>$1,317,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusk Center - LAC 11 / Electronics</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>Dec. 2011</td>
<td>Dec. 2013</td>
<td>$2,147,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohr Hall</td>
<td>18,048</td>
<td>Sep. 2012</td>
<td>Dec. 2015</td>
<td>$14,945,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodda Hall North, 3rd Floor</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>Sep. 2012</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>$3,783,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillard Hall</td>
<td>27,535</td>
<td>Sep. 2014</td>
<td>Dec. 2017</td>
<td>$22,296,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Instructional Space (Mohr 2)</td>
<td>17,880</td>
<td>Sep. 2016</td>
<td>Dec. 2019</td>
<td>$13,327,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Off Campus Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>ASF</th>
<th>Design Start</th>
<th>Occupy</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis Center-Phase 1 &amp; TAP 1</td>
<td>14,455</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>Nov. 2011</td>
<td>$8,916,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Center-Phase 2</td>
<td>15,806</td>
<td>Aug. 2013</td>
<td>Nov. 2016</td>
<td>$11,921,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Center-TAP 2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Aug. 2013</td>
<td>Nov. 2016</td>
<td>$971,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento Center-Phase 2</td>
<td>15,806</td>
<td>Aug. 2014</td>
<td>Nov. 2017</td>
<td>$11,921,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento Center-TAP 2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Sep. 2014</td>
<td>Nov. 2017</td>
<td>$971,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Center-Phase 3</td>
<td>15,606</td>
<td>Aug. 2015</td>
<td>Nov. 2018</td>
<td>$11,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Center-TAP 3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Sep. 2015</td>
<td>Nov. 2018</td>
<td>$971,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento Center-Phase 3</td>
<td>15,606</td>
<td>Aug. 2016</td>
<td>Nov. 2019</td>
<td>$11,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento Center-TAP 3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Sep. 2016</td>
<td>Nov. 2019</td>
<td>$971,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Considerations for Project Planning

Facilities Master Plan
This chapter of the Facilities Master Plan outlines a range of issues developed relative to the master plan as a whole that provide context for planning each of the individual projects. These issues support the mission of the College as expressed in the character of the facilities, and serve to define SCC’s commitment to the community by:

- Coordinating current and future projects
- Using funding and resources judiciously
- Being conscientious toward the environment and health and well being of students and staff

Every project is expected to begin with a review of these issues to define the project’s contribution to the College with respect to the desired outcomes. As a design guideline, these issues outline desired visual and aesthetic characteristics of the College’s buildings, grounds, and the experience of people as they move through the campus, instilling a sense that the College is a place of learning, growth, commitment, improvement and success.
Guiding Principles

The following three principles – long range planning, facility functional planning, and college environment planning - serve as a broad framework for project development and evaluation.

Long Range Planning

*Anticipate and meet future college facility needs, demands, and opportunities.*

- Maximize use of campus real estate by examining each need holistically, building up, combining replacement buildings, exploring alternatives, and taking advantage of opportunities for expansion, whenever possible.
- Consider SCC’s ability to support ongoing costs with respect to space, personnel, future equipment upgrades, infrastructure, and other resources.
- When evaluating project sequence and scope analyze program and service needs (in relation to the campus as a whole), cost/benefits, opportunity costs, condition of the facility, and optimization and relevance of the overall plan.

Facility Functional Planning

*Create functional and efficient space utilization in the delivery of college programs and services.*

- Design and develop campus facilities educational environments that promote consistent student success and achievement, and are conducive to effective student learning.
- Whenever appropriate design multi-use spaces to increase flexibility and efficiency.
- Match facilities to programs and services to provide the most efficient and functional space.
- Analyze college program and service interrelationships and functions when consolidating, combining in one location, or determining location.
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College Environment Planning

Ensure the environment reflects SCC’s values, architectural themes, and public stewardship.

- Develop facilities and campus features that promote positive community relationships and enhanced opportunities for college-community interactions, such as joint-use, performance and athletic venues.

- Utilize design, building practices, and management practices that promote environmental quality and stewardship.

- Create interior and exterior public spaces that facilitate circulation and opportunities for social interaction and gathering.

- Enhance SCC’s features to promote a welcoming, safe, accessible and navigable environment.

Best Practices

Whereas the Guiding Principles described above provide a broad framework for the planning and development of individual projects, this section outlines in detail six facility design and management practices identified as essential to the overall atmosphere and human quality of the collegiate experience at SCC. These Best Practices are an integral component of the decision-making and application processes. Many of these elements currently exist at SCC, along with a strong desire to expand and augment them as projects are implemented.

The Best Practices also include several facilities management issues. Building codes and other regulations, including the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will be addressed in each project. Utilities and other infrastructure between buildings will be upgraded in conjunction with building projects. College standards for the size of various room types and the equipment supplied to them will be followed.
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Sustainable Building Design and Operation

A major goal of SCC is to reduce the amount of energy and natural resources required to build and operate its facilities. Consideration should be given to pursuing the US Green Building Council’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification. This has become a requirement for publicly funded projects in many locations. In all cases, new buildings should be designed to meet a minimum criteria of LEED silver certification.

Energy

To reduce the need for energy, the building systems should be as efficient as possible. Heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems (HVAC) should be appropriately sized for the building shell. When planning the HVAC and lighting systems consider when each space is utilized. Event, office and other specialty spaces that are frequently used in off hours may benefit from separate controls or systems. Natural daylighting should be provided where ever possible. Narrow building footprints, sky lights and light shelves can all aid in maximizing the amount of natural light accessible to the facility. When daylighting is available, the artificial lighting system should be adjustable to reduce energy consumption. The advantages of sensor controlling these adjustments should be evaluated for each project. To implement a successful daylighting plan, glare control and limiting heat gain and loss needs to be addressed.

The integrity of the building envelope dictates the amount of heat the building gains during the summer and loses during the winter; therefore, the materials used should have high insulating properties. While reflective glazing does not fit into the context of the campus, other approaches can reduce the amount of heat gain and lost through the windows. Limiting southern facing glass, multi-paned windows, deciduous trees and shading devices can improve the energy efficiency of glazing. Light colored roofs should also be considered where aesthetically appropriate.
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Water
Reducing the amount of water used by the campus should be addressed both within and outside buildings. When replacing or installing new fixtures, low flow fixtures should be utilized. Building projects should analyze the feasibility of installing a gray water system. Toilet flushing or irrigation could utilize this gray water. Efficient irrigation systems should be installed when creating new or updating outdoor spaces. Drip systems, micro sprayers, rain sensors, and soil moisture sensors could be possible approaches to creating a more efficient system. When designing the landscaping, projects should consider introducing trees and shrubs which require less water than grass. Drought resistant and native plants will further reduce water requirements.

Materials
Every effort will be made to integrate materials that include recycled content, can be easily recycled, and that have low inherent energy values. Renewable materials and those produced locally or that do not need to be transported long distances are preferred. Products that lower the life cycle cost of operating the facility by being durable, easy to maintain, and in general, have a low impact on the environment should be utilized.

Waste
Within new building projects, the need for facilities to manage recycling and other waste separation should be addressed. The feasibility of composting green or kitchen waste through a composting service should also be considered. If deemed appropriate, storage and pick-up areas will need to be addressed within the design of the project. In all facilities, waste and recycling areas should have the proper screening and storm water protection measures.

Storm Water
While the limited site area does not lend itself to open swales or retention ponds, storm water management is important to a comprehensive environmental plan. Limiting the amount of impervious surface is the
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best way to improve the quality and quantity of storm water. This measure will also reduce heat island effect. Other means that should be considered to manage this effect is to shade parking lot areas.

Alternative Transportation

Facilitating the use of alternative transportation has been embraced by this urban campus through the light rail station and other measures. To continue this initiative, new projects should evaluate the need for additional or improved secure bike parking. Access routes to the facilities should also be considered. Within vehicular parking areas, motorcycle parking should also be considered.

Pedestrian Experience

The pedestrian experience is a significant and positive feature of the SCC campus. Efforts should be made to expand and enhance the walking experience, maximizing pedestrians’ experience of place by providing a sense of safety, aesthetics, comfort, and connection to the surrounding buildings and landscape. Strengthen links from the main quad to student parking and the south end of campus. Extend several important features that currently exist into pedestrian areas recovered from parking areas. These features include:

* Covered walkways provide a sheltered route connecting many parts of the campus. They also create a unifying architectural element, tying different building styles together.

* Benches, seat walls, outdoor tables and other places to sit and gather give people a place to socialize, keeping areas lively and populated.

* Brick bands set into the sidewalk in many areas of the campus reduces the pavement to a human scale and brings variety to the walking surface.

* A visual axis terminated by an important building, fountain, or other feature which give the walking path a sense of place and aid in way finding.

* The campus’ abundance of mature trees provides cooling shade. Maintain a balance between areas dedicated to paved walkways and landscaping.
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Campus Gateways

Vehicular Gateways

The primary vehicular entrance to the campus for students and visitors is from Sutterville Road, as described in the TAP Plan. This entrance should continued to be improved. Additions need to maintain the smooth flow of traffic without compromising the safety of off-site traffic or pedestrian crossings. Any further improvements should create the greatest possible aesthetic experience through the use of landscaping, detailing, high quality materials, and site features. Locate monument type signage at the main entrance to the campus parking areas. The design and materials of the sign(s) shall be similar to existing campus signage.

Pedestrian Gateways

In addition to the primary pedestrian gateway to the campus from Freeport Boulevard, between buildings Rodda Hall North and Rodda Hall South, a second pedestrian entrance to the campus currently exists on the northeast side near the stadium. Develop this second entrance as a primary gateway for students and visitors arriving via the light rail station and parking. Design the gateway such that it is clearly visible to pedestrians entering the campus, providing a positive aesthetic consistent with the collegiate experience. Position and configure future buildings to reinforce and frame this gateway. Locate directional signage in these important areas, similar to existing campus signage.
Signage and Way Finding

Signage and way finding aids all people who wish to come on to the campus. The need for signage and way finding exists at each level of experiencing a site. The initial level is finding the campus as a whole. Once a visitor has found the campus, the next level of the experience begins. Within the campus, most visitors are attempting to find an event, service, class or person at a particular facility. The second layer of signage and way finding should direct a visitor from the entry point to the building or facility they are seeking. Even after the structure is located, an additional level of signage is needed within the building to identify the correct room or department. As facilities are being built or renovated, all three levels of signage and way finding should be considered and improved.

Signage

Signage identifying the college should be placed and sized appropriately for visitors from vehicles, public transportation, bicycles and sidewalks. The master plan has further addressed the overall site identification in Campus Gateways sections.

Campus Maps

Campus maps are a useful tool in navigating once inside the campus by providing a visual of the entire organizational system of the campus and identifying major structures and uses in comparison to the visitor’s current location. The map should identify locations that visitors and first time students would be most likely to visit. For example, the location of the library, cafeteria, student services offices and event spaces should be highlighted. The map should also include:

- “You Are Here” symbol
- Building names
- Parking lot identifiers

These maps should be placed at every major pedestrian entrance and where main pedestrian circulation routes converge. While the signs need to be easily identified, the maps should be placed so users of the signs will not be run over by the main
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stream of people and bikes using the path. Lighting around the map is important for evening visitors.

**Building Signage**

When trying to locate a building, knowing the name is only useful if the name also appears on the building façade. Building names should be displayed above main entrances of each building. Every side of a building that faces a major or secondary pedestrian circulation route should have an identification marker which states the name of the building. This marker may be over the main entrance if a main entrance occurs on that façade of the building. Font and finish of building markers should be consistent across the campus. Lighting should be considered when placing the building name.

Within the building, room signs should be placed near doors to state the room number or function of the room. Room numbering should follow a logical system that is consistent throughout the campus. In larger or complicated buildings, consider placing a building map at each main entrance, stairways and elevators. If a popular destination is not visible from a main entrance, include directional signs identifying that function.

**Way Finding**

While signage is a useful resource, design elements and layout enhances a person’s ability to navigate. Termination points, hierarchy of path and building articulation around major entrances are all tools that can be used to increase way finding. These devices increase the first time user’s understanding of the campus and provides returning visitors a memorable path to assist in finding their way back to their destination.

Terminus points and intersections of major pedestrian circulation routes should have an identifiable architectural feature or public art piece that is unique to that area. These features create a “node.” Views of these points lets users triangulate their position and provides “stepping stones” to remember a trail. When giving directions to another person, these features also provide useful descriptors.
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Pathways should have varying levels of importance based on their length and what they lead to. Pathways that stretch across the length of the campus hold more significance than a path that connects two adjacent buildings. These destinations allow visitors unfamiliar with the campus to identify which paths will lead to most destinations from one that only leads to one. As projects are implemented, each project should address the types of pathways that are created or altered.

The hierarchy should be reinforced by varying the width, material and amenities on each class of pathway. Major circulation routes should be obvious to the casual observer and distinguishable from the secondary and tertiary routes. Each major circulation path should have its own identity through the type of amenities, plantings, color or texture of pathway. In most cases, entrances to event spaces and first time student services are visible from a major pathway; however, when this condition does not exist directional signs should identify the secondary circulation path to those locations.

Parking Lots

Parking lots are particularly demanding for signage and way finding. This interface between the pedestrian and vehicular environment creates a dangerous area to navigate. The TAP plan has identified the need for protected pedestrian pathways through the parking lots. When traveling from the parking lot, first time visitors should be able to identify the main entrance into the campus from secondary entrances by gateway markers, width of pathway or other prominence. The repetitive nature of parking lots makes finding a destination or vehicle difficult. Large parking lots should have identification number to departmentalize the lot and allow users to locate their vehicle more easily. In order to identify lots on a campus map and allow user to more easily remember which lot contains their vehicle, color coded sign or other monuments should be considered.
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Transitional Spaces Between Buildings
Make spaces between buildings into places compatible with their scale and location within the campus. Avoid making unusable spaces or spaces that do not have a clearly defined use. Passageways and spaces between buildings are to be places to stay, a destination, not just a pathway between buildings or from parking areas to the campus core. Accomplish this by transforming leftover spaces into courtyards, arcades, or outdoor rooms and by creating wide spots in pathways for places to sit.

Provide interior and exterior open spaces that link activities and promote social interaction. These spaces will vary in scale and design and be a mixture of hard and softscapes. Design common open spaces to accommodate a variety of group sizes and individuals who might use these places to eat lunch, study, meet for coffee, hold discussion sections, etc.

Locate new buildings such that they create usable outdoor places and maintain the continuity of the campus. Do not locate buildings such that unusable or undefined spaces are created. Strengthen and protect smaller quads that exist between a family of buildings. Avoid facing “backs” of buildings to quads or major pedestrian pathways.
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Safety

Visibility
Maximize the ability of users to observe open spaces and adjacent parking areas. Wherever possible place indoor activity nodes and common spaces adjacent to outdoor open spaces and pathways, and arrange windows and glass doors to increase observations. Outdoor spaces will be visible by users from surrounding buildings.

Lighting
Vehicular Site Entrances: Design lighting to softly illuminate parkways and site entrances to parking areas that is adequate also for purposes of safety and visibility.

Pathways and Open Spaces: Light pedestrian paths and open spaces to softly illuminate paths, courtyards, and open spaces between parking areas, buildings, and the campus core. Adequately illuminate exterior spaces and pathways for purposes of safety and visibility. Clearly illuminate hidden recesses, corners, and elevation changes along pedestrian walkways.

Separation of Pedestrians and Vehicles
Minimize conflict between pedestrian and vehicular circulation through use of clearly defined and separated routes. Separate pedestrian walkways from vehicular circulation routes using bollards, changes in material and landscaped areas. Designated bike routes should also be considered to avoid conflicts with both vehicles and pedestrians.
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Architectural Themes
The Sacramento City College campus has a collection of buildings spanning over 75 years of construction and architectural design. From the concrete cast art deco details characteristic of the auditorium and north gym’s WPA heritage to the massing and expression of materials expressed in Lillard Hall’s international style, and even in the utilitarian simplicity of the technology building, the campus buildings reflect style changes over time. This will remain an important feature of the campus as buildings continue to be added.

However, there exists a distinct Sacramento City College aesthetic that originated with the construction of the South Gym in 1969 and continued with the Business Building in 1970 and Rodda Halls North and South in 1975. Subsequent additions to the campus have continued the themes established by these buildings.

The most recognizable and unique features of these buildings are the rounded brick corners, warping to regular square shapes at top and bottom. This distinctive element is part of a style utilizing brick, concrete, glass, timber and clay tile that is Craftsman, yet contemporary and very distinctive. The buildings have a vertical emphasis with panels of brick or glass framed with board-formed concrete extending uninterrupted from grade level to eave. Covered walks detailed with board-formed concrete, timber framing, and tile roofs provide a horizontal counterpoint as well as a human scale to the pedestrians’ experience of the campus.

The following themes draw from the existing established features of the campus to guide the development of future projects.
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Unity
Create a design concept consistent with the existing buildings on campus as expressed through the use of scale, materials, colors, textures, fenestrations, roof forms, and architectural detailing and articulation. The buildings together will present a unified character, yet each building will establish its own identity.

Use architectural features to create a unifying theme that clearly identifies the buildings as the Sacramento City College campus.

Design all building elevations to a compatible and comparable level. Repeat design elements from the primary facade on those sides considered less important.

Scale
Use scale, massing, and height of the buildings and interior spaces in ways appropriate to their function.

Use scale and ceiling height to develop a hierarchy of interior spaces. Public spaces, such as lobbies, atriums, and lecture halls, should be grander in scale; while more private spaces, such as offices and seminar rooms will have lower volumes.

Design all interior and exterior spaces to a human scale.

Design architectural elements and details at a scale appropriate to their context. Overly large, out of scale elements are discouraged.

Design the buildings and surrounding open spaces such that the scale, height, and massing of the buildings create a place that is inviting, complex, and visually stimulating, but not overwhelming.
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Materials/Colors/Textures

Acceptable materials for exterior finishes are skittle brick, glazed curtain wall, wood, and board-formed concrete. Skittle thin brick veneer is acceptable, but not preferred. Imitation materials (i.e., materials manufactured to look like another material, such as vinyl tile that looks like brick) and reflective glazing are prohibited. Provide access to all surfaces for maintenance purposes. Use exterior finish materials consistent with existing applications on campus buildings and structures.

Materials, colors, and textures, as well as other elements of the project (i.e., outdoor furniture, light fixtures, etc.) will be consistent with the overall design concept, and work together to present a unified theme for the campus.

Earhtone colors are preferred. Choose colors that are compatible and consistent with the overall architectural theme of the campus.

Use materials, colors, and textures to differentiate types of spaces and provide transitions from one place to another.

Where volume and detailing is minimal, use materials, colors, and textures to increase the level of architectural design and interest.

Use materials that are appropriate to their function and location in the project.

Emphasize architectural details and entrances with contrasting colors or materials.

If a single texture is to be used, use color, volume, and architectural detailing to increase the level of articulation and interest.
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Windows
Use window patterns that are consistent and complimentary with other architectural elements and forms of articulation and design on the campus.

Patterns of windows are preferred over long, unbroken expanses of glazing. Use fenestration to accentuate and articulate the building design.

Roof Forms
Variable roof forms are preferred over flat roofs. Sufficiently detail cornices if flat roofs are provided.

Rhythm of Spaces Between Buildings
Use spaces between buildings to create a pattern or rhythm of building and space that encourages movement from building to building.

Building Orientation and Relation to Project
Orient the building toward a quad, common open space, or court.

Level of Detail and Artication
Design projects to a level of complexity in design and detail that is consistent with a human scale and in keeping with the overall aesthetic.

Use a variety of design strategies to attain a suitable level of architectural detail and articulation. Use such devices as window and door placement, changes in vertical planes, volume, and/or materials, significant color changes, variable transparency of exterior wall materials, and shadows generated from trellises and overhangs.

Monolithic, un-articulated glass or concrete structures are highly discouraged.
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Consistent Process

This section provides a means for ensuring architectural continuity with the vision of the master plan. The themes outlined in this chapter are to be systematically applied to the various projects as they are built over a period of many years. To be used throughout the development of the project, the following questions are intended to ensure that as each new building or project is completed they:

- Portray an image of a unified whole to preserve and extend architectural continuity and cohesiveness
- Promote the established architectural vision and context through a unifying design theme of architectural features
- Promote a sense of place/community throughout the project

Directionary Questions

1) In what ways does this project reinforce the architectural character of the existing campus?

2) What components of the project address the need for a facility that is environmentally responsible and sustainable? Can this project be considered for LEED certification?

3) How does this project improve or contribute positively to the pedestrian experience of the campus? How does the project’s design affect the following aspects of the pedestrian experience:
   a) A positive sense of safety for the buildings’ users and passing pedestrians
   b) Aesthetic experience
   c) Comfort
   d) Connection to the immediate surroundings, the campus, and the local community
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4) How do pedestrian gateways contribute to the collegiate experience of the students, staff, and visitors? What features of the project distinguish it as a campus gateway?

5) In what ways does the project protect pedestrian pathways from the sun and rain?

6) How are landscaping, detailing, materials, and site features used to create the greatest possible aesthetic experience along pedestrian pathways and links between buildings and outdoor spaces?

7) How are the spaces created around the project and between the project and adjacent buildings compatible with their scale and location within the campus?

8) For what purposes are the new spaces created around the project between the project and adjacent buildings to be used?

9) What kinds of spaces have been created around the project and between the project and adjacent buildings?
   a) Courtyards
   b) Arcades
   c) Outdoor rooms
   d) Amphitheaters
   e) Places to sit

10) In what ways does this project and/or promote social interaction?

11) How do the common indoor and/or outdoor spaces provided in this project accommodate different group sizes and activities?

12) From what locations and buildings are the outdoor open spaces, pathways, and parking areas created as part of this project visible?
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13) To what level is the illumination of pathways, courtyards and open spaces between parking areas, buildings and the campus core provided for purposes of safety and visibility? How are hidden recesses and corners, and changes in elevations created in this project illuminated to adequately ensure the safety of students, staff, and visitors?

14) How are parkways, site entrances, and parking areas illuminated to adequately ensure the safety of students, staff, and visitors?

15) In what ways are conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular circulation routes minimized?

16) What makes the vehicular entrance clearly visible to approaching vehicles? How is the intersection designed to eliminate conflicts with off-site traffic? How are landscaping, detailing, materials, and site features used to create the greatest possible aesthetic experience at major vehicular entrances?
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Facilities Master Plan
Building Project Descriptions

The following is a brief description of each of the building projects in the Sequence. All projects address and satisfy a base set of facility issues, including accessibility and ADA compliance, improved instructional space, adequate faculty offices, meeting rooms and other program support spaces.

**Performing Arts Complex**

The Auditorium (1936), the Music Wing (1990) and the Art Court Theatre (1970) will be unified into the Performing Arts Complex. This project will provide updated building systems, improved room layout and efficiencies and much-needed modern fixtures to bring the building up to current performance facility standards. Improvements in the Music Wing will be limited to fire sprinklers.

**Hughes Stadium Modernization**

Design for the Hughes Stadium modernization has been completed. Upgrades include improving the general structural integrity and infrastructure. Replacement of the grass field with sports turf, replacement of the track and relocation of field events are also planned. Improvements will update the accessibility, safety and functionality of the 1928 facility. Renovations will be completed where possible. The renewal will be complete by summer 2012.
Mohr

Mohr Hall (1963), had the highest FCI number in 2003 for any building on campus, indicating the need for modernization of this 16,694 ASF building. Its building systems, lab spaces and other support facilities are outdated making this building a candidate for full building replacement. The new facilities will also be designed to match program needs, improving utilization. The new building will also include the assignable square footage from portable 11 which will removed at the completion of the Mohr building. A two story structure has been designed to reduce the footprint of the building while maintaining the same amount of usable area. Siting of the building should allow sufficient space for an additional building in this corner of the campus.

Lillard

Like Mohr Hall, Lillard Hall (1963) has many program-specific spaces with significant building systems that have become outdated and inefficient to operate and maintain. This modernization project will address those issues as well as program space needs to improve flexibility and create rooms appropriate in size and function. Primarily instructional space, Lillard Hall’s 27,238 ASF represent a major portion of the College’s traditional science laboratory space. After the modernization Lillard Hall will continue to serve these functions.
Student Services

The Student Services Building (1957) formally known as the Administration of Justice & Student Services Building is a small single story structure. The building housed the student bookstore until it moved to the Lusk Center in 1999. Student service functions have since moved into the vacated space. The balance of the existing student services functions are located within this building and in the first floor of Rodda North. An additional expansion of student services is still required.

Photography and journalism programmatically would benefit by being located adjacent to one another and in close proximity to the technology computer labs. Journalism, currently located in portable 26, does not have a permanent home. The Student Services Building would offer a great opportunity for both programs to be co-located in a permanent building near the Technology Building and Mac Lab.

The current building cannot be expanded to meet these needs due to the adjacent buildings and parking lot. The master plan is projecting the current building be demolished and replaced with a two story 16,000 ASF structure in order to maximize the limited footprint. Design and placement of this building should maintain the parking to the south (H Lot) and quad to the north of the building. Consideration also needs to be given to the service area north of the current building. Incorporation and aesthetic improvement of this area is included in this project.

Because of the first time visitor components of a Student Services Building, a 2 story structure offers an opportunity to create a statement building while still fitting into the context of the campus. The entry way should address the central quad of the campus and the east west axis that leads from the main student parking areas and light rail station.

Minor renovations might also be required on the first floor of Rodda after the completion of the Student Service Building. Some student service functions may be relocated into the Student Services Building allowing the remaining services to expand.
Rodda North

Rodda Hall North (1975), houses many administrative and student service programs, as well instructional and faculty spaces. A third floor renovation of 8,600 ASF will move the photography department to the Student Services Building and electronics to Lusk. The vacated space will be occupied by general instructional space and faculty offices. In order to consolidate the math department into Rodda buildings, the math department office will move out of the South Gym and the math classes currently held in Lusk will move into Rodda North.

TAP Plan - Surface Parking

A number of surface parking lot projects have been identified to improve accessibility, safety and utilize available land efficiently. The intent of the college is to consolidate accessible parking as close to the campus core as possible versus supplying a proportionate number of spaces to each lot. SCC also recognizes the need to provide more accessible spaces than the minimum number required by code to meet the needs of the student and faculty population. The eventual removal of portable buildings from the campus will also open up areas that can be repurposed back into staff parking.

The B and C lots, need to be upgraded to meet current accessibility codes and improve safety. Future, although currently unfunded, improvements to the H and G lots will include drop off areas along Freeport Boulevard. The H lot will need some slight adjustments to accommodate the drop off; however, the major renovations to the lot were recently completed. The G Lot will need more extensive improvements beyond the drop off which will include revamping the accessible parking. The area north of the Auditorium represents an area that could provide additional accessible parking for events held at the Performing Arts Complex.
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**New Instructional Space (Mohr 2)**

A new building (Building 22) will be constructed in proximity of the existing Mohr Hall. The two-story replacement of Mohr (Building 4) will create enough space for a multi-story building to house 17,880 additional asf. This new building will provide 3,800 afs of lecture space, 10,000 asf of laboratory space and up to 1,000 asf for a cafe. The New Instructional Building will provide additional program space for science, allied health and other related fields. The engineering laboratories in Lusk will be relocated to this new facility.

**Lusk Center**

Portions of the Lusk Center (1938), have been modernized previously for the Bookstore and some instructional space. The remaining portions need modernization to update building systems and reconfigure labs and support spaces to be more appropriate for the programs offered. Modernization will include renovations to LAC 11 for the electronics program.
Summary of Building Projects

The diagram below identifies the building projects identified in the master plan. The major program shifts, identified in red, may be adjusted as time and curriculum change. For parking projects, refer to the diagram on page 5-5.
Building Project Descriptions

Intentionally Left Blank