

## 6.0 Planning Workshops and Concepts

### INTRODUCTION

The development of the Facilities Master Plan was conducted in consultation with Ventura College's Facilities Oversight Group (FOG). This group met on a regular basis, on the second and fourth Thursday of each month, to discuss and advise on the development of the Facilities Master Plan.

### PARTICIPANTS

The permanent members of this group included:

Tom Kimberling- Chair  
Diane Moore  
Larry Manson  
Sandy Hajas  
Nancy Latham  
Joan Smith  
Kay Faulconer  
Steve Palladino  
Scot Rabe  
Ralph Fernandez  
Robert Forest  
Linda Rubenstein

In addition to this group, Team Leaders were assigned to various projects/buildings:

Learning Resource Center (LRC)  
Diane Moore  
Larry Manson  
Sandy Hajas

LRC Secondary Effects  
Lyn Macconnaire  
Nancy Latham  
Carol Weinstock  
Susan Bricker  
Carol Cressman



Facilities Oversight Group Meeting

1.0
2.0
3.0
4.0
5.0
<b>6.0</b>
7.0
8.0
9.0
10.0
11.0



Facilities Oversight Group Meeting

Theater/Performing Arts (G Building)

Jay Varela  
Judy Garey  
Bob Lawson

Advanced Technology Center (ATC)

Joan Smith  
Glenn Hisayasu  
Kay Faulconer  
Bob Regner

Science and Arts Facility (SAF)

Bob Renger  
Colin Terry

Science Building Safety Upgrades (SCI)

Bob Renger

Athletic Complex

Steve Tobias

Agriculture Building (AA)

Casey Mansfield  
Bill Theiman

Automotive, Machine and Welding Technology (APP,  
DP & S)

Glenn Hisayasu  
Casey Mansfield  
Alan Penula  
Scot Rabe  
Gary Lewis

Classrooms (J, K, U, UV and T)

Mayo De La Rocha  
Kay Faulconer  
Nancy Latham  
Diane Moore

Fine Arts Lab and Classroom (H)

Bob Moskowitz

Ellis Jump

Cafeteria, Bookstore and Student Center (B & E)

Tom Kimberling  
Abdallah Alsadek  
RaeAnn Lappo  
Richard Lapaglia  
Lyn Macconnaire  
Glenn Hisayasu

Warehouse

Robert Forest  
Bob Reeves

General Purpose Classroom Building (GPC)

All College Deans  
Art Sanford

Health Science Complex (HSC)

Steve Tobias  
Joan Beem  
Meredith Mundell

Science and Arts Facility (SAF)

Ellis Jump  
Bob Moskowitz

Maintenance and Operations Complex (M&O)

Tom Kimberling  
Robert Forest  
Bob Reeves

Infrastructure

Tom Kimberling  
Robert Forest

Parking

Tom Kimberling  
Robert Forest  
Campus Police

Student Health Center (CR)



Facilities Oversight Group Meeting

1.0
2.0
3.0
4.0
5.0
<b>6.0</b>
7.0
8.0
9.0
10.0
11.0



Master Plan options from April 24, 2003 FOG Meeting (above and below)



Elaine Tennen  
**SUMMARY OF MEETINGS**

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 1**  
September 12, 2002

At this meeting the Bond Measure S project list, project descriptions, project phasing and preliminary Facilities Master Plan documents were issued. The committee charge was discussed and future meeting dates and training schedules were arranged.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 2**  
September 26, 2002

At this meeting the Experience Engineering training was organized, including the ground rules, purpose and goals, magnitude and significance of the Measure S projects, theory of Experience Engineering, the field projects and the reference material in “The Disney Way” and “Discovering the Soul of Service”.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 3**  
October 17, 2002

At this meeting the results of the Experience Engineering field projects were discussed.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 4**  
October 31, 2002

At this meeting the “First Contact” task force project was presented, student perceptions to the campus were discussed and the preliminary results of site visits were reviewed. The guiding principles were introduced and the members were asked to work closely with their departments.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 5**  
November 14, 2002

At this meeting the group reviewed the draft guiding



principles for Ventura College. Which set the stage for the overall Master Plan criteria.

### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 6**

December 5, 2002

At this meeting facilities planning, design and construction processes were discussed, including the JCM Group's role, the Bond Measure S funding, phasing of expenditure, master plan content and the planning and design "guiding principles".

This meeting was also a training session for project leaders focusing on the development of project descriptions, including: goals, objectives, criteria, programming and outcomes.

### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 7**

January 23, 2003

The project leaders presented their draft project descriptions.

### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 8**

February 6, 2003

At this meeting the preliminary draft narratives were reviewed and a schedule for individual task force meetings with the master plan consultants was developed.

### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 9**

February 27, 2003

At this meeting the development of the Facilities Master Plan from the Educational Master Plan was discussed. A work plan, scope of work and consultant list was submitted by Leo A Daly for FOG review.

### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 10**

March 13, 2003

Goals and objectives were discussed with and



Master Plan options from April 24, 2003 FOG Meeting (above and below)





"Pirates Walk" concept as discussed by AHBE at the 05.09.03 FOG Meeting (above and below)

emphasis on identifying successful and unsuccessful examples on campus. Land use and organization of the campus was discussed in specific categories, including: zones of use, Universal Design, edges, signage, parking, public access, food service, landscaping and planetarium location options.

### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 11**

March 27, 2003

At this meeting climatic data and its impact on the physical master plan was discussed. In addition, existing parking locations and numbers, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, successful campus outdoor spaces, campus zoning, and existing building conditions were discussed.

The Imirzian and Committee master plans were compared and critiqued.

Options for the locations and sizes of future campus parking structures were discussed.



### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 12**

April 10, 2003

At this meeting options for the organization of the campus, including new facilities were presented and discussed.

### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 13**

April 24, 2003

At this meeting the master plan organization options were reviewed, opportunities for alignments between the Educational Master Plan and the Facilities Master Plan, locations of new construction and demolitions, and strategies for support services were discussed.

### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 14**

May 2, 2003

At this meeting the results of a campus landscape questionnaire were reviewed, including positive and negative perceptions, landmarks, outdoor functions, and the identification of important large-scale, small-scale and special places on the campus. The questionnaire also measured perceptions on the condition of landscape, hardscape and accessory elements. The questionnaire also gathered a number of suggested locations for information kiosks and new way-finding signage.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 15**  
May 9, 2003

At this meeting the landscape master plan development was reviewed, the facilities master plan was presented in terms of development zones and the balance of demolition and new construction to align with the Educational Master Plan was discussed.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 16**  
June 05, 2003

At this meeting the LRC Building exterior colors were reviewed and approved and the overall LRC project was presented to the committee.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 17**  
June 26, 2003

At this meeting landscape schemes were presented, discussed and strategies selected for the major outdoor spaces on the campus, including entry markers.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 18**  
July 24, 2003

The Measure S projects were discussed in terms of a prioritized list, project scope descriptions and preliminary cost opinions.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 19**



Example of grand open space (above),  
Pedestrian paths weaving through lush landscape (below)



1.0
2.0
3.0
4.0
5.0
6.0
7.0
8.0
9.0
10.0
11.0

August 7, 2003

The Measure S funding was discussed in terms of priorities, cost opinions, available matching funds, and deferral of planned projects.

A phasing sequence for the construction of the proposed Advanced Technology Center/General Purpose Classroom building and the Health Sciences Center was presented and discussed.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 20**

August 14, 2003

The Measure S Project Descriptions and the Phase 1B Project Narratives were discussed.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 21**

September 4, 2003

An update on the development of the landscape master plan was made, including issues concerning maintenance and operating costs.

Facilities Master Plan implementation issues were discussed and project phasing strategies explored.

Interim parking suggestions were discussed.

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 22**

September 25, 2003

At this meeting the landscape concepts were presented by AHBE landscape architects. AHBE presented the overall campus landscape plan and discussed the main open spaces through a series of diagrams and photographs.

The plant material selection for the campus, as described by a series of diagrams and photos was discussed. Site furnishings and hardscape options were also presented and discussed.



### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 23**

October 9, 2003

Parking solution options were presented by two FOG members.

Interim parking solutions were presented, showing overall parking gains from the re-striping of the East Parking Lot and the Pool Lot, as well as extending the parking lot south of the tennis courts to the Pool Lot.

Possible locations for disabled student parking were presented and discussed. Possible locations for Staff parking were also discussed.

Drop-off locations were discussed and approved by the FOG.

### **Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 24**

October 23, 2003

Jack Biesek of Biesek Design presented options for site signage.

Further discussion from the past FOG meetings regarding possibilities for site parking and drop-off zones were discussed and the locations approved.

The main focus of the meeting was the on-going problem among FOG members regarding the northeast zone of the campus. Alex Ward of Leo A Daly presented various options for the arrangement of buildings in this zone. There was a concensus among the FOG group for the final building locations for Measure S projects and future building locations for non-measure S funded projects.

A standardized lecture classroom design was presented. Two person tables in place of tablet arm chairs in the classrooms was approved.

1.0
2.0
3.0
4.0
5.0
<b>6.0</b>
7.0
8.0
9.0
10.0
11.0

**Facilities Oversight Group Meeting 26**

November 13, 2003

Standardized classroom and equipment diagrams for both lecture classrooms and computer labs were presented. Two options were presented for the lecture classroom, classrooms with tablet arm chairs and with two person desks. Again, FOG concluded that the two person desk is the desired solution to their classroom needs.

The final master plan was presented for approval from the FOG in order to move into the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process.

Melissa Mascali of Ricon Consultants presented the process for completion of the Environmental Impact Report and the issues the report will address.

**Comprehensive Master Plan Presentation**

December 11, 2003

Vince Coffeen and Alex Ward of Leo A Daly presented the proposed Facilities Master Plan to the entire campus community. The process of the master plan development and the decisions made from the collaboration with the FOG group were discussed. The presentation boards and the Master Plan document draft were delivered.

In addition to the FOG meetings, the campus master plan has been developed in consultation with the Project Leaders, students, faculty, staff and the campus police.

**SUMMARY OF CONCEPTS**

The FOG and other consultative meetings have provided the master planning process with valuable feedback, direction, ideas and enthusiasm. Some of the

major planning concepts identified and incorporated into the Facilities Master Plan include:

Create an aesthetically pleasing campus through planning open and inviting outdoor spaces, thoughtful sight-lines, sweeping views of mountains, valley and sea, wide and attractive walkways, water features, public art, a unifying color palette, colorful plant palette and generous, open and naturally daylit buildings.

Reinforce the collegiate appearance of the campus with prestigious buildings, modern/high-tech, well-equipped classrooms and coordinated landscaping, walkways and arcades.

Implement design principles to provide continuity between the various construction projects planned for the campus through consistent architectural themes, surfaces and materials, consistent exterior lighting, the use of landscape and hardscape elements to unify buildings and outdoor spaces, the control of unwanted noise and the encouragement of pleasant sound (birds, water, breezes through landscape), the employment of low-maintenance/low-water demand landscaping, the planning of low-energy-use/low-maintenance buildings, the planning of parking and utility elements to be visually unobtrusive, welcoming and identifiable building entries, a complementary blending of existing and new buildings, a balance of scale, height and massing of buildings, well-planned outdoor areas for student use, the incorporation of study areas within buildings, convenient access to food service and faculty offices, adequate and appropriate placement of clocks, spacious bathroom facilities, the provision of heating and air-conditioning to meet nationally-recognized comfort level standards, Universal Design, the ability to retrofit utilities in the future and support evolving and new technologies, rounded edges to wall corners in high-traffic areas and an architectural expression that evokes a sense of fun, well-being and belonging.

Make the campus user-friendly through the provision

1.0
2.0
3.0
4.0
5.0
6.0
7.0
8.0
9.0
10.0
11.0

of good signage and way-finding, functional building names, manned kiosks, adequate parking, weather protection, wide walkways, spacious bathrooms, Universal Design, comfortable furnishings, welcoming spaces, community use and other such strategies.

Support the health and safety goals of the campus through designated smoking areas, panic button alarms, security lighting, crosswalks and maintenance.

Plan for a well-maintained campus through the selection of low-maintenance landscaping and facility design, ease of cleaning, adequate and well placed bulletin boards and clean and attractive classrooms.

Plan for sustainable design and construction practices that minimize the negative effects of the development on the environment through the application of energy-efficient design and other sustainable design principles.

New development zones should be contiguous with the academic campus core area.

Building placement should define high-quality outdoor spaces, circulation and social spaces.

Compact and efficient building envelopes and higher density within development footprints will conserve open space and reduce energy and operating costs.

The replacement of facilities is planned with the demolition of obsolete facilities.

Modular and standardized classrooms, where appropriate, allow for more flexible use and higher utilization.

These concepts are further elaborated in Chapter 10, Design Guidelines.