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The word *campus*, more than any other term, sums up the unique physical character of the American college and university. When it was first used to describe the grounds of a college, probably at Princeton in the late eighteenth century, *campus* had simply its Latin meaning, a field, and described the *green expansiveness* already distinctive of the American schools. But gradually the word assumed wider significance, until at most colleges it came to mean the entire property, including buildings, so that one could speak even of an "urban campus" that might possess nothing remotely resembling a field. In 1925, the German city planner Werner Hegemann, writing about America, defined *campus* for his countrymen as "a piece of land that is covered with the buildings of an American university." But beyond these purely physical meanings, the word has taken on other connotations, suggesting the *pervasive spirit of a school*, or *its genus loci, as embodied in its architecture and grounds*. *Campus* sums up the distinctive physical qualities of the American college, but also *its integrity as a self-contained community and its architectural expression of educational and social ideals*. As early as the 1870s the term was so evocative that an observer of one American college could write, "There is no spell more powerful to recall the memories of college life than the word Campus."

Paul Venable Turner


[Bold Italics added for emphasis.]
Introduction

The College of Marin was founded in 1926; it grew steadily through the nineteen sixties and early seventies. In the late sixties and early seventies several new buildings were built on the Kentfield Campus. At that same time a complete new College of Marin campus was built at Indian Valley on the southwest side of Novato. The enrollment growth projected for the seventies and eighties did not occur. Presently, the College is serving a region that has had relatively little population growth since that burst of new construction. Accordingly, there have not been any significant new buildings or major renovation and capital renewal projects since that earlier period. Moreover, the physical plants at both the Kentfield and Indian Valley campuses are aging such that major capital renewal or replacement is needed to restore the physical condition and meet contemporary standards of educational adequacy.

Only limited funds from the State are anticipated to be available, so the District is looking at other ways to finance the needed renewal as discussed in subsequent sections of this report. The District has not had a major capital improvement program for several decades.

The Marin Community College District retained 3D/International (3D/I) to develop a facilities master plan and a statement of facility needs. The work began with assessing the physical condition of the existing facilities and documenting the repair, rehabilitation, and modernization needs—presented in the Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA), a separate report—followed by the development of a statement of new facility needs.

This report summarizes our findings and recommendations. It is divided into two major sections following this Executive Summary plus appendices. These sections present more detailed information about the major concepts and tasks presented in this Executive Summary. The first major section, the Facilities Master Plan, describes the organizing principles adopted for the Kentfield Campus and the Indian Valley Campus and establishes the long-term goals for development of both campuses to provide for the anticipated changes in type and possibly size of enrollment and activities. In the second section, the Projects List, the individual projects that are recommended by this study and that are the basis for the bond referendum to be presented to the voters are described with simple narratives and graphics.

The findings of the Facility Condition Assessment are summarized in an appendix to this report.
During the course of the investigations, the College has reached the following conclusions that support the need for expanded and improved facilities:

- Statewide budget cuts are affecting the College’s ability to provide the facilities and educational equipment needed to deliver high-quality affordable education for local students.

- Existing facilities are suffering from cuts in maintenance and capital renewal budgets and are falling behind in educational adequacy.

- The College will retain and operate both the Kentfield and the Indian Valley Campuses with Kentfield remaining as the “main campus” and Indian Valley being reformatted as a multi-institution “Educational Park” where the District and selected educational partners will provide a range of educational services to the community.

- The College must continue to provide facilities and specialized job training programs to meet the needs of local communities and to allow students and adults to acquire or upgrade job skills in these tough economic times. Facilities upgrades are necessary to enable the District to accomplish this mission.

- Because the University of California and California State University systems are becoming more expensive and difficult to enter, more people rely on community colleges; therefore, College of Marin must be upgraded so it can provide local students with a high quality education they might otherwise not receive.

Process

The District has embarked on a methodical process of facilities evaluation and planning since 2002 to reach the current level of definition of needs and remedies. The effort has involved faculty, staff, administration, students, the community, and outside consultants working together for the good of the College.

Activities to date have included:

- Facility Condition Assessment of both campuses
- Strategic Facilities Assessment and Approaches to Redevelopment
- First Round of Community meetings to seek community input and understand community expectations
- Development of Facilities Master Plan
- Two Community Opinion Surveys
- Financial Analysis
• Demographics Analysis
• Energy Consumption/Operating Cost Analysis
• Sustainable Building, i.e. “Green” Principles developed and adopted
• Second Round of Community Meetings
• Evaluation of all data and consideration of funding options, including the possibility of a facilities bond measure

As the District goes forward with the facilities initiative, additional planning activities will be required as a continuation of the planning efforts to date. Additional planning activities needed to implement a specific facilities program plan when such a program plan is developed in detail and is scheduled to begin, include the following:

I. Program Preparation—necessary groundwork for successful, efficient program
   a. Alignment of Strategic Plan with Facilities Program
      i. Verification of the strategic academic plan
      ii. Assess impact of any strategic plan changes on the facilities program
   b. Environmental Impact Reports
      i. Geotechnical engineers look for underground storage tanks, pollution sites, etc.
      ii. Geotechnical surveys and reporting
      iii. Coordination with appropriate state and federal agencies’ reporting and testing requirements
   c. Utilities
      i. Coordination with local utilities providers
         1. Locations
         2. Capacities
   d. Traffic
      i. Evaluation of current traffic patterns
      ii. Growth management for proposed program
      iii. Coordination with local authorities
   e. Verify Existing Conditions Mapping
   f. Systems and Controls
      i. Policies and procedures
      ii. Documentation and reporting
      iii. Cost and schedule controls
      iv. Web-based collaboration tools
      v. Systems to update and monitor the progress of facility condition assessment information
   g. Public Interface
      i. Public access website for project information
      ii. Public relations component to keep people informed

II. Design Guidelines and Standards
   a. Why Set Standards?
i. Defines campus identity
ii. Improves program efficiency
iii. Reduces cost
iv. Maintains quality
v. Builds consensus

b. Overall Design Goals
   i. Esthetics
   ii. Adaptability
   iii. Sustainability

c. Site Guidelines and Standards
   i. Parking
   ii. Wayfinding
   iii. Landscaping
   iv. Hardscaping

d. Building Systems
   i. MEP
   ii. Technology
   iii. Finishes
   iv. Materials

e. Educational Space Standards
   i. Space Allocations
   ii. Quality of Space
   iii. Instructional Aids

III. Project Definition
   a. Evaluation of individual projects in the context of the overall master plan/program
   b. Charrette sessions to define priorities and goals for project
   c. Contextual/esthetic analysis
   d. Space planning
   e. Budget analysis
   f. Produce project program to give to project architects

The Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) was conducted in 2002 under a separate contract through the Foundation for California Community Colleges to assess all of the State’s community colleges and develop a system-wide database of facility conditions. Specialists from 3D/I examined maintenance records and inspected the facilities while collecting data that was processed into 3D/I’s assessment software called COMET.

During the first half of 2002, the College commissioned a San Francisco real estate and facilities-oriented management consulting firm, Conversion Management Associates (CMA), to help the Board evaluate several scenarios for the disposition and/or redevelopment of its campuses. The five scenarios ranged from do nothing to sell both campuses and build a new one. This
study brought many issues to light while delving into utilization, facility condition, and development options for each campus.

As part of the evaluation process, the College held six community meetings to solicit opinions and desires for the future of the College and the campuses. The importance of the College to the Marin community was evidenced by the significant turnout for these meetings and the high level of participation. These meetings gauged the community’s commitment to both campuses.

The Board of Trustees then determined that the College would retain both the Kentfield and Indian Valley Campuses. Significant renovation would be required to improve the operational capability and appearance of the existing facilities. In addition, some new construction would be needed to replace buildings that are beyond their useful lives and to provide contemporary educational adequacy and capacity to allow for a return to previous higher enrollments.

**Facilities Master Plan**

The facility needs determination reported in this document, *Facilities Master Plan*, began in May 2003 with intense activity from August through October. 3D/I conducted numerous work sessions with faculty, staff, students, administration, and board members. (See List of Interviews in Appendix) Additionally, the 3D/I team conducted numerous one-on-one interviews with faculty and staff from both Colleges and several community representatives. The team enjoyed frequent collaboration with Dr. Lois Callahan, Interim President/Superintendent, Dr. Michael Beebe, Vice President for Business Services, and Dr. Jan Dargl, Vice President for Academic Affairs.

During the initial stages of this study, 3D/I commissioned four consultants to assist in this planning effort. These consultants reviewed the architectural and landscape design traditions, assessed the general accessibility, and researched utility capacities and environmental constraints to development at both the Kentfield and Indian Valley campuses. These consultants were KMD Architects from San Francisco, Sandis Humber Jones Civil Engineers from Oakland, RHAA Landscape Architects from Mill Valley, and Sally Swanson Associates ADA Consultants from San Francisco.

In the first quarter of 2004, 3D/I commissioned three additional consultants to address specific issues not included in the initial analysis. A demographics consultant, Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographics Research, Inc., was commissioned to study historical and anticipated enrollment trends at the College of Marin and two engineering consultants, Capital Engineering
Consultants and The Engineering Enterprise, were commissioned to evaluate anticipated energy savings based on the assumption that all new and modernized facilities would be designed and built using “green” building standards.

**Linkage to the Educational Master Plan**

At the same time the facilities needs determination and other investigations were progressing, the College was preparing an updated Educational Master Plan with an in-house committee. Information from this process helped assure that the *Facilities Master Plan* will meet the educational objectives of the District. The *Facilities Master Plan* has embraced the goals and objectives of the Educational Master Plan to date. The *Facilities Master Plan* incorporates the following themes from Educational Master Planning effort:

- A re-balancing of programs offered rather than a substantial change in types of programs
- An assumption that enrollment will remain steady
- A demand for more Advanced Technology Classrooms (ATC’s) for all departments
- Better-integrated student support services such as study spaces
- The advantages of shared, flexible space for interdisciplinary initiatives
- The desire to offer Contract Education, on campus and off, with the need for seminar space
- College of Marin as “THE Center of Marin” for the arts, lectures, and cultural events
- Expansion of links and partnerships with educational institutions and other organizations.

Much additional collaboration during the programming phase and during detailed plan development will occur during the program definition phase described above.

Taking the results of the Facility Condition Assessment, considering issues communicated by the on-going Educational Master Plan team, and the “wish list” for new facilities gathered through the interview process, 3D/I developed a series of projects that combined new (including replacement) facilities, renovations, and site improvements to achieve the Master Plan for...
each campus. Several iterations with College leadership were required to arrive at the recommendations in this report.

The Facilities Master Plan represents a long-term vision for the College that is independent of the funding sources. This report anticipates a bond program to pay for most of the projects. The College will continue to seek State funding as well as donations.

The “finalist” projects are grouped by types of related projects (preparatory, modernization, infrastructure, and new construction), and are prioritized as either “Critically Needed” or as “Desirable”. “Critical” priority projects must be implemented within an approximately ten-year time frame if the District is to continue to be able to deliver high quality education to the community. If these critical needs are not addressed in that time frame, significant degradation of the educational mission will inevitably occur as buildings are taken off-line and as the District’s educational equipment becomes ever more obsolete.

Investigation of Facilities Financing Alternatives

There are three sources of facilities funding potentially available to the District: operating funds, State Capital Project outlay, and funds from a local facilities bond measure. Diverting operating funds for construction of new facilities means cutting programs, something the District is very reluctant to do. The amount of State Capital outlay funds allocated to the College of Marin have never been great. Due to the fact that the College has not had local matching funds, in recent years COM has received little or no State Funding. Thus, a local facilities bond appears to be the only practical financing option for a major facilities program for the district.

Survey of Voters

The Survey of Voters conducted by Godbe Research in November 2003 found significant support among the 600 District constituents surveyed. A carefully crafted and balanced questionnaire was used with each respondent to assess the level of support for an approximate $225 million bond and to determine issues that seem most important to voters. The following are some of the key conclusions reported to the Board.

- Sufficient support (55%) for the bond was reached at a maximum of $22 per $100,000 of assessed valuation.
• Support for the measure increased to 63% with additional information.
• “Maintaining existing community college facilities” ranked within the top four issues of importance for respondents.
• “Maintaining” college facilities is more important to voters that “Renovating” or “Building” new community college facilities.
• Features of the measure that tested highest:
  o Modernization of the Kentfield Science Center
  o Providing state-of-the-art computer technology at both campuses
  o Improvements in campus accessibility for the disabled at both campuses
  o Improved security and safety systems
• Positive arguments that tested highest in support of the measure:
  o The community college provides affordable educational opportunities for those who need it
  o A community college education is one of the best bargains in the Bay Area
  o This measure will fund remodeling to improve energy efficiency at the college campuses saving future costs
• A public education campaign is necessary in order to mitigate the potential negative perceptions of the College that tested against the measure.

We find the results of the Survey of Voters extremely encouraging, considering there has been no public education campaign initiated yet. The more the Voters know about the College of Marin, the more positive the results.

**Bond Financing Analysis**

The College of Marin commissioned Public Financial Management, Inc. of San Francisco to prepare an analysis of the District’s bonding capacity and the related cost to Marin County property owners, assuming the majority of the plan would be funded by a General Obligation Bond.

In a report presented to the Board of Trustees on December 9, 2003, Public Financial Management, Inc. stated that the current assessed valuation within Marin Community College District is approximately $39 billion, providing sufficient bonding capacity.
The cost to the average homeowner in the District, based on the assumption that General Obligation Bonds will be issued for between $175 million and $250 million, will range from $55 to $85 per year.

**Demographics Analysis**

Lapkoff & Gobalet, demographic consultants, were engaged to analyze the demographic characteristics of the District’s potential student base. They determined that there will be minimal growth in Marin County over the next several years. Thus the Facilities Masterplan approach has been to understand what is needed to allow the District to continue to offer high-quality educational opportunities to the citizens of the District and County for the next 40 years.

**Sustainable “Green” Construction Principles and Energy Analysis**

The Board of Trustees has expressed a commitment to embrace “green” building standards and “sustainable” design standards for all future construction projects. This is a sound position to adopt, not only from an environmental perspective, but also from an operating cost perspective.

Capital Engineering Consultants and The Engineering Enterprise conducted a study that compared current energy consumption, at the Learning Resource Center on the Kentfield Campus, to the expected energy consumption if the building were to completely modernized to LEEDS standards. As expected, this study proved that for this building alone, the College of Marin would realize a reduction in operating costs of at least $53,000.00, which is approximately $.81 per square foot. If we apply the same rate to all COM facilities, the District would realize savings in energy related operating costs of approximately $410,000.00 annually.

The district then moved to adopt a “Sustainable Facilities Construction and Operation” resolution at the Board Meeting of July 20, 2004.

**Second Round of Community Meetings**

The College conducted another series of community meetings in April of 2004 to share the recommendations from this report and seek additional input from the public regarding appropriate actions. As a result, a refined proposed projects list will be prepared.
Over a period of about two months, a staff of several 3D/International architects and engineers performed an Existing Facility Assessment of the Marin Community College District’s facilities at both campuses. The physical condition assessment of existing facilities resulted in a separate report issued as a stand-alone volume in the fourth quarter of 2002. The key existing facility condition findings and costs to repair, as reported in this earlier volume, are provided for reference in the Facility Condition Assessment Executive Summary in the appendix of this report.

A visual inspection of the District’s existing facilities was conducted to identify the condition and to estimate the cost to perform the necessary maintenance, repairs and renovations.

The Facilities Condition Assessment reported on the current physical condition of fifteen of the District’s buildings at Kentfield and four clusters at Indian Valley, totaling approximately 357,599 gross square feet and 150,770 gross square feet respectively.

The results of the assessment are summarized in the Facility Condition Index Table on the next page. The estimated initial cost to repair the facilities (i.e., to renew the component systems to a “like new” condition) at Kentfield totals $45.1 million with a projection of the need for an additional $18.9 million for systems replacement over the next ten years. For Indian Valley facilities these numbers are $18.7 million and $9.3 million respectively.

- The overall FCI of 36.40% at Kentfield and 37.42% at Indian Valley indicates that overall the District’s facilities are in poor condition from a life cycle point of view.
- None of the major buildings on the Kentfield or Indian Valley campuses have an FCI of 10% or less, the range considered representative of a building in good condition. Two building are between 10% and 20%, one of which is the most recent of the old buildings (Harlan Center).
- Most other buildings have an FCI far in excess of 10% -- between 20% and 50%. One building exceeds 70% (Bolinas Marine Station). Major systems in these buildings are nearing the end of their life cycle thresholds which accounts for the large expenditures projected for the next ten years.
- The worst building is the Administrative Center at Kentfield, one of the oldest, which has an FCI that exceeds 100%.
More discussion on the methodology is included in the Facilities Condition Assessment Executive Summary in the appendices of this report. The detailed findings for each of the District’s buildings is provided in the FCA Report issued to the District as a separate volume.

Capital renewal cost estimates in the FCA report were used in developing the rough order of magnitude budgets or cost allocations for modernization projects for existing facilities.

As part of a statewide effort in conjunction with the California Community College Chancellor’s office and the Foundation for California Community Colleges, 3D/I conducted Facility Condition Assessments for all 72 California Community College Districts, which included 108 separate campuses, and over 48 million square feet of buildings.

The FCI’s for these Districts ranged from a low of .04% to a high of approximately 50% for a campus consisting of primarily portable buildings. With an FCI of approximately 37%, the College of Marin ranks in the lower 10% of all Community College Districts, actually 66 out of 72 Districts.

That means that 65, or over 90%, of the California Community College Districts have facilities in better condition than those at the College of Marin. Yet, Marin County is one of the wealthier counties in California and the nation!

The Facilities Condition Assessment Executive Summary illustrates how it would take an investment of approximately $4.4 million per year over the next 10 years to maintain the current FCI, which is worse than 90% of the Community College Districts in California. However, according to the District’s records, over the past five years, an average of $1.5 million per year has been spent on maintaining the buildings and grounds. If the District does not undertake a major capital improvement plan, while continuing to fund the same amount annually on maintenance, in 10 years the FCI will raise to well over 50% from the current 38%.

The other factor to consider relating to the condition of the current facilities is educational/functional adequacy. The newest facilities at IVC are nearly 30 years old. Since there have been no major renovations or modernizations in the past 30 years, the facilities are educationally and functionally inadequate in many ways. This deficiency is not reflected in the FCI.

As illustrated by the references in the margin to the left, the built environment has a measurable effect on student performance. The literature is filled with results of similar studies.

"Studies associate 13% to 26% higher scores on standardized tests with well-designed day lighting."


"Carbon dioxide levels in schools decrease student performance on tests and increase complaints of health problems."


“A GAO study found acoustics to be the biggest problem in 2/3rds of the schools they surveyed."

## Facility Condition Index Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Gross SF</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Repair Cost</th>
<th>Replacement Cost</th>
<th>FCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kentfield Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Center</td>
<td>50,837</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>$6,237,105</td>
<td>$15,848,669</td>
<td>39.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Center/Childrens Center</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>$1,304,430</td>
<td>$1,252,195</td>
<td>104.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolinas Marine Lab</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>$180,631</td>
<td>$250,454</td>
<td>72.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolinas Marine Station</td>
<td>3,333</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>$485,988</td>
<td>$1,120,611</td>
<td>34.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Management Center</td>
<td>5,429</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>$788,972</td>
<td>$1,805,644</td>
<td>43.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Center/Landscape Center</td>
<td>9,604</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>$1,427,940</td>
<td>$3,808,264</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond P.E. Center/Gymnasium</td>
<td>36,392</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>$4,690,560</td>
<td>$12,890,938</td>
<td>36.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson Hall</td>
<td>11,870</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>$866,878</td>
<td>$3,947,871</td>
<td>21.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Students Center</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>$87,241</td>
<td>$588,312</td>
<td>14.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCLRC/Lib./Bookstore/ESL/CIS</td>
<td>65,575</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>$6,458,868</td>
<td>$23,175,090</td>
<td>27.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Art/Art Gallery/Box Offic.</td>
<td>79,636</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>$13,358,745</td>
<td>$28,206,386</td>
<td>36.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusselman Hall</td>
<td>14,717</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>$2,285,791</td>
<td>$5,212,635</td>
<td>38.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan Center</td>
<td>25,651</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>$1,563,038</td>
<td>$8,521,562</td>
<td>18.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olney Hall</td>
<td>12,227</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>$1,357,843</td>
<td>$4,066,606</td>
<td>33.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stdt.Serv.Cen./Cafe/Emeritus</td>
<td>36,227</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>$3,979,059</td>
<td>$13,138,283</td>
<td>30.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Gross SF</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Repair Cost</th>
<th>Replacement Cost</th>
<th>FCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indian Valley Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pomo</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$731,753</td>
<td>$1,874,841</td>
<td>39.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 Auto Body and Fender</td>
<td>8,824</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$642,660</td>
<td>$2,867,175</td>
<td>22.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Auto Technology Lab</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$1,384,235</td>
<td>$2,984,377</td>
<td>46.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Medical Asst/Class/Lab/Ofc.</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$564,972</td>
<td>$1,877,214</td>
<td>30.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Indust. Tech/Machine &amp; Mtls</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$686,661</td>
<td>$1,689,632</td>
<td>51.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Classrooms/Food Vending</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$1,653,815</td>
<td>$3,017,910</td>
<td>54.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Geol/Geog/Bio/Chem</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$690,212</td>
<td>$1,462,181</td>
<td>47.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Class/Office/ESL</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$476,154</td>
<td>$1,767,068</td>
<td>26.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Administrative Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Admissions/Student Services</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$388,222</td>
<td>$1,243,330</td>
<td>31.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Admin. Services/Health Cntr</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$363,881</td>
<td>$1,209,726</td>
<td>30.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ASIVC Office</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$203,473</td>
<td>$482,195</td>
<td>42.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Info. Services Center</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$476,154</td>
<td>$1,767,068</td>
<td>26.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Book Store/ Child Care</td>
<td>5,804</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$559,503</td>
<td>$1,950,347</td>
<td>28.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Miwok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Art Labs/Gallery/Classrooms</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$1,038,817</td>
<td>$3,017,910</td>
<td>34.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Foreign Language lab</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$628,586</td>
<td>$1,462,181</td>
<td>42.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Assoc. Students/Lounge/Deli</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$931,381</td>
<td>$2,047,054</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dig. Village Bus. Cluster</td>
<td>8,610</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$1,155,062</td>
<td>$2,887,134</td>
<td>40.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Library</td>
<td>14,280</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$1,324,235</td>
<td>$4,201,563</td>
<td>31.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ohlone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Compr/Court Rept Labs</td>
<td>4,187</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$699,875</td>
<td>$1,360,479</td>
<td>51.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Ofc Occup/Court Rept/Comp</td>
<td>16,356</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$1,950,909</td>
<td>$5,484,548</td>
<td>35.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Food Vend/PE/Class Rooms</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$1,017,690</td>
<td>$2,169,227</td>
<td>46.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Pool/Shower/Locker Room</td>
<td>9,506</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$1,179,536</td>
<td>$3,543,944</td>
<td>33.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Campus Police/Corp Yard</td>
<td>4,273</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$271,213</td>
<td>$1,435,878</td>
<td>18.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilities Master Plan

The Facilities Master Plan identifies 40 projects that are needed to accommodate the projected changes and possible growth in enrollment and to accomplish capital renewal. Twenty-one projects are on the Kentfield Campus; 18 are on the Indian Valley Campus, and one is for the Bolinas Marine Lab. The Projects List sorts the projects into primary projects plus several alternates. Some projects may eventually not be recommended for inclusion in the final bond referendum. The projected costs for all of the projects total some $267 million. The 40 projects will:

- **Construct** 210,000 gsf in four buildings and two expansions at Kentfield
  80,000 gsf in 2 buildings at Indian Valley

- **Modernize** 310,000 gsf by renovating 7 buildings at Kentfield
  135,700 gsf by renovating 4 clusters of buildings at Indian Valley

- **Demolish** 80,000 gsf in 6 buildings at Kentfield

- **Enhance and expand campus utilities, roads, sidewalks, courtyards, lawns, and landscape features.**

- **Develop a multi-institutional educational park at Indian Valley**

**Kentfield Campus**

The primary emphasis at Kentfield will be the modernization and/or replacement of the existing inventory of 30-plus-year old buildings. Strategic demolition of most of the oldest, smallest, and least functional buildings will provide space on the site for new construction to meet acute needs for student processing, technology, teaching, and campus operations.

The following site plan illustrates the existing buildings recommended to be demolished.
The following site plan illustrates the existing buildings to be expanded or those recommended to replace demolished buildings.

The following site plan illustrates the existing buildings to be modernized.
Indian Valley Campus

The current plans to develop an educational park directly influence the future development of the campus. The existing clusters of buildings allow for a multi-institutional campus to develop with the College of Marin at Indian Valley occupying the largest and most comprehensive cluster (Pomo Cluster) and the Administrative Services Cluster. New buildings would be those that are typically shared by the various institutions, such as student life, community and conference center, and amphitheater, but at least one new facility will be required to expand the capacity of the Pomo Cluster to house the consolidated activities of the College.

The following site plan illustrates those buildings to be “preserved” for future use, proposed expansion projects and proposed modernization projects.


**Projects List**

The proposed projects have been listed in the categories or types of related projects (preparatory, modernization, infrastructure, and new construction) with no priority intended. The final prioritized list for a bond proposal, as determined by the Board and the administration prior to a bond referendum, will be subject to change as the bond proposal process unfolds, but major rearrangements are not anticipated.