Overview

The primary goal of this study was to develop a long-range master plan for both campuses of the College of Marin and recommend a catalog of facilities projects for inclusion in a bond referendum for 2004 elections. These projects will remedy current and anticipated deficiencies and support potential growth. To achieve this goal, the facilities needs should be accommodated in an orderly manner within the framework of a master plan. Although the details of some projects and the timing proposed in this report may vary in the actual execution, the framework of the plan should be honored such that the final outcome will match the vision, if not the details.

The secondary goal was to define projects suitable for inclusion in a bond referendum for the November 2004 elections.

The Facilities Master Plan (the “Plan”) and the component projects reported in this document were developed by 3D/I along these steps:

1. Conduct a facility condition assessment (refer to Appendix A) to ascertain what work is required to sustain, renew or replace the existing inventory;
2. Develop a “wish list” of new facilities and site improvements;
3. Examine the current draft educational master plan to confirm and justify facility needs to support educational programs;
4. Determine a “most wanted / most needed” list for both new and renovated facilities;
5. Develop project descriptions and preliminary costs;

Steps to be taken during the next phase in preparation for a bond referendum:

6. Investigate what scope and types of facilities the community will support (polling by the College);
7. Update preliminary budgets, schedules, priorities, and construction sequences;
8. Determine the amount of money the District can legally bond;
9. Prepare final projects list with priorities for inclusion in the bond proposal.

As depicted by the diagram in the margin, there are many factors that contribute to the statement of needs and the definition of the bond program components. Ideally, the process of preparing the master plan and then deriving the specific projects to submit for bonding is linear. However, due to the time available, the District proceeded with several parallel tracks. The faculty and staff were conducting on-going deliberations over a new
educational or academic master plan and discussions about new programs and facility needs for several months. Draft copies of the Academic Plan chapters were shared with 3D/I. Although specific facility requirements were not defined, mention was made of deficiencies and aspirations for up-to-date facilities to support the academic plans. The Facilities Master Plan recommends both renovation/modernization and new construction projects that will provide facilities to accommodate the educational activities discussed in the Academic Plan.

3D/I conducted the facilities condition assessment in mid-late 2002. Beginning in May of 2003 and continuing later in September and October, 3D/I conducted on-campus faculty and staff interviews and group workshops meeting with approximately 110 people including community representatives and students. A list of these interviews is included in Appendix B of this report.

On the following pages are the Guiding Principles for the Plan that 3D/I distilled from the numerous interviews and deliberations.

Combining all the research and products of workshops by the contributing firms, 3D/I prepared project descriptions that identified the components and sub-projects that make up a building and/or site work project (infrastructure, accessibility, landscape, etc.). Each of the descriptions and the accompanying graphics in the following section of this report reflect the methodical evaluation of needs and wants against the conditions of existing facilities and the need for more space. The order or sequence in which these projects should be accomplished is important to both the costing and the development of the bond tiers as well as the time frame required to meet specific needs. This sequencing and prioritization will be best addressed closer to the bond election and will be constantly reviewed throughout the bond program’s life.

The diagram on the following page illustrates the three categories of facility needs and the steps taken to resolve those needs in a project proposed for the bond program. “Inventory” refers to the existing physical plant and whether these buildings need capital renewal of key systems to extend their usable life or renovation to accommodate new uses. A basic question is whether the building is worth renewing or should it be demolished and replaced.

“Projected Growth” means new capacity. That can be addressed by adaptive use of existing facilities or construction of new space and, also, by land acquisition. “Functional Change” is shorthand for evolutionary modifications in functions or criteria of service that can be provided for by either new or renovated facilities. “Infrastructure” reminds us that the systems that power,
cool, heat, transport, etc., need to be kept up to date and up to capacity as conditions change and new space is brought on line.

As the project descriptions were being formed, the College conducted community opinion surveys to gauge the interest and support for a bond proposal (see related comments above). Also, preliminary legal and financial studies have determined how much money the District could borrow through bonds under laws that govern the rate of indebtedness the College could undertake. These activities may be revisited later in 2004 to confirm and update the determinations as preparation for the bond referendum proceeds.

### Needs Assessment Flowchart

The resulting list of projects and the rough order of magnitude cost estimates were submitted to the Board in November 2003. The composite master plan map in the Executive Summary shows the locations of all the proposed new construction projects.

The impact during construction on the Kentfield campus will be very significant, as will the increased capacity and quality of the learning environment when the work is completed.
Guiding Principles for Campus Development

Introduction

Generally, the importance of the facilities master plan resides in the framework it provides to guide development over many years of growth and change. The major elements of that framework are these: HISTORY, SITE DEVELOPMENT, REAL ESTATE, UTILITIES, TRANSPORTATION, PARKING AND PEDESTRIAN LINKAGES, OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPE, and ARCHITECTURE. From these elements statements that summarize the influence of each element on the long-term development of the physical environment at the College of Marin campuses were derived. These statements are referred to as “Guiding Principles”.

The Guiding Principles were used to establish proposed Projects for each category of the Plan.

Guiding Principles for the District

The College of Marin was founded in 1926 as the Marin Junior College (MJC). The campus was established on the grounds of the Butler estate. The first classes were held in the Butler House and Barn in that same year. In 1948, the name of the college was changed to College of Marin (COM).

Overall, the history of the District’s development can be observed in this Chronological List of Major Events:

- 1926 Marin Junior College established
- 1927 Tamalpais Center acquired for MJC
- 1928 Butler estate purchased for MJC
- 1929 Harlan Hall completed
- 1937 Golden Gate Bridge opened
- 1938 Original Campus Plan prepared
- 1940 Fusselman Library occupied
- 1948 Name of college changed to College of Marin
- 1955 Bolinas Marine Center acquired for COM
- 1966 Pacheco Ranch acquired for second college campus of COM
- 1971 Second college began classes in temporary location
- 1975 Indian Valley Colleges campus opened
- 1985 Indian Valley Colleges campus closed for repairs
- 1987 Indian Valley Campus reopened as second campus of original college
Following is a summary of the District’s real estate assets at present that were assessed by 3D/I and as reported in the Facility Conditions Assessment Report:

### Land Owned

- Kentfield campus: 77.7 acres
- Indian Valley Campus: 333.3 acres
- Bolinas Marine Center: 0.5 acres

**TOTAL:** 411.5 acres

### Buildings

- Kentfield Campus, 15 buildings and: 354,266 gsf
- Indian Valley campus, 22 buildings and: 150,770 gsf
- Bolinas Marine Center 2 buildings and: 3,333 gsf

**TOTAL:** 508,369 gsf*

### Parking Spaces

- Kentfield Campus: 1,721 spaces
- Indian Valley Campus: 899 spaces

*Several temporary and modular buildings were not assessed and therefore are not included in these totals. They may encompass as much as 35,000 gsf.

The population growth projected for Marin County (especially the North County area) in the 1960’s never happened. Those projections were the basis for the development of the second college and its campus at Indian Valley. The student enrollment at both campuses has actually diminished over the past decade or so. Preliminary findings of a current demographics study being prepared by Lapkoff & Gobalet indicate that Marin County will experience an approximate 0.05% increase in population over the next several years. If nothing else changed during that time frame, there would be minimal growth in enrollment at the College of Marin.

However, we believe there is a real probability for resurgence in enrollment at the College of Marin based on the following factors:

- An enhanced image and recognition in the community,
- Enrollment caps at the State of California four-year universities,
- Higher demand for job training and/or retraining,
- The impact of the Educational Park concept on enrollment at IVC.

Additionally, we believe the College of Marin should be able to recapture students that have drifted away as measured by the Participation Rate or Enrollment factor. Influences that will impact this potential resurgence are:
• Improved public perception gained by the enthusiasm resulting from a new district president,
• Increased marketing for students,
• A return of the positive messages about the College from faculty and staff, and
• Enhancement of the physical image resulting from renovation and new construction.

According to a recent article in the Chronicle for Higher Education, California’s Community Colleges have estimated that some 175,000 students could not enroll in classes this academic year. Additionally, there is a trend, both nationally and in California, towards dual-enrollment programs that give college credit to high school students.

Completing the first two years of school at a community college may well become the norm rather than the exception for those going to four-year institutions. This may bring an increase in academically oriented students from beyond the District as well as from within.

The increased interest in job training and workforce development is well documented. COM needs to successfully capture sponsorships and provide appropriate training facilities for vocational programs.

Additionally, although the current population in Marin is only experiencing modest growth, during the next decades it is likely to “recycle”. There is already evidence of an emerging trend of the elderly population selling their homes to younger families with children. It is only a matter of time before these children cycle through the K-12 system and arrive at college age.

The best facilities master plan will provide for the improvement of the quality of the physical plant while positioning the campus to grow, if necessary. There is a local pride in the College of Marin as the “Little Berkley” or “Junior Stanford”. It is very possible that College of Marin could become the college of choice for students bound for these famous institutions. The improved quality of the College’s campus will be important if this occurs.

The Guiding Principles for the District for developing both of its campuses are derived from the culture and traditions of Marin County. The culture of the county is built on distinctive regional interests in areas of health, wellness, fine arts, natural environment, and technology. These principles are also the basis of the mission established for the College. The District is committed to a quality core curriculum that produces a high rate of transfer
to four-year colleges and universities and a high percentage of
degree/certification completion. It is also committed to quality, flexible
career education that responds to the evolving needs of industry and students.

The Plan recommends these general Guiding Principles for the District:

- **Maintain the organizational concept of one college with two
campuses; the flagship campus is the Kentfield Campus and the ancillary campus is the Indian Valley Campus.**

- **Provide appropriate and attractive courses for the entire county in the most efficient yet easily accessible manner.**

- **Develop the Indian Valley Campus as a specialized “educational park” to complement the Kentfield Campus and enrich the District through increased use of existing facilities. The IVC will house the workforce development / career education campus of the College of Marin and various separate and autonomous educational institutions ranging from a charter high school to upper level and graduate schools. The park will have a single administration to facilitate its purposes.**

- **Respect the Native American archaeological sites on both campuses.**

- **Develop completely accessible campuses.**

- **Practice good stewardship of the environment of Marin County.**

- **Continue the tradition of good stewardship of the public capital invested in College facilities through maintenance, renovation, and remodeling (i.e., capital renewal).**

- **Build sustainable buildings when new construction is required or when existing buildings are modernized.**

### Guiding Principles for the Kentfield Campus

#### History

As mentioned above, the original campus was located in Kentfield on the grounds of the former Butler Estate. The view of Mount Tamalpais and an arboretum-like collection of trees were features of the estate, and they became the theme of the first campus plan of 1938 by the landscape architect, Horace Cotton. An “Art Deco Missionesque” style of architecture was adopted for the initial buildings. This style may have been derived from the Tamalpais Center which was purchased by the College as its first
permanent structure. Characteristics of this style were pastel stucco walls, terracotta tile roofs, and loggias of semi-circular arches resting on short classical style columns with smooth shafts and detailed capitals. Examples of the style survive in Fusselman Hall and the Administrative Center. The theme or icon building for the original campus plan was Harlan Hall, which was demolished (c.1969) and replaced by the present Harlan Center (1971).

Several other buildings were added to the campus in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. The Diamond Physical Education Center, the Austin Science Center, the Compton Learning Resources Center, the Expansion of the Fine Arts Center, and the Deedy Student Services Center are from this period.

The historic campus plan and its associated architectural theme were violated beginning with the construction of the Diamond Physical Education Center. There is apparently no campus plan that supports the location of the “newer” buildings. These violations are still on the minds of many of the faculty, administration, and community—those who nostalgically remember the “way things were” and those new to the College who sense a definite lack of cohesiveness in the physical plants.

There has been no major new construction on the Kentfield Campus in the three decades since these buildings were constructed.

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for the Kentfield Campus:

- **Reestablish the spirit of the Original Campus Plan of 1938.**
  - View of Mount Tamalpais from campus commons and from buildings
  - View of Commons from Sir Francis Drake Boulevard
  - Campanile or Bell Tower as a visual marker and Campus icon. This may well be integrated as part of a replacement building
  - Amphitheater (enhanced “people place”)
  - Embracing of Corte Madera Creek as landscape feature integrated with the campus
  - Unified architectural style (a “family” of buildings)

- **Develop a new and contemporary architectural vocabulary for the design of new buildings in harmony with the original architectural style—“Neo Art Deco Missionesque”—as exemplified by the existing Fusselman Hall (1940) and the demolished Harlan Hall (1929).**
Site Development

With the Original Campus Plan in mind, the major expansions of the campus boundaries that have accumulated over time should be united with the original campus both physically and visually to emphasize and enhance the continuity of the present campus. The presence of this contemporary campus also needs to be made recognizable to the public.

The lower part of the original campus to the south of Corte Madera Creek is in the flood plain. Refer to Appendix C. (Flood events are well known, although FEMA does not currently publish an official flood plain elevation for this area) New construction in that area should be designed in accordance with the flood plain elevation to be determined by a new topographical survey to be commissioned by the College.

The Kentfield Campus should be made completely accessible to the disabled. As part of this planning process, Sally Swanson Architects, Inc. has prepared an Access Compliance Survey Report. Copies of that document are on file at the 3D/I office in San Francisco. This document is available for review upon request.

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for Site Development:

- Prepare and maintain a campus plan update.
- Prepare and maintain a new topographic survey, including flood elevation section specific to Corte Madera Creek at the campus.
- Create a “sense of place” with numerous student-gathering spaces.
- Develop a “public edge” along the entire College Avenue frontage; consider lease space for businesses that complement the College, such as the “Tacqueria”.
- Connect and blend the “physical education” campus (“east campus”) and the lower area of the original campus (“west campus”) with the upper area.
- Create a perimeter identity for the campus—a “sense of location” and a “sense of arrival”.
- Carefully consider impacts of the campus on the surrounding neighborhoods.

The Plan recommends these Projects for Site Development:

- New Entrance Plaza at College Ave. and Sir Francis Drake Blvd.
- Enhanced Perimeter Landscaping
- New Campanile (may be integrated as part of a building)
Real Estate

Marin County is one of the most beautiful environments in which to live in the United States. The County is a bountiful confluence of mountains, redwood trees, seashores, and bays in a comfortable year around climate all only a half an hour away from San Francisco. Marin County is also noted as one of the most costly real estate markets in the country. The Kentfield Campus is land locked and surrounded by existing residential neighborhoods and commercial and institutional uses.

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for Real Estate:

- Prepare a current boundary survey of the campus.
- Continue acquisition of contiguous properties whenever possible.
- Consider any advantageous exchange of the tract north of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard for other contiguous tracts adjacent to the campus.

Utilities

The buildings on the campus are served directly from the perimeter by the usual external public and private utilities with the exception of the Deedy Student Services Center. The utility route and source for this building are unknown. The public and private utilities that supply the campus are of sufficient capacity to accept the proposed increase in building area. Refer to Appendix C.

Each building has its own heating and cooling systems except for the collection of old buildings that are served from the Fine Arts Center. The District should consider developing a Central Plant and distribution system for thermal energy utilities. Such an investment will have significant long term savings for costs of production and equipment maintenance. Because there are no major utility lines within the campus, the installation of a thermal utilities distribution system after the fact will be easier than in many other such situations.

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for Utilities:

- Prepare and maintain a detailed utilities map for the external utilities lines and all internal utilities lines.
- Plan for a Central Heating and Cooling Plant and distribution system.
- Plan all new and modernized buildings that precede the development of a Central Plant for eventual attachment to the Central Plant distribution system.
The Plan recommends these Projects for Utilities:

- New Fire Alarm System.
- New Central Heating and Cooling Plant

**Transportation**

The College of Marin at Kentfield (“College”) is on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard; the boulevard cross section transforms to a regular, four-lane road at the College. College Avenue intersects Drake Boulevard at the College; it turns into Magnolia which loops back to US 101 by way of Doherty Drive and Tamalpais Drive. The bus routes use this loop. Bicycles and foot traffic use the extensive hike and bike route system as it connects to the Corte Madera Creek route. In spite of the extensive use of the hike and bike routes, they seem to have virtually no use for accessing the College.

Transportation to the Kentfield Campus is by automobile, bicycle, or by Golden Gate Transit buses. Automobile transportation requires vehicle storage (“parking”) at the destinations. Refer to **Parking and Pedestrian Linkages**. Because land costs in Marin County are so high and the campus is surrounded by existing neighborhoods and commercial and institutional uses, bus and bicycle transportation should be strongly encouraged. Implementation of higher parking fees may encourage this shift in transportation while supporting improvements to the parking.

Transportation within the campus is pedestrian (and by wheelchair for the disabled). An efficient and accessible pedestrian linkage system should be maintained and improved on a constant basis. This system should link parking to the campus and the buildings and gathering spaces to one another within the campus.

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for Transportation:

- **Constantly lobby to preserve and expand the Golden Gate Transit service to the campus.**
- **Enhance the use of the hike and bike path on Corte Madera Creek.**
- **Provide secure bicycle parking adjacent to the creek path.**

The Plan recommends these Projects for Transportation:

- New Campus Accessibility Improvements
- Improved Pedestrian Linkages
Parking and Pedestrian Linkages

Parking is part of the automobile transportation system and must be provided by the destination. The parking is costly both in land taken up by surface use and in capital cost for the structures required when there is no longer land for surface parking. The great cost of land in Kentfield and the adjacency of neighborhoods may mitigate the cost of structured parking. The user of the automobile can be required to pay for the parking at the destination, but this is a limited source of financing for the typical community college.

An automobile transportation system requires vehicle storage (“parking”) at the destinations. Because of this, parking is an unintended part of the mission of virtually every college and university. How well parking is done is often a large part of the image of an institution in the public’s eyes. At a minimum of 350 square feet per automobile parking usurps a great deal of land area not counting associated landscape areas and drives.

Parking at the Kentfield Campus has been developed adjacent to the pedestrian core of the campus on an as-available and as-needed basis over the years. The criticisms about parking are primarily qualitative (i.e. location) rather than quantitative. The proverbial complaint of “There’s not enough parking!” is really not a complete statement. “There’s not enough parking at a time and place convenient for me!” is the complete statement.

Most of the existing parking stock at Kentfield sits on areas needed for expansion of facilities presently or in the future. This includes Lots 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 13. Given the adjacency of neighborhoods, commercial establishments, and institutions; the College is not likely to make significant acquisitions of contiguous land for use in relocating parking from needed building sites. Additionally, the cost of land when available is at least $100 per square foot. These facts suggest that one or more parking structures may have to be constructed.

Parking structures are costly and should only be constructed when there is no alternative solution. If such a situation occurs the structure should be located according to these criteria:

- Accessible to traffic
- At the edge of the permanent campus (at present and in the future if possible to determine)
- On a site that will not obstruct future growth
- On a site that allows for a long structure at least 125 feet in width to accommodate two parking bays.
Given these criteria and the present situation, the best location for an initial parking structure at the College is at the south edge parallel to the back of the Woodlands Market. Another location is along College Avenue, south of the creek.

A design of a parking structure on a campus should:

- Consider the structure to be an academic building for the quality standards of its architecture,
- Use the ground floor for institutional use,
- Expose the vertical traffic to view from the campus,
- Provide stair landings that serve as overlooks with benches,

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for Parking and Pedestrian Linkages:

- Monitor parking supply ratio constantly and adjust parking supply as necessary to maintain the existing ratio.
- Construct parking structures only when there is no other option for maintaining the parking supply ratio with surface lots.
- When parking structures are constructed, plan for mixed use on the ground floor and for a handsome appearance.

The Plan recommends these Projects for Parking and Pedestrian Linkages:

- New Parking Structure 1
- New Pedestrian Bridge across Corte Madera Greek
- Improved Campus Accessibility
- New Wayfinding System

Open Space and Landscaping

Open space is the land permanently set aside for outdoor uses. Primarily, open space is dedicated to active recreation such as sports fields or for passive recreation such as lounging, Frisbee throwing, and kite flying, or just to be an “outdoor room”, a place for pedestrian interaction or just passing through.

The athletic fields at the physical education campus provide the active open space on the Kentfield Campus. All of this area of open space is committed under a shared use agreement with the nearby Branson School. The Commons and Corte Madera Creek provide the passive open space. The view of Mount Tamalpais adds psychologically to the open space inventory.
at Kentfield campus. This has been important to the Kentfield Campus since its beginning.

Lush landscaping has been a tradition of the Kentfield Campus since the beginning, also, when it inherited the landscaping of the Butler Estate. This tradition with its collection of heritage trees and generous shrubbery should be maintained and enhanced. Presently, the landscaping is overgrown in many areas and needs to be reexamined, thinned, and removed in some cases. Refer to Appendix E. Design guidelines for landscape should be developed and adopted by the District. Refer to Appendix F.

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for Open Space and Landscape:

- Develop landscape design guidelines.
- Continue the landscaping tradition of the Butler Estate and establish an arboretum and botanical garden for educational purposes.
- Reexamine the existing landscaping for needed improvements.
- Embrace Corte Madera Creek by maintaining a fifty-foot setback and using the area within for landscape and pedestrian / bicycle access.

The Plan recommends these Projects for Open Space and Landscape:

- Campus Landscape Renovation, Amphitheater, and Creek Bank and Bridge Improvement

Architecture

The College of Marin was established in Kentfield. The growth and evolution of the Kentfield Campus can be seen in the following Chronological Inventory of Buildings:

- 1924 Butler House and Barn [built in 1902, demolished c.1950-51], Architect unknown
- 1926 Main Junior College Gateway, [demolished] Men’s Luncheon Club
- 1927 Tamalpais Center, [built, 1909, demolished, c. 1964], Acquired from Tamalpais Center Board of Directors
- 1927 Science Building, [demolished, c. 1971], A. A. Cantin, Architect
- 1929 George H. Harlan Hall (demolished, c.1969), A. A. Cantin, Architect
- 1931 Addition to Science Building, Architect unknown
- 1935 Dickson Hall, Architect unknown

Outdoor Gathering Spaces

Outdoor Gathering Spaces
Based on the findings of the FCA, and considering the limited capability, several of the older buildings should be demolished and replaced with new buildings. The remaining buildings have significant deferred maintenance. These same buildings are badly in need of modernization for contemporary educational adequacy.

The buildings of the campus should show a harmony of design even while having distinctive designs. A new theme or icon building is needed for reference; it should probably incorporate the campanile as did the original theme building, Harlan Hall. The theme building and the restored Fusselman Hall should serve as a two-part reference for future designs. The new style should allude to the old and include the aesthetic elements and style that sustainable design will contribute to it. This should be easily achieved since the original architecture used a number of sustainable design concepts. Refer to Appendix G. The new vocabulary (“style”) should be recorded in architectural guidelines adopted by the District. Refer to Appendix F.

New buildings should reflect the high level of commitment to the environment in Marin County by being of highly sustainable design. Refer to Appendix H.
The new buildings on campus should also be sited so as to perpetuate, enhance, and extend the spirit of the Original Campus Plan.

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for Architecture:

- Develop architectural guidelines for design of new and modernization of existing buildings.
- Demolish selected old buildings in accord with the FCA and replace with new buildings.
- Renew existing buildings in accord with the FCA and modernize them to serve current functions.
- Adapt the style of the more recent buildings to harmonize with the new architectural vocabulary and the original architectural style.

The Plan recommends these Projects for Architecture:

- Modernization of Learning Resource Center, Conversion to Technology Center
- Modernization of Harlan Center
- Modernization of Fusselman Hall
- Modernization of Science Center
- Modernization of Diamond Physical Education Center
- New Learning Resource Center
- Addition to Student Center, or New Student Center
- New Facilities Management Center
- New Multi-Purpose Academic and Support Facility
- New Child Care / Development Center

Implementation

To implement the Plan, a sufficient amount of “turn around” or “swing” space needs to be constructed first. This will allow all or significantly large areas of the existing buildings to be emptied for renovation and modernization. The new construction will then become space for easing crowded conditions, for remodeling to implement the Academic Master Plan and for providing space for potential growth.

Virtually any new construction will take up existing parking. In order to keep up the stock of parking a parking structure will probably be necessary.

A plan for renovation and modernization of this magnitude practically demands that a Central Plant be constructed. Much of the cost of the plant
would be derived from the aggregated savings in the costs of the H/VAC work in each individual projects.

Guiding Principles for the Indian Valley Campus

History

Beginning in the early 1960’s, plans were developed for a second college and a new campus in the northern part of Marin County. In 1975 the Indian Valley Colleges campus opened for class.

Ten years later the campus of the Indian Valley Colleges, which had a separate administration and faculty, was closed for structural repairs to its buildings. The glue-laminated wood structures, where exposed to the elements, were deteriorating. The needed repairs to the buildings were made, and in 1987 the Indian Valley Campus (IVC) of the reorganized and now singular College of Marin reopened for classes. The momentum on the campus was never regained and the campus has languished largely unused to the present.

Site Development

The planning for the Indian Valley Campus went on for nearly ten years. The process and the product of this planning are recorded in the Indian Valley Colleges: A Master Plan of 1980 by Neptune & Thomas Associates, Architects. From its inception the plan was developed by applying the best ecological design concepts available at the time. This moment in time saw California take the lead in the nation with respect to ecological design. This was the time of the development of Sea Ranch (Al Boeke, 1963, Lawrence Halprin, 1964, and Charles Moore, 1966), of Ian McHarg’s highly influential book, Designing with Nature, 1970, and of the first Earth Day in 1971. The theme for the development of Sea Ranch by landscape architect, Lawrence Halprin, was drawn from the Pomo Indians’ philosophy of “Live lightly on the land”. The IVC is truly in the vanguard of the nation’s progress with respect to ecological design.

The original plan called for small-scale wooden buildings in clusters reminiscent of the campus plan for the University of California at Santa Cruz. The clusters were conceived for the colleges of social and behavioral sciences, arts and humanities, and natural and physical sciences and for recreation, and administrative services. The three college clusters were
named for local Indian tribes that once lived in the area: Ohlone, Miwok, and Pomo respectively.

The campus remains as it was when it opened except for effects of non-use and related minimal maintenance.

A recent concept for using the IVC facilities calls for an “educational park” which would be populated by various autonomous educational institutions. Refer to Appendix I. The concepts have been put into practice by inviting the College to San Francisco State University to locate programs on the campus (although no commitment has been given by either institution) and by leasing space to the Marin School for Arts and Technology, a new charter school.

The original wayfinding system has degenerated over time. A new and stronger system will be necessary to direct the users of the “educational park”. The entrance sequence for the campus should be strengthened, also. The nature of the institutional geography of the “educational park” may necessitate several new pedestrian bridges over the creek that separates the pedestrian academic core from the parking.

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for Site Development:

- Prepare a campus plan update.
- Continue to develop the campus honoring the basic concepts and fundamental principles of the Original Campus Plan of 1980 by Neptune & Thomas Associates.
- Adapt the campus plan to enhance the establishment and evolution of the “educational park”.
- Enhance access and way finding in support of the “educational park”.
- Designate the Pomo Cluster as the College of Marin campus at Indian Valley and consolidate all College activities there. Expand the cluster as needed to support future functions.

The Plan recommends these Projects for Site Development:

- Campus Accessibility Improvements
- New Way Finding System
- New Pedestrian Bridges and Entrance Gate Feature
- New Commons / Connector / Quad
- New Amphitheater and Clock Tower
Real Estate

The IVC campus has some 333 acres of which only about 20 percent is buildable (topographic slope of 20° or less). The original plan allowed for expansion by providing sites for the addition of four additional clusters of similar buildings and for the expansion of the Pomo Cluster. If the original plan is adhered to, the IVC has land sufficient for doubling its present size without any acquisition. More intense development of the original plan would provide expansion even beyond that originally planned for without need for additional land.

The Plan recommends no Guiding Principles for Real Estate.

The Plan makes no recommendations for Projects for Real Estate.

Utilities

The trunk line utilities were put in place for a campus twice as dense as present. Refer to Appendix C.

The Central Plant is a geothermal installation. This fact should be celebrated as part of the campus’s avant garde sustainability.

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for Utilities:

- Maintain quality infrastructure systems and utility corridor.
- Promote sustainability through innovative design and low-impact operations, such as promulgated by the LEED™ program.

The Plan recommends these Projects for Utilities:

- Gas Line Replacement
- Capital Renewal and Expansion of Central Plant

Transportation

The Indian Valley Campus is at the very end of Ignacio Boulevard. By design the traffic ends in the parking lots at the campus. This is the source of the pervasive feeling that IVC is “far away” and “on the way to nowhere”. The connection of Ignacio Boulevard westward to Indian Valley Road, as contemplated in the original plan, or to another route to connect Ignacio to Center Road or Novato Boulevard would greatly enhance the access to the IVC for the north county area and reduce the sense of a campus “out in the wilderness”.

3D/International
A hike and bike route exists along stretches of Ignacio Boulevard. The original campus plan provided large amounts of bicycle parking. This hike and bike route should be made continuous and its use encouraged.

**Parking and Pedestrian Linkages**

At the Indian Valley Campus, parking was designed as part of the campus plan from the beginning. Few campus plans have done a better job of providing for parking than did the IVC plan. The existing parking ratio at IVC is quite adequate for the current enrollment.

The parking is arrayed along the northern edge of IVC and separated from the pedestrian academic core by Novato Creek. Access to the pedestrian campus is by bridges across the creek. There will be need of more of these bridges as the “educational park” develops.

If the concept for an educational park at IVC is extremely successful and additional parking is needed, the existing parking could easily be double decked to use the existing topography. Additional parking constructed at IVC will face strict environmental requirements functionally and aesthetically.

**Open Space and Landscaping**

The IVC is open space and landscaping. The academic core of the campus uses only about 50 of its 333 acres; the remaining acres are all natural state open space. Additionally there is a large Indian Valley Open Space Preserve adjacent to the campus. The landscaping is virtually all natural (xeroscape) and remains in place due to careful siting of the original buildings so as to preserve as many of the existing trees as possible.

The natural landscaping of the IVC should be maintained and perpetuated. Contrasting landscapes should be planted in the courtyards of the clusters. Refer to *Appendix E*.

Design guidelines for landscape should be developed and adopted by the District. Refer to *Appendix G*.

The Plan recommends these *Guiding Principles* for Open Space and Landscaping:

- Continue to develop the campus honoring the basic natural concepts and fundamental ecologic principles of the Original Campus Plan of 1980.
- Adapt the campus plan to enhance the establishment and evolution of the “educational park”.
• Develop design guidelines for landscaping. Use more formal landscaping in the courtyards of the clusters for contrast with the natural landscaping of the campus in general. Preserve and augment the natural landscape.

The Plan recommends these Projects for Open Space and Landscaping:

• Enhanced Entrance Road Landscaping.
• Construct a New Courtyard Landscape for the Pomo Cluster.

Architecture

All of the buildings at Indian Valley were designed and built at the same time, so they are all of the same style. The Neo Indian Valley style will blend with the original buildings but will be a new and contemporary version of the sustainable institutional buildings designed originally to blend in with the natural environment. Refer to Appendix F.

Since their closure for repairs in 1985 the buildings at IVC have been suspect in their quality, durability, etc. The buildings represent a capital investment of some $50,000,000 and a total of 151,000 gross square feet that can be easily put back into service in the immediate future, to be replaced in the longer-range future of a successful “educational park”. Refer to Appendix J.

The Plan recommends these Guiding Principles for Architecture:

• Celebrate the sustainable and archaeologically reverent design of the existing architecture.
• Develop architectural guidelines (“Neo Indian Valley style”) for design of new and modernization of existing building.
• Adapt the existing architectural style to improve maintainability of the buildings, enhance their sustainability, and blend the buildings into the natural landscape.
• Establish the Indian Valley Campus as the workforce development / career education campus for the College. Grow it into a general education campus, as well, over time. Use the “Neo Indian Valley” architectural style developed for all new buildings.
• Perform renovation of buildings sufficient to preserve the capital (roofs, walls, etc.) of the Miwok and Ohlone Clusters for use by others.
• Renovate, remodel, and augment the existing facilities as necessary for educational adequacy.

The Plan recommends these Projects for Architecture:
• Fire Safety System Project
• Modernization of Pomo Cluster
• Capital Preservation of Ohlone Cluster
• Capital Preservation of Miwok Cluster
• Modernization of Administrative Services Center
• Capital Preservation of Library
• New Community / Conference Center
• New College of Marin Building at Pomo Cluster
• New Planetarium and Observatory

Implementation

A strategy for developing the educational park concept at IVC is presented in Appendix I. In the beginning, the implementation of the concept is largely organizational. With regard to existing facilities, capital preservation of the buildings to be used by others is urgent. Renovation and modernization of the Pomo Cluster for the College of Marin is of immediate importance, too.

The larger challenge will be the guidance of new development by both the College of Marin at the Pomo Cluster and the other autonomous institutions that locate on the campus and build new buildings.

The Central Plant and its distribution system should be renovated and modernized, too.