



---

Stockton Campus Master Plan

## Introduction

### Master Plan Context

This report follows two others, a *1999 Education and Student Services Master Plan* by the Keithley Consulting Group and a *Facilities Bond Master Plan* by 3D/International adopted by the San Joaquin Delta Community College Board in 2003. The following summarizes their findings.

### Demographics

According to the 1999 report, 95% of students come from San Joaquin County's major cities, Stockton, Lodi, Manteca and Tracy. The majority of students are ethnic minorities. 72% population growth was projected over 20 years for San Joaquin County with higher growth in the southern part of the county (Tracy). San Joaquin County's population was forecast by the State Department of Finance to be 745,000 by 2010. District enrollment potential was estimated at from 22,000 to 25,000 students by 2005. Another finding was that transfer rates to U.C. and C.S.U. were lower at Delta than state averages.

### Employment

Regional employer needs were found for college graduates at entry level positions and for continuing education for existing employees. Jobs requiring higher education were for business managers and line supervisors, registered nurses, human services and social workers, and school teachers. Professional and technical job opportunities for accountants and auditors, social workers, systems analysts and computer programmers, and electrical and computer engineers were discussed.

### Facilities Bond Master Plan

The 2003 report identified 23 capital improvement projects including the expansion and improvement of two existing centers at Stockton and Manteca, three new centers at Tracy/ Mountain House, Lodi/Galt and Mother Lode/Foothills and the re-establishment of Mountain Ranch as a field laboratory for a future Foothills center. Project costs were estimated at \$307M included some State contribution. A facility condition assessment was also performed as part of the master plan.

### Measure L Bond

In March 2004, the Measure L Bond was passed providing for \$250 million to be spent for the renovation and repair of existing facilities and construction of new facilities at Stockton and Manteca Centers per the Facilities Bond Master Plan. New education centers included land acquisition for Lodi/Galt and Foothills Centers and site improvements for Tracy/ Mountain House were included. In August 2004, Douglas E. Barnhart Incorporated was selected as bond program manager. Barnhart's program management scope was expanded to include Education Plan review and this Stockton campus master plan update, both intended to support a separate bond implementation plan to be delivered to the District.

At this point, schematic design and environmental review are complete for Mountain House. A Final Project Proposal (FPP) for Cunningham Center has been submitted with a projected 2007-2008 funding date. An Initial Project Proposal (IPP) was submitted in June 2005 for both the Holt and Shima Center reconstruction projects. The District continues to work at achieving State matching funds for its capital outlay projects.

### Master Plan Goals

The goals of this master plan were derived from the District's mission statement. Key points taken from this statement were affordable access to high quality education, student-friendly services, advanced technology and provision for a beautiful, safe and caring environment. This mission statement is understood to have final Board acceptance pending but it provided a strong vision and direction for campus planning.

### Master Plan Approach

The central theme of the planning approach is that facility planning needs to follow educational planning. The plan solution needs to respond to teaching environment criteria based on instruction needs. The first step was to review existing education plans. When the most recent plan was found to be over five years old, a special task force was established to perform a plan validation process establishing an education program for the master plan. Demographics were updated and historic growth and Weekly Student Contact Hour (WSCH) analysis were performed. This will be discussed further under "Education Plan Analysis" in this report.

### Site and Building Analysis

Campus history and the campus physical setting were investigated. The planning team included architects, programmers, engineers and landscape architects. Traffic, utility and landscape analyses were performed that appear in the appendices but are summarized in this report. The existing buildings were analyzed using information taken from the District's inventory report and from construction drawings in the campus archives. The document research was supplemented by on-site observation that continued over the course of the planning process.

### Education Program Analysis

This analysis covered program relationships and general requirements for the District's Divisions. Course scheduling and student load data were received from the District's Information Services Department taken from their System 2000 database. A relational database was created joining the System 2000 data with the Chancellor's Fusion space inventory data. This database became the basis of analyzing room utilization and identifying space needs. Classroom, Class Lab and Office capacity load analyses were performed for 5, 10 and 15-year time frames.

A critical component of this analysis was the numerous District stakeholder interviews that were held with Division Chairs, Department Directors, Deans, student and faculty representatives. The outcome of this analysis was a 15-year long-range program for the Stockton campus.

### Master Planning

The usual planning process has programming occurring prior to planning. In this case, by necessity, planning started during programming and site analysis. The State's funding schedule dictated that the Cunningham expansion site be located early. Therefore, decisions regarding the north half of the campus were formed early. Site analysis suggested campus improvements should be influenced by existing traffic patterns, underground utilities and site development patterns and characteristics.

The planning approach used the evaluation of site alternatives to establish building locations. Each building was considered in context with surrounding buildings and other potential projects in the Bond program. As programming proceeded, overall campus concepts were developed and tested. Site improvement recommendations followed with new building projects identified.