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 its
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% of
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 Mother Lode/Foothills and the re-establishment of 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
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, 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 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.

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 research was supplemented by on-site
observation that continued over the course of the planning process.

Introduction
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 (WSCCH) analysis were performed. This will be discussed
further under “Education Plan Analysis” in this report.

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 existing 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.