

Campus Development Committee (CDC)

October 14, 2004 (2:00 PM to 4:00 PM)

Room 296- Administration Building

Minutes

Committee Members Present: Andrew Aubery, Vice President/Student Body; Carl Carlucci, Executive Vice President; Rod Casto, Associate VP/Research Technology; Bijal Chhadva, President/Student Body; Sandy Cooper, Director/EH&S; Adrian Cuarta, Director/Physical Plant; Charlotte Domingo, University Police; Barbara Donerly, Facilities Planning and Construction; Trudie Frecker, Associate VP/Administrative Services; Ron Hanke, Chair and Director/Facilities Planning and Construction; Patricia Haynie, Associate VP/Health Sciences Center; Sheila Holbrook, President/A&P Council; Tom Kane, Director/Residence Services; Elizabeth Kaplon, Executive Assistant to the VP/Student Affairs; Jeff Mack, Director/Auxiliary Services; Holly Schoenherr, Assistant Director/Academic Support; John Scott, Associate VP/University Advancement; Renee Seay, President/USPS Senate; Ralph Wilcox, Vice Provost;

Call to Order

Ron Hanke opened the meeting at 2:00 p.m., and asked the Committee members and guests to introduce themselves. Mr. Hanke noted that we are meeting today to review 3 proposals. Each proposal is unique and has a different set of issues to consider. Our role is advisory, and our primary responsibility is to review each proposal in the context of land use and its impacts to the University's physical resources. Our recommendations will go to the President's Cabinet and the ACE Workgroup of the Board of Trustees. If we recommend approval of these proposals, we should outline items to be considered by the UBOT in giving their approval to proceed to the next step.

Some proposals involve business decisions that must be made by the University Administration. In those cases, the CDC can recommend conceptual approval of the proposal from a land-use standpoint, contingent on reaching an acceptable agreement to all parties.

Presentation of the Florida State Golf Association Proposal

Ron Hanke introduced Michael Rierson, and asked him to proceed with his Power Point presentation of the FSGA proposal. In summary, the proposal is to develop a partnership between USF and the FSGA that would include the ability of the FSGA to: 1) Build the Florida Golf House replacing existing limited facilities with larger clubhouse, new conference facility, office space, and larger restaurant; 2) Develop up to 10 acres of land adjacent to the Golf Course; 3) Invest up to \$9 million in golf course and facilities renovations; and 4) Sub-lease the Golf Course land and assume control of the golf course in mid-2005.

After a period of questions and answers, the Committee formulated a recommendation that reads:

“The current USF Master Plan designates this land as the University Golf Course, which is bordered on the east by the USF Ecological Research Area. Therefore, the CDC recommends approval to continue use of the land as a golf course. Consistent with that, the CDC recommends USF immediately pursue and negotiate a partnership arrangement

with FSGA to operate the golf course as their state headquarters contingent upon the University reaching an acceptable agreement with FSGA on the following issues:

USF should negotiate a Partnership arrangement to:

- Provide continued support of USF activities on the golf course.
- Maintain USF related alliances.
- Address current contractual relationships, such as Exclusive Beverage Sponsorship Agreement.
- Accommodate any existing research in the adjacent land.
- Address potential disturbance of archeologically significant sites as required by statute through the USF Archeology Department.
- Address responsibility of mitigating natural resource impacts.
- Address responsibility and liability of use of water for irrigation under the current Water Use Permit.
- Address potential fees that may be assessed to USF for impacts to the level of service of the host community's infrastructure due to planned improvements.
- Specify the term of the agreement.
- Address the terms of a buy-back option.
- Upon reaching a satisfactory partnership agreement, provide for all necessary documentation for proposed improvements to be included in the 2005 Master Plan Update, including traffic and environmental impacts.
- Include a land survey of boundaries, easements, and natural features of the proposed sublease of land.
- Be structured in such a way as to facilitate and foster casual use of the facilities by students.”

A motion was made, and seconded, and the Committee voted unanimously to forward the above recommendation to the UBOT Workgroup on Academic and Campus Environment for consideration.

Presentation of the Geology Alumni Society GeoPark Proposal

Ron Hanke introduced Dr. James Garey, and asked him to proceed with his Power Point presentation of the GeoPark proposal. In summary, the proposal is to formally designate the GeoPark in the USF 2005 Master Plan Update.

During the Q&A session, Dr. Garey clarified that, for security purposes, signs will be posted that limit visitor access to the GeoPark during “dusk to dawn” periods. Also, signs will be on posts anchored in concrete to minimize vandalism. After the Q&A period, the Committee formulated a recommendation that reads:

“The designation of the GeoPark at this location is compatible with the Greenway, Open Space, and Conservation elements of the current Master Plan. Therefore, the CDC recommends that the areas as shown in the proposal (AHIJEFGA), for a total of approximately 16 acres be designated in the 2005 Master Plan Update as the USF Geology Alumni Society GeoPark with the following comments:

- Future Use of land: As part of the Master Storm Water Drainage Plan, the University will be enlarging the West Basin at the northern section of this area to accommodate future University growth on the west side of campus. Designation of this area as the GeoPark should be reviewed at each 5-year Master Plan Update.
- Impacts: Agreements with Physical Plant, Transportation and Parking Services, and University Police should be reached regarding maintenance, parking and safety/security issues.
- All physical improvements to the GeoPark shall go through the Space Impact review process. The Botanical Gardens may propose some compatible exhibit areas.”

A motion was made, and seconded, and the Committee voted unanimously to forward the above recommendation to the UBOT Workgroup on Academic and Campus Environment for consideration.

Presentation of the Joint Military Science Leadership Center (JMSLC) Site Location

Ron Hanke introduced Luis Visot, and asked him to proceed with his presentation of the proposed location of the JMSLC facility. In summary, this request is for approval to continue with a site feasibility study for locating this facility in the vicinity of the Physical Education Building (PED).

After a period of questions and answers, the Committee formulated a recommendation that reads:

“The current Master Plan does not designate a location for this facility. However, the program meets the Mission and Strategic Plan of the University in the areas of research, teaching and community engagement. The program has received funds for the Phase I of the project. A feasibility study is being conducted to identify potential sites and impacts to the campus infrastructure.

Therefore, the CDC recommends:

- The feasibility study continue in order to identify potential sites in the vicinity of the Physical Education Building (PED).
- The proposal be placed on ACE agenda for informational purposes.
- At the conclusion of the study, ROTC will return to the CDC for final recommendation to ACE Workgroup.
- The project be included in the 2005 Master Plan Update, pending ACE Workgroup approval of the recommended site as determined by the feasibility study
- The project shall mitigate impacts to University infrastructure as identified in the feasibility study.
- The study shall list the advantages, disadvantages, impacts, and cost of each site.”

A motion was made, and seconded, and the Committee voted unanimously to forward the above recommendation to the UBOT Workgroup on Academic and Campus Environment for information.

Next meeting

The Chair noted that the next meeting will be scheduled prior to the ACE Workgroup meeting in January. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.