

CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (CDC)

MEETING MINUTES 1/11/05 (2PM TO 4PM)

ROOM 271 - MARSHALL CENTER BRIDGE

Meeting Commenced at 2:05pm

In Attendance:

USF Campus Development Committee

Andrew Aubrey
Carl Carlucci
Rod Casto
Bijal Chhadva
Sandy Cooper
Adrian Cuarta
Barbara Donerly
George Ellis
Trudie Frecker
Ron Hanke
Patricia Haynie
Tom Kane
Elizabeth Kaplon
Jeff Mack
Renee Seay
John Scott
Ralph Wilcox
J.D. Withrow

Guests:

Kathy Bennett
John Gerdes
Ray Gonzalez
Gary Haber
Eric Hunter
Norm Johnson
Dimple Lalwani
Roy Olney
Vicky Medlock
Vicki Mitchell
Michael Rierson
Lee Roy Selmon
R. Wingard
Doug Woolard
Todd Zeiller

CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (CDC)

MEETING MINUTES 1/11/05 (2PM TO 4PM)

ROOM 271 - MARSHALL CENTER BRIDGE

1. Welcome – Ron Hanke

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 presentations:

- Second step in the review of the JMSLC site selection
- Athletics Land Use Plan
- Campus map with sites available for development and the list of Sub-lease entitlements

2. Approval of Minutes from 10/14/04 CDC meeting.

Correction made to minutes of 10/14/05 meeting changing wording from “forwarding recommendation to ACE Workgroup for consideration” to “forwarding recommendation to ACE Workgroup for information” for the JMSLC Site Location.

A motion was made, and seconded, and the Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes as corrected.

3. Website.

There is a “Campus Development Committee” (CDC) link from the ACE website. The CDC website will continue to be improved and updated. Ron Hanke thanked Dr. Carlucci’s staff for assisting in setting up the Website.

4. Joint Military Sciences Leadership Center.

Mr. Ron Olney (Graduate Research Assistant) and Mr. Ray Gonzalez, Architect with FPC, were introduced to make the presentation for the JMSLC Site Selection.

a. Proposal Presentation

Ron Olney, representing Louis Visot, with the Joint Military Department requests approval of using Site A for the JMSC in conjunction with the study that has been completed by Lunz Prebor Fowler Architects recommending Site A for the USF Joint Military Science Leadership Center.

Ray Gonzalez presented the advantages and disadvantages of Sites A and B as described in the Feasibility Study. Site A is recommended based on less cost and impact to USF infrastructure.

b. Questions and Answers:

Q: How many more employees would there be with this new facility?

CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (CDC)
MEETING MINUTES 1/11/05 (2PM TO 4PM)
ROOM 271 - MARSHALL CENTER BRIDGE

A: There would be approximately 4 or 5 additional personnel.

Q: Where would future 2 phases go?

A: The other phases would go on the front and north side. All additional phases will go through the CDC for review and recommendation.

Q: How will access into PED be affected?

A: There will possibly be a joint entrance with PED. The project has not been designed yet; there are many possible solutions.

Q: Would there be parking spaces used for staging?

A: Probably about 6 spaces in front if Site A is chosen.

c. Discussion and Recommendation

Comments (read by Ron Hanke):

- Comment from Liz Kaplon, indicating V.P. of Student Affairs is in favor of expanding to the West (Site A).
- Comment from Environmental Health and Safety indicating that site orientation will have to comply with new Fire Truck Access Code.

Motion:

A motion was made, and seconded, and the Committee voted unanimously to make a recommendation to ACE Workgroup to approve Site A for the USF Joint Military Scientific Leadership Center.

- 5. Athletics Land Use Plan:** Mr. Doug Woolard, Athletics Director, was introduced to make the presentation for the Athletics Land Use Plan.

a. Proposal Presentation

Doug Woolard, Director of Athletics made a presentation in favor of the proposal in order to accommodate the future growth of USF Athletics Department in light of USF's entrance into the Big East Conference. A University in the Big East Conference should be able to have the commitment to obtain the facilities needed to attract the talent and participation as a revenue source for a University in this category. He proposed components of a new, upgraded Athletics District, i.e.:

Athletic Training Center (complete)

CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (CDC)

MEETING MINUTES 1/11/05 (2PM TO 4PM)

ROOM 271 - MARSHALL CENTER BRIDGE

Renovation of Sun Dome
Women's and Men's Basketball Gym
Softball Stadium
Three Football Practice Fields
New Soccer Stadium
Tennis Center
New Sports Turf Multi purpose Track Field

Vickie Mitchell of Athletics made a presentation in favor of the proposal by presenting diagrams that indicated land usage by Athletics and Campus Recreation. Proposed additional land in Section 4 be reassigned for Athletics growth and some land be reconfigured for Campus Recreation.

Michael Rierson reinforced the need for Athletics to expand stating that USF needs to make the commitment for future growth.

The Department of Athletics requests that the CDC recommend the reallocation of the area currently described on the land use and density plan as District 4 for athletics uses and provide conceptual approval of the realignment of land currently used by Athletics and Campus Recreation as specified in the proposal.

b. Questions and Answers

Q: Has anyone else been consulted regarding the reallocation of land in District 4 other than Campus Recreation?

A: Yes, the President and Kofi Glover.

Q: Regarding the timing, is everything being based upon the funding by donors?

A: Yes, and the feasibility study will help to assist in the timing.

Q: Would the designated green belt areas (tennis courts, etc.) be part of the plan?

A: The tennis courts were pre-existing conditions. There are some concerns in maintaining the green belt. The 2005 Master Plan Update consultants should address this issue. Some areas can be reassigned as greenway to offset proposed use of greenway.

Q: Was there consideration made with regard to the three adjacent children's educational facilities?

A: Yes, tennis courts, because they would be quieter, would be placed near the educational facilities.

CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (CDC)

MEETING MINUTES 1/11/05 (2PM TO 4PM)

ROOM 271 - MARSHALL CENTER BRIDGE

Q: Would reallocation of land require an amendment to the Master Plan?

A: It would depend on the timing of construction and what is needed to be under construction before the Master Plan Update is finalized.

Q: What is the allocation of District 4?

A: The 2002 Master Plan Update allocated it for housing.

Q: Will the Sun Dome remain independent, or will it always be under Athletics:

A: The fact that it is under Athletics right now, does not impact this plan. The Sun Dome will remain operationally independent.

Q: Who do we need permission from to change the greenway?

A: This will be addressed through the 2005 Master Plan Update and meetings throughout the University, as well as public hearings.

Q: What is the next step should this proposal be approved?

A: The recommendation will go to the ACE Workgroup, and will go through review and validation during the 2005 Master Plan Update process.

Q: What are they doing in the Chapel Fellowship area?

A: There is a current effluent research project that may be impacted by the plan. This will be reviewed during the feasibility analysis.

CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (CDC)
MEETING MINUTES 1/11/05 (2PM TO 4PM)
ROOM 271 - MARSHALL CENTER BRIDGE

c. Discussion and Recommendation

Comment: I see a lot of potential for Campus Recreation in this plan. It is a well thought out plan.

Comment: This is the most exciting time in USF history and for our lifetime. Donors need to understand that we have a game plan so we can aggressively go forward with our fundraising. There is great momentum in the community right now.

Discussion:

The CDC understands that the Plan has been reviewed by the President's Cabinet, and that Athletics and Recreation agree that funding for athletics facilities that require relocating campus recreation spaces will include the cost of replacing those facilities at mutually agreeable locations and at a quality level not less than currently enjoyed.

Motion:

A motion was made, and seconded, and the Committee voted unanimously to make a recommendation to ACE Workgroup to conceptually approve the Athletics Land Use Plan, with the understandings noted above in the discussions.

7. Buildable sites on campus – Informational Item

FPC was asked to develop a map that shows all sub-lease entitlements, as well as sites that are available for development of projects.

As the CDC and ACE Workgroup consider land use proposals, and as the 2005 Tampa Campus Master Plan Update moves forward, a Tampa Campus map indicating remaining land available for future development, including surface parking lots, has been drafted. This information will become a valuable tool for CDC and ACE, and will be updated as necessary.

8. Next Meeting

3rd or 4th week of March 2005. The 2005 Master Plan Update process to be reviewed by the CDC at future meetings in 2005/2006.

9. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 3:40pm.