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What is Sustainability?

The UN’s Brundtland Commission definition (1987):

“Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

Put another way, sustainability is:

“Living on nature’s income rather than its capital.”

Or simply:

“Taking the long view.”

The Triple Bottom Line makes sense, if it’s built up from its foundation

- Our ecological systems provide the natural capital upon which all else is built
The Triple Bottom Line makes sense, if it’s built up from its foundation.

Social systems are built on environmental ones.

A sound economy depends upon a secure society, which in turn depends on healthy natural systems.
Why Incorporate Sustainability into USFSM Master Planning?

- Demonstrates social responsibility to students, faculty, the community, the world
- Enhances campus operational efficiency
- Enhances health and quality of life for students, faculty, university staff, and the community
- Results in cost savings
- Supports President Judy Genshaft’s pledge to the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment (ACUPCC)

The 5 Aspects of Sustainability

1: Energy / Greenhouse Gas Reductions
2: Transportation Efficiency
3: Land / Water Resource Management
4: Buildings / Materials Management / Waste Management
5: Social Considerations
1. Energy Efficiency & Greenhouse Gas Reductions

Reduce greenhouse gas emissions through energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources

- Greatest opportunity for cost savings
- Necessary to meet campus climate action plan commitments
- Operational Improvements to Existing Facilities:
  - Incorporated into design of future Capital Improvement projects

2. Transportation Efficiency

Maximize efficiency and use of transportation systems

- Integral element of campus life and campus sustainability
- Enhances student, faculty, staff, and community quality of life
- Increases health benefits from improved air quality
- Optimizes investments in transportation solutions
- Reduces greenhouse gas emissions
3. Land / Water Resource Management

Maximize use of land; enhance water quality by reducing load and enhancing efficiency of stormwater systems.

- Optimizes use of land resources and existing capital investment
- Preserves natural resources through recognition of its value as education, recreational, and restorative contributions to students, faculty, and community
- Enhances transportation connections / linkages between open spaces and buildings
- Reduces costs associated with waste / stormwater treatment


Maximize use of materials to minimize waste and conserve resources

- Green buildings incorporate environmentally preferable products
- Reduces costs associated with materials management
- Reduces greenhouse gas emissions associated with building materials and waste processes.
- Local sourcing can have positive impact on local economy
- Consider all phases: planning, design, construction, operation
5. Social Considerations

Enhance quality of life for university students, faculty, and staff, as well as local community

- Results from improvements of built and natural environment
- Enhances relationship with community through increased sensitivity to university context and impacts
- Connect through local employment and purchasing
- Connect through partnerships in education and outreach

Summary

Sustainability is not separate and apart, but integrated throughout the Master Plan Update

- Sustainability is the filter through which Elements are considered
- Sustainability means taking the long view
- Improve operations now and plan future expansion wisely
Work session Schedule and Committees

Rick Lyttle provided an outline of the work session schedule and committee makeup:

Executive Committee
- Dr Arthur Guilford – Regional Chancellor will approve all review materials.
- Ms. Elizabeth Lindsay – USF Sarasota Manatee Campus Board –Chairwoman
- Will also be adding a representative from USF Sarasota—Manatee Community Leadership Council

Steering Committee –
- Ben Ellinor – Administrative Affairs Advisory Group Chair, Regional Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration
- Dr. Jay Schrock – Academic Affairs Advisory Group Chair, Director School of Hotel and Restaurant Management (attending Executive Session due to scheduling conflict)
- Mary Beth Wallace – Student Support Advisory Group Chair, Director of Academic Advising

All USF SM advisory committees will be well attended in these sessions. The Community Advisory Group is also anticipated to have pretty good attendance on Thursday. Included in the group are representatives of the Uplands neighborhood, the Sarasota-Bradenton International Airport and North Trail Redevelopment Partnership. Rick noted that this latter group – North Trail Redevelopment Partnership - is largely business driven. The North 41 corridor section addressed specifically by this group extends from downtown to USF SM (at Sarasota line). The group looks to the Colleges and Ringling to spur change. Rick sits on this committee. (See attached Committee Organization.)
Planning Background and Issues

Rick noted that sustainability should not be an issue for push back. He has been reviewing the Roadmap to a Green Campus and found it very useful. Leo provided background on the process of its development. The group noted the value in having Christian Wells, Director USF Office of Sustainability; participate in sustainability discussion/planning process at USF SM. The last master planning effort was 2008-2009 – not much elapsed time; however, much has and will be changing for the campus.

SACS (Southern Association of Schools and Colleges) accreditation is anticipated this June. Four year program is anticipated to begin in 2012.
- Introduction of on-campus housing is anticipated for 2013 and increased student life demands.
- Laboratory facilities for general education requirements – shared or on campus

Manatee Community College (MCC) is now State College of Florida (SCF) and is also going from two year to four year program. Rick noted that while there will always be some 2+2 (MCC to USF SM) there will be less so now that both schools are offering BA degrees with some similar programs and overlap between the schools. Traditionally, eighty percent of USF SM students have been feeder students. SCF/MCC does not have residential component yet, but development is anticipated. SCF/MCC has three campuses – Bradenton, Venice and Lakewood Ranch.

USF SM North Point campus will be represented in the Academic Affairs Group by Lora Kosten, Director USF SM at North Port.

Campus Property

Campus program and facility expansion is limited by property size and configuration; six acres at frontage are an established “preserve”. Property acquisition is anticipated as a key component of the planning process.

Outparcels owned by USF SM include the Viking Property along North 41 and a trapezoidal piece of land west of the used car lot adjacent to the Viking property (north). Campus bookstore serving USF SM and New College is located at Viking, operated by Barnes and Noble and would like a larger space. Property is difficult to access from main campus and limited in development potential due to airport restrictions. Other adjacent properties were reviewed including:
- Crosley Estate to the west along the Bay – owned and operated by Manatee County
- Used car lot north of Viking along North 41
- Rental property adjacent to campus (south) along North 41
- Hilton Garden Inn property on north
- Self storage facility property on north edge of campus and north of Hilton Inn.

Program

Student Life and academic expansion with four year program including food service/coffee shop, tiered lecture hall, classroom space for more than 80 seats, and faculty offices.

Athletics and Recreation – The campus is initiating a rowing team.

Housing will be built with bonds with consideration weighing potential for property USFSM owns versus property USFSM would need to purchase (100 to 125 beds in Phase 1).

Shared New College/USF SM facilities include the bookstore, Library, Sudakoff Conference Center, campus police and health services. There is a desire to separate and provide services on the USF SM campus. USF SM students typically rely on the campus Information Commons access to the USF Tampa library collection and do not typically make use of the New College site library. Expanded student study/internet access space on campus is desired.

USF SM campus has a very active Senior Life Long Learning Academy program. Enrollment averages 800 HC (higher in the winter).

Enhance transportation connections to campus via SCAT or equal.
Need to look at maximizing classroom utilization.
Maintain “one stop shop” student services.
Work with the community on North Trail Route 41 improvements. Enhance the quality of the corridor and improve safety for bicycles, pedestrians, and campus access.

2010 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN UPDATE -COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Master Plan Executive Committee
Dr. Arthur Guilford, Regional Chancellor
Ms. Elizabeth Lindsay, USF Sarasota-Manatee Campus Board
Representative(s) TBA, USF Sarasota-Manatee Community Leadership Council (not present)

Master Plan Steering Committee
Richard Lyttle, Director, Facilities Planning & Management, Committee Co-Chair
Rosana Ellana, Assistant Director, Facilities Planning & Management, Committee Co-Chair
Dr. Jay Schrock, Academic Affairs Advisory Group Chair
Ben Ellinor, Administrative Affairs Advisory Group Chair
Mary Beth Wallace, Student Affairs Advisory Group Chair

Academic Affairs Advisory Group
Dr. Jay Schrock, Dean, School of Hotel and Restaurant Management, Advisory Group Chair
Dr. Robert Anderson, Dean, College of Business
Dr. James Curran, College of Business, Faculty Senate Representative (unable to attend)
Linda de Mello, Academic Affairs (Donna Prado attending for Linda de Mello)
Dr. Bonnie Jones, Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Dr. Lora Kosten, Director, USF Sarasota-Manatee at North Port
Dr. Terry Osborn, Dean, College of Education (unable to attend)
Dr. Jane Rose, Dean, College of Arts & Sciences (unable to attend)
Judy Sedgeman, Director, Institute for Public Policy and Leadership

Administrative Affairs Advisory Group
Ben Ellinor, Regional Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, Advisory Group Chair
Geoff Copeland, Facilities Operations Manager, Facilities Planning & Management
Laura Hoffman, Statistical Data Analyst, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
Greg Mallay, CIO/Director, Campus Computing
Chris Manning, Director, University Relations
Alexis Upham, Senior Director for Development
Pat White, Associate Director, Administrative Services

Student Support Advisory Group
Mary Beth Wallace, Director, Academic Advising, Advisory Group Chair
Pamela Doerr, Regional Vice Chancellor for Student Services
Courtney Coulter, Student Government
Brittany Gleitsman, Student Government
Darren Gambrell, Student Affairs
Michelle Groves, Academic Advising (unable to attend)
Julie Lazaris, Recruiting
Toni Ripo, Career Services,
Mark Bukowski, Assistant Director, Admissions

Community Advisory Group
Elliot Falcione, Bradenton Area Convention and Visitors Bureau ( Powel Crosley Estate) (unable to attend)
Florida State University/Ringling Museums (not represented)
Mote Marine (not represented)
Suzanne Janney, New College of Florida
Jay Patel, North Trail Redevelopment Partnership
Dave Morriss, Indian Beach/Sapphire Shores Neighborhood Association
Vald Svekis, Indian Beach/Sapphire Shores Neighborhood Association, Sarasota City Planning Office
Robert Walker, Sarasota-Bradenton International Airport
Chris Miller, Uplands Neighborhood Association

Intergovernmental Coordination Advisory Group (no work session held with this advisory at this time)
City of Sarasota Government
City of North Port Government
Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
Manatee County Government
Sarasota County Government
Sarasota County Area Transit (SCAT)/Manatee County Area Transit (MCAT)
Sarasota/Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

Professional Consultants
Anthony Call, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
Jean Garbier, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
John Jennings, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
Leo Pierre Roy, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
Barry Wilcox, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
James Tatone, Affiliated Engineers, Inc. (AEI) (not present)
Justin Gore, Affiliated Engineers, Inc. (AEI)
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Master Plan Steering Committee Work Session Introduction

Rick Lyttle provided an introduction to the Master Plan and work session schedule. The work session participants introduced themselves and their role at USF SM.

John Jennings introduced the consultant team, reviewed the Master Plan schedule and goals of Master Plan per Chapter 21 requirement.

Leo Roy provided an overview presentation of sustainability and the role sustainability considerations play in shaping the planning process.

Work Session Forum

How do the thoughts on sustainability ring with USF SM?

Mary Beth Wallace (MBW): Our students are very interested in issues of sustainability. In particular this year student organizations have shown a sharp increase in interest and activity.

Ben Ellinor (BE): The Green Fee was authorized by the State Legislature. Student government has endorsed the Green Fee. A student referendum is required to pass the fee.

How will the move to being a four year institution impact USF SM and its planning?

Ben Ellinor (BE) The campus is a stranded asset with limited growth potential. The introduction of dormitories, security and operations related to housing and student life haven’t been managed before. Six acres along North Trail/US 41 (preserved land based on designation as gopher tortoise habitat) can’t
be touched. The new signs on US 41 have made a difference in the campus' visibility, but the extent of frontage is limited and separated from institution frontage to the south (New College, Ringling) by outparcels owned by others. The rental property immediately south of campus is in poor condition, unattractive and overvalued (asking $7 million). The three properties along US 41 to the south (rental housing, used car, USF SM’s Viking property) need to connect. The asking price by the owners of the properties is more than the current market value of the properties.

The Hilton property to the north is a potential acquisition, but asking price $9-10 million is high. Two eastern outparcels adjacent to US 41 are asking an additional $1.5 million.

The Self Storage parcel to north is also a possible acquisition.

MBW: The safety of students walking or biking to the bookstore (located on US 41 at the Viking property and serving New College as well) is a real concern.

BE: This is not a biking type of campus.

*What is the background to the strategy in going to a four year institution?*

BE: This is a matter of survival, to compete with other local academic options, including Manatee Community College (MCC)/State College of Florida (SCF).

MBW: President Genshaft favors this move. Changes to Admissions will be significant. First time in college students (FTIC) are a different population - whole different process. We will need additional faculty offices to accommodate teaching for FTIC and sophomores, and additional student services. Freshman want to engage in campus. We have to identify what is going to light their fire. In contrast, our current students have a lot going on off campus with jobs and families.

As background, approximately 2,800 students are currently enrolled at USF SM. New College is now part of State University System (SUS), but no longer affiliated with USF SM. New College is approximately ¾ mile to the south of the campus and has an enrollment of about 700 students.

*How many housing units/beds are being considered for implementation?*

First phase might be 100-125 beds. There is no data as yet to support how many beds would be needed. It is possible FTIC students might be required to live on campus as was done at St. Peters burg. It was noted that this was done at Tampa also.

MBW: Other groups besides FTIC are interested in living on campus, such as international students. The international students have been recruited to the Hotel and Restaurant Management program. It is a challenge to have them on campus without available housing. Students don’t feel comfortable with transportation arrangements between their housing and campus. Bus system only runs until 7:00 pm. No other transit service is available. Buses are sometimes from the Manatee transit system and other times from the Sarasota transit system. Bus 99 (route along US 41) is a nightmare.

The property just to the southeast of the campus was a motel and has been converted to low-end apartments. There really aren’t any inviting apartment complexes nearby for students.

*Are there any van or escort services available after regular bus service ends?*

BE: There is no transportation access fee. If there was a shuttle, what would the hours of operation be? Critical mass data to support it is not available.
JJ: Would it be possible to arrange an “on-call” demand shuttle service in coordination with the Hilton Garden shuttle?

What do today’s students need?

MBW: We’ve seen more student involvement and time spent on campus. We would like to keep students on campus longer. Students are “place bound” on campus. We need to offer more. They have ideas and there is interest in hanging out. As there are changes in the student body (becomes younger) demands will expand for activities.

What is the hook? Why does a student choose USF SM

BE: USF SM, lowest faculty/student ratio in the system at 1:19.

MBW: This low ratio is a huge advantage.

RL: They are also choosing the USF system. USF Tampa is a Research I university that offers students many grad and post-grad opportunities.

MBW/BE: When applying to USF, prospective students select a preferred campus. If not admitted to Tampa a student may be offered admission at an alternative USF campus. If citing a desired major – the selected campus must have that degree program.

RL/BE: Currently the campus is limited by agreement with county zoning to 150,000 SF at maximum 62 foot height (approximately three stories). The current Master Plan shows an additional two 75,000 SF buildings. There is no science laboratory space at present. USF SM is considering sharing science lab facilities with Mote Marine.

$1 million in services paid to New College for shared Library, Sudokoff Conference Center, police services and counseling and wellness. The bookstore (operated by Barnes and Noble) is shared between New College and USF SM.

Where are the pressure points?

BE: Would prefer to use the $1 million currently going toward shared NC/USF SM facilities toward developing independent Library and police services. USF SM students do not make use of shared facilities on New College campus. Other pressure points:

- Faculty offices
- Tiered lecture hall – top priority, currently the largest classroom seats 54 after that must go to resetting the auditorium which seats 100 in classroom style. Will be particularly needed with introduction of general education courses
- Expanded food service with dormitory
- Recreation – softball, volleyball, basketball and bay front property rowing and sailing.

MBW: Add bookstore/gathering café.

What is utilization percentage of the existing facility?

RL/BE: 7:30-11:00 am campus is a ghost town, except for Tuesday mornings when Life Long Learning classes are in session. Utilization spikes during the evening 6:00-9:00 pm and is at capacity on Tuesday
and Thursday evenings. The younger student population wants the earlier time slots, more daytime classes. They prefer to work evenings. Scheduling impacts faculty – typically working on three hour class blocks.

Adjunct faculty get “touch-down” space, not full faculty offices. With four year program there will be move to have more fulltime faculty. First rub to expansion will be Faculty offices.

MBW: USF SM has a good retention rate compared to other USF campuses – percent ahead – for those that transfer in. FTIC retention will be a new ballgame. There are two distinct student groups being served by USF SM:

- Full time more traditional younger student taking 4-5 classes/semester
- Part time older student taking two classes/semester.

Have you looked across US 41 to the airport for expansion and more control of institutional visibility on US 41?

RL: Currently, USF SM has no affiliation with airport. DOT presented a proposal for medians and improvements for traffic control, but not beautification. USF is interested in traffic control and an aesthetic improvements with landscape treatment in medians rather than concrete. USFSM has proposed roadway intersection improvements for the campus entrance at US 41 (see Kimley Horn study sent to VHB).

How to get bike/pedestrian access to and through the campus is a really big issue. Upland neighborhood is interested in protecting park at end of Upland (Edwards Drive).

RL: Crosley Estate owned and operated by Manatee County. It is not likely a potential acquisition. Used as wedding/event space. USF uses the facility for reduced fees. Crosley uses USF SM parking in return.

USF SM Facilities are used by the community - often with facility rental fee waived by Advancement “friend raising”.

Of note, USF SM hosts Itzhak Perlman and 40 protégé students each year through the Perlman Music Program. The Perlman Program puts on free concerts open to the public. USF SM earns public visibility through the program, but no revenue.

Vision for this campus?

BE: See it as a vibrant campus where students live and study.

MBW: Be able to offer full services – a complete education all in one destination. So good students stay for graduate degree.

Character of this campus?

RL: Could see us be more like St. Pete campus with housing, student activity and academic spaces connected by interesting spaces and access to the waterfront.

BE: Personally had wanted a more distinct, awesome look for this campus, rather than the “Med Rev” architectural style.
MBW: Agree. The style presents students with an office space character - not like a “real” campus. It was designed as a one stop shop and is very convenient for providing access to advisors, services, and classrooms in one place, but there is no single space just for students. They need spaces to make it feel like it is their own.
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**Master Plan Executive Committee Work Session Introduction**

Rick Lyttle provided an introduction to the Master Plan and work session schedule. The work session participants introduced themselves and their role at USF SM.

John Jennings introduced the consultant team, reviewed the Master Plan schedule and goals of Master Plan per Chapter 21 requirement.

Leo Roy provided an overview presentation on sustainability and the role sustainability considerations play in shaping the planning process.

**Master Plan Executive Committee**

John Jennings opened the conversation by asking Dr. Guilford and Ms. Lindsay their thoughts on USF SM, its current needs and issues faced.

Dr Arthur Guilford (AG): The campus was land locked from the outset. The 150,000 SF limit (two 75,000 SF buildings) to development won’t do it. Growth seen here will be greater. The campus needs access to New College. The adjacent rental property (old motel) to the southeast and two used car lots further south are asking unrealistic pricing right now ($7 million rental property and $1 million each used car lots). These properties cut off contiguous access to the USF SM owned Viking property further south. The Viking property - two story section - should be demolished (currently getting estimate) It is an unattractive nuisance, vacant with chiller malfunctioning, inviting trouble. It would be more valuable as planted landscape i.e. park like, than with the existing buildings.
Think very strongly that the University should look to the north, small hotels are over built. There are six to seven hotels in range of the airport. Hilton Garden Inn, adjacent to the campus, is one of the older of the hotels (estimated price $10-12 million). The parcel plus the two adjacent frontage parcels (estimated price $1 million) would provide significant room for expansion and greater visibility.

Though the University may not need more land during Dr. Guilford’s tenure as Chancellor, buying land now is a good opportunity. Dr. Guildford noted that $1 million is within vision for a donor’s gifting and this could allow for acquisitions.

By Fall 2012 USF SM will be a four year institution. Eventually there will be on-campus housing also. This growth, including expanded student life and residential components, could be accommodated on the northwest plot (as shown in latest Master Plan). A building design might consider 1st floor with student activity, floors above with residences.

Over the next five years, anticipated enrollment growth is from 4500 (HC) to 10,000 (HC). Ms. Lindsay noted that’s 10,000 “car count” as well.

North Trail/US 41
North Trail/US 41 needs to be reconfigured and landscaped. It has been talked about and there is verbal support, but no action yet. North to Bradenton and south of Ringling Museums toward Sarasota as well, is blighted.

USF SM needs to become that entity on North Trail that is the model to emulate. Speed limit is 45 in Sarasota, but increases to 50 at the Manatee County line; however, current speeds on the road at campus are typically 60 mph. Traffic calming is a must. Traffic coming out of campus is often at risk for accidents. There have been fatalities coming and going from campus. It should be unacceptable.

FDOT has agreed to medians in US 41 in Manatee County, but will not move forward until USFSM and Manatee County agree on a plan. At issue is the location of the median cuts and left turn lanes to and from the campus. USFSM wants the access and median cuts at the campus main entrance, and Manatee County wants median cuts and access at Seagate Drive (south of main entrance) to the Crosley Estate. The two locations are too close together for both to be approved. Seagate Drive is currently right in/right out. DOT says the traffic volume at either location does not qualify for a signalized intersection. Better data is needed to justify location of signalized intersections and campus gateways.

What about the Self-storage site to the north?
Expansion to the north could provide increased visibility on US 41 and take care of near term housing needs. Pedestrian connections will be essential. Buffer/edges to residential neighborhoods are important.

What about land across US 41 at the airport?
Land is periodically for sale. Some of the property on the east side of US 41 does not belong to the airport. Getting to the other side of US 41 would be difficult, though the pedestrian bridge at New College works well.

The City of Sarasota and Sarasota County are currently implementing roundabouts in Sarasota. One was constructed in downtown Sarasota, and additional roundabouts are planned for intersections at US 41/14th Street and US 41/Gulfstream Ave (main road to St. Armand’s and beaches).

Northbound traffic at the University Parkway and US 41 intersection backs up one mile and is getting worse.
There is also talk of the Sarasota bus line making the USF SM campus the northern terminus of the proposed BRT line.

North Port teaching center
USF SM at North Port is leasing one floor of a building (2nd floor) with an additional two floors available (currently empty) in this same building. Space was leased from a bank (property was in foreclosure), but has now been sold to a private developer. Facility has been built out to USF SM quality and specifications. USF SM has a two-year option to lease the remainder of the second floor (1,500 SF) and the first right of refusal for the remainder of the building (first and third floors). The building is similar in style to main SM campus building. Building is within an office park with an approved site development plan of five potential buildings. It may be good strategy to look at long term acquisition of the site.

Previously North Port center was located at MCC/SCF campus. The move to the present location was done Fall 2010. USFSM would love to find a permanent location for the learning center. The intent for North Port is to provide outreach to the North Port/Charlotte County communities, which are younger and faster growing than Sarasota or Manatee. North Port enrollment is increasing. There are technology issues with North Port, but USF SM is working to fix these issues. Set between Ft. Myers and Sarasota, this is a good location that allows USF to draw from growing Charlotte County. For Charlotte County residents, Florida Gulf Coast University is one hour drive away. USF SM is about 15 minutes drive away.

How will going to four year program affect North Port?
It may add 25 to 40 freshmen from North Point to USF SM campus. North Port envisions a bigger presence for USF.

Crosley Estate
The Crosley Estate is a non-issue for acquisition for at least the next 10 years. It is a prized jewel in Manatee County. Ideally, USF SM would extend all the way to the Bay. The Crosley is used by the University for special events and has a small catering kitchen. USF SM and Manatee County are working together to open a bay front walking/bicycle trail that will extend from the Crosley south to the Ringling Museum. The University-owned grounds extending along the Bay are public parkland (passive recreation) though it is currently fenced on edges. Pedestrian access from campus to the Bay is a priority.

Rowing program
The newly established rowing program is currently working out of the boathouse at Spanish Point near Venice – using both boats and coaches from the facility. Ideally, the program would like a non-permanent secure boathouse with dedicated (program owned) boats. Benderson is interested and will allow USF SM to row there, but USF will have to provide their own boats. SRQ Airport is thrilled with crew. Several donors support athletics in a major way at USF Tampa, so there is opportunity here.

What are the priorities or hot issues for action?
Priority should be placed on acquisition.

Housing
The public/private partnership considered for the Viking property is not desirable for first time college students who need affordable housing in close proximity/on campus. RCA&D has built residence halls, and New College has increased on campus housing over the past few years. Currently USF SM has five French students. As international students, they have difficulty obtaining driver’s licenses or affording a car and rely on bus transportation and bicycles. This makes commuting difficult.

How can the Master Plan help convey the importance of land purchases?
USF views the Sarasota-Manatee building as one of the nicest buildings. PECO request list is a centralized/combined USF System list. Each USF campus submits its own priority PECO list, and then those lists are consolidated into a single USF System list. Priority for land acquisitions is at the bottom of the Florida Board of Governors (BOG) priority list. It becomes a catch 22 between providing land, housing and faculty to offer more classes. USF SM has received only PECO infrastructure funds since completion of the new campus in 2005-06. They have decreased from $1.5 million (2008-09) to $375,000 (2010-11).

The USF SM student body is becoming more traditional in age. Faculty will need to be convinced to take on more daytime classes. The campus will need to change in character. Right now, to the younger students this building feels more like an office building than a campus. Establishing a desirable campus feel is critical to success.

There are mixed feelings about the conservation land along US 41. It is attractive for development, but as conservation land it is contentious and politically charged.

The University could say no to residence halls on campus, but a four year institution cannot be developed without including housing. Students demand more. Fontana Hall at Tampa (private) rose out of such a need. Both Dr. Guilford and Ms. Lindsay agreed it is imperative that housing be included in the updated master plan.
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### Academic Affairs Advisory Group Introduction

Rick Lyttle provided an introduction to the Master Plan and work session schedule. The work session participants introduced themselves and their role at USF SM.

John Jennings introduced the consultant team, reviewed the Master Plan schedule and goals of Master Plan per Chapter 21 requirement.

Leo Roy provided an overview presentation on sustainability and the role sustainability considerations play in shaping the planning process.

### Work Session Discussion

**USF SM Visibility and Attracting Students**

One of the biggest issues - the University is not visible in the community. The community is not aware of USF SM’s existence. The campus needs to distinguish itself and not be a “Mini Tampa”. As an example of an opportunity, USF SM has a distinct program in Hotel and Restaurant Management, but no lab facilities to support the program. The institution should want the highest quality in everything. The faculty: student ratio at 1:19 is the best in the USF system, maybe the state. This is a draw for our
potential students. The graduation rate (based on today’s transfer students) is 80.8% compared to Tampa’s at 50%. The faculty is very good. The “value added” factor is amazing on the USF SM campus.

Going to a four year program is a dramatic change. Given the choice would prefer to fill classrooms with traditional students. Around 1,300 to 1,400 students leave this county area for four year schools. We’d like them to stay in this community. The move to four year program will give the University the platform to train community members and provide community leadership. However, today USF SM lacks the faculty offices and science facilities to accommodate a four year program.

Transitioning to a four year program will require some type of student focus including physical places conducive to students getting together. The courtyard is currently used by a very small minority of the students. Right now it is mostly faculty and staff and Life Long Learning students. The campus is a “drive through” campus – similar to how Tampa and St. Pete were years ago. St Pete has the advantage of downtown nearby. Sarasota Manatee will need amenities. USF SM will need to do more with student support/assistance to help with transition to college.

USF SM would like to start the four year program transition with a freshman cohort of 40 students. Ideally this would grow exponentially.

**Access and transportation**

The bus transportation ends at 7:00 pm and doesn’t run on Sunday. What we are saying is, “If you don’t have a car, don’t come here.”

Campus parking is a problem during the transitional classroom times, but otherwise is adequate if not plentiful. It was noted this is somewhat dependant on what side of the building one parks on.

International students are a component of the student body, but they are much more transit dependent than the typical student.

Traffic lights and signage are needed for improving access/egress at campus drive.

The Institute of Public Policy and Leadership is a bridge to the community and dealings with the community highlight the issues of community access to the campus. The gateway to campus has a design character that suggests condominium development rather than a University to many and is not easily identifiable as USF SM’s entry. The campus needs something more powerful that is in keeping with the speed of viewers on US 41. It was noted that the largest sign on campus is the sign to the Crosley Estate and this is likely to become a reference point. There has been feedback noting that a significant number of community members will not attend events after dark because of difficulty accessing and departing campus.

**North Port**

There is an assumption that once economy rebounds North Port will likely be one of the first areas of growth, based upon the availability of affordable housing.

North Port facility is currently located on the 2nd floor of a three story building. It is rather lonely with the vacant space surrounding. A Student Center with cafe, or student centered space, Student Success Center (tutorial center, computer work area, group study area, video conferencing, and reception space) and Community function room are desired to support the program offerings. The City library is located across the street and has WiFi and a dedicated USF room, but requires crossing eight lanes of traffic to get there. Students typically drive across the street. Having residences on the main campus and available transportation to North Port would be a good option.
Presence in Lakewood Ranch is critical as it is a strong socio and economic hub in Sarasota/Manatee with younger families. Lakewood Ranch is a gateway to Sarasota and Manatee communities with lots of undeveloped land. Consideration needs to be given to establishing a visible presence (possibly a learning center such as North Port) in Lakewood Ranch. It was noted that MCC/SCF has a post in Lakewood Ranch.

**Facilities**

**Classrooms**
The campus is short on classrooms during peak attendance periods (evenings), and in particular there is a need for larger, multi-functional classrooms. General classrooms seat 20 to 40 students – would like to have a number of classrooms that seat 80. The Business program would like a classroom for 120 to 150.

Large classrooms need to be able to be broken down into smaller areas with good sound-proofing. Selby Auditorium is a lovely facility, but it is technologically is primitive. The Master Plan should address speed of IT development, expectations for multi-media, and ease of presentation use.

USF SM will need science teaching facilities (not necessarily hard-core research) to compete. None currently exist on campus.

The Hotel and Restaurant Management program will require specific facilities including at least 1-2 portable/flexible guest rooms for training. The program has good relationships with local industry. Having on campus housing, such as a dormitory, would serve as access to another level of student. The program plans to grow from 125 undergraduate students to 350, and from 16 graduate students to 60 optimally. In order to do that, the program needs two new faculty members.

**Library**
Cook Library (on New College campus) is a shared facility. USF SM students need a better way to get there if the relationship continues. New College has removed a lot of parking, making it more difficult for USF SM community to access the facility by car and other transportation options are poor or non-existent. Students of USF-SM feel like outsiders when going to the library on the New College campus.

The USF Tampa library is available electronically to USF SM students and is a much larger collection than Cook. It would be desirable to have a dedicated USF SM electronic Library or “Information Center” on the USF SM campus (rather than the shared Cook Library facility tie). Ideally students would bring their own laptop. The facility could include IT help, printers and copiers, seating areas, group work areas, WiFi, and more electric outlets for re-charging. A student tutorial center (computers, work stations, central reception desk, and quiet study areas) would be helpful and could be combined with the central Information Center. Currently, students have nowhere to receive help from student assistants.

**Office**
Office space is a critical component. Some faculty members are currently doubled up. The University will need a minimum of eight new offices to cover the introduction of General Education curriculum and pre-requisites that will be added when USF SM goes to four year program. Over the next five years, would like to see 20 to 30 faculty offices with space for adjunct faculty. A Faculty Center would be great for gathering and interacting, perhaps offering food service or option for catered meal service.

**Student Life**
The University will need to find a way to keep students on campus. Many students come alone in personal cars, others car pool (example given of 12 to 14 Hotel Management students commuting by car pool from Hillsborough County, Pinellas County or even Orlando), but both groups frequently have class schedules arranged in sequential three hour blocks. Typically, many students leave campus between blocks.
A Student Center, or Student Union, is desperately needed to create a sense of community. Campus lockers/storage space is needed for commuting students. International students have special needs in integrating into campus that would be helped with a Student Center.

USF SM needs improved food service, but current campus demand makes it difficult to support options. Jonathan’s Café (campus dining café) often looks like a geriatric center during the Life Long Learning sessions, not a student center for freshmen and sophomores. It was pointed out that Jonathan’s doesn’t offer basic fare such as burger and fries that typically appeal to students. With Mc Donald’s less than 1 ½ blocks away there is strong competing draw off campus and away from on campus eating at Jonathan’s. There was a suggestion made to offer food on-campus that the off-campus community would be drawn to campus to dine.

The campus needs land for accommodating growth.
Administrative Affairs Advisory Group Introduction

Rick Lyttle provided an introduction to the Master Plan and work session schedule. The work session participants introduced themselves and their role at USF SM.

John Jennings introduced the consultant team, reviewed the Master Plan schedule and goals of Master Plan per Chapter 21 requirement.

Leo Roy provided an overview presentation on sustainability and the role sustainability considerations play in shaping the planning process.

Work Session Discussion

Vision, Mission

Campus is looking for a comprehensive MP that defines what the campus is about. Buildings are not necessarily the most important element – the plan needs to express the campus’ vision and mission. Programs will be the first priority. What resonates with donors and the community is the strength and depth in current programs, collaborative outreach to diverse populations, keeping our youth in the community, services for our seniors, and entrepreneurial activity.

While there is a trend to online multimedia access, people also like to come together.

What would you do to engage the general public and students more?

Location of USF-SM and cost is appealing to people working with families. There is a distinction of prestige that goes with USF-SM versus State College of Florida/Manatee Community College.
Acquisition of frontage along US41 would provide a capacity to expand and draw in elements of the locale such as the waterfront.

Expand externally visible programs that draw community such as “crew team” sailing, etc. – that will bring people together.

Campus needs to develop partnering relationships with other organizations like developing joint classes with FSU/Ringling, RCA&D Ringling, and New College.

Campus needs to use clean energy. Also have a back-up generator.

**Visibility and Attracting Students**
The campus (es) needs to be able to expand. How we locate – Sarasota Manatee on US 41, North Port, and Lakewood Ranch - each need their own identity and amenities and accessibility between locations.

The main campus needs increased presence along US 41. Traffic needs to slow.

The University District (Ringling, New College, and USF SM) has never really taken off. Currently there is a local entrepreneur – Rich Swier of the “the Hub” interested in establishing a high-speed fiber optic along the US 41 corridor. USF SM has fiber. Sarasota wants to be the place with high-speed fiber optic connections. USF-SM is viewed as a major player in their minds. Sarasota used to be of a non-growth mentality, but there has been a change – “act now or get run over”. The University needs to be proactive and capture the energy out there for development. High-speed fiber optic providers (fiber optic) are not providing models for business development, but businesses would be drawn to such a corridor due to the available high-speed fiber optic. The Campus could become Sarasota County’s northern anchor to attract information technology entrepreneurs. Campus could become Manatee County’s southern anchor of the Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) corridor.

The challenge exists in working with three different local governments entities. USF SM can lead by bringing them together. The Master Plan will cover 2 counties and 3 political entities: University and Cultural District – right now it ends at College Drive (the north end of New College). USF SM needs the district extended to include USF SM. One sector of the Manatee County; North Trail Extension; and the Manatee Community Redevelopment Area includes area surrounding USF SM.

**What is the benefit, if any, to having the airport across SR 41?**
The airport’s presence is a benefit for accessing campus. It is attractive to international students. It allows the University to develop and draw a broader student base to a higher level of program. It also supports a higher level of accessible security if we need it. However, the stretch of the airport property along US 41 is not pleasant aesthetically.

**What is the community’s view of USF SM?**
USF has visibility, but not USF SM. The University has a recruiter dedicated to local high schools and community colleges. Location of USF SM and cost is appealing to local SW Florida Students and continuing education for working people with families. There is a distinction of prestige, higher level of faculty that goes with USF SM versus State College of Florida/Manatee Community College.

Lower division programs will make USF SM more convenient, but will require real campus life with bookstore, café, housing, recreation, student support, etc.
There is a big push to admit more international students. Big tuition cost difference for out-of-state tuition versus in-state enrollment that works to the institutions advantage in increasing international student body make up enrollment.

Bridge across 41, like at New College, would provide advertising for campus.

**Access and Transportation**
Campus needs to have connections to other campuses such as: New College, FSU/Ringling, RCA&D.

Speeds along 41 are too fast. Need to develop traffic calming measures. The dedicated bike lanes are not safe with current road speed. Bus stops need to be visible and safe. Access from the street onto campus needs to be well lighted.

There is no organized carpool program. No shuttle either, though there was a consideration at one time to have one – as much to serve faculty as to serve students. Public bus times are limited. SCAT has applied for federal grant funding to implement a BRT system which USF SM has offered campus property to be the northern terminus.

Parking is adequate. A-B classroom has the least amount of nearby parking. Complaints are received that the HP parking is too far away. All parking is permitted, with no metered or reserved parking, no separate parking for faculty and staff. Some students only have a class on Saturday, and would prefer a metered option. There is a day parking pass for $2.

**Facilities**

**Student Life**
Campus needs comfortable and engaging gathering places – home like. There needs to be more covered areas outside for both small intimate groups and larger gatherings. Better ‘soft’ recreation places. Goal is to keep students on campus between classes.

**Classroom**
Campus needs an auditorium to realistically hold 400 to 500 students (400 is more practical), ideally 2,000 students for graduation, with a stage and a terraced floor. The current flat floor campus auditorium is used 2-3 times a day, with 2-3 changes a day between auditorium and classroom set ups. Each set up takes 2 people 1 ½ hours to complete.

Culinary labs (VE item in the original design), MBA tiered executive style classrooms, and science labs (currently offered through MOTE Marine lab. (No lab space shared with New College)

**Support Space**
There is not enough quite space, storage space (for students and facilities), or electrical outlets. Between classes students need places to work that are quiet enough to concentrate. Jonathan’s is too noisy and Information Center on second floor of rotunda fills up quickly. Students working with three hour class blocks run out of power part way through class.

Need to improve the central receiving loading dock.

**Security**
It would be nice to have own dedicated campus police. Currently New College provides security and has 11 officers and phone response. Two security personal are assigned to USF SM for 40 hours per week. New College security patrols both campuses and the Uplands neighborhood.
In general, the building is secure and well prepared for emergency. IT would have preferred a raised floor in the data center and put data center on 2nd floor. Big concern for safety of equipment in a major storm on the third floor directly under the roof.

To improve security, there could be an intercom system. For security, campus needs a location to check into/register upon entering the buildings.

Building has internal and external cameras.

Blue-lights on campus have continued operational problems due to weather protection.

**General**
Building architecture has a lot of underutilized space. Awnings provide incomplete cover. Covered colonnades on the outside stop short of fully accessing entryways (incomplete).

Gopher tortoise tunnels were a mandated element. It is not clear that there actually are any gopher tortoises remaining on site.
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Community Advisory Group Introduction

Rick Lyttle introduced the Master Plan and work session schedule, and reviewed new considerations included in this planning effort, such as SACS accreditation, move to a four year program and North Port satellite campus. The work session participants introduced themselves and their organization.

John Jennings introduced the consultant team, reviewed the Master Plan schedule and goals of Master Plan per Chapter 21 requirement.

Jean Garbier provided an overview presentation on sustainability and the role sustainability considerations play in shaping the planning process.

Work Session Discussion

This work session offered community representatives the opportunity to ask questions of the University and provide input regarding the Master Planning process.

The community representatives seemed to strongly support the sustainability initiative. David Morriss (DM) noted that “It’s the right thing to do” is good enough reason to push for greater sustainability.

Vald Svekis (VS) questioned how many students were on the USF SM campus and how many would be housed in proposed on-campus residences.
Today’s enrollment is approximately 4,500 and is anticipated to grow to 7,500 over the next five years. Projected housing numbers are not definitive – maybe 200 to 300 on campus in five years? It was noted that the location for housing had not been determined and that both clarification of the housing program and determining its location is part of the activity of the master planning process.

DM: What does the consultant team see as the trend in siting campus housing relative to the campus street edge?

John Jennings (JJ) noted two contrasting trends in siting housing - one that favors placing housing in a way that it begins to define the streetscape, for example at the edge of campus on public roadway as part of the urban fabric, and another that favors siting housing internal to the campus. The latter is sometimes driven by security concerns.

DM: How do University’s generate revenue for carrying out greater sustainability? Can they generate revenue on their land through retail offerings?

JJ noted that part of this master plan effort is consideration of the North Trail US 41 corridor – finding key nodes to develop positive anchors.

Vald Svekis (VS): Have any thoughts been given to sports offerings such as crew or basketball?

Rick Lyttle (RL): USF SM has formed a crew team that is training out of Spanish Point. It was noted that New College has crew and sailing programs.

DM: Might Crosley Estate and USF campus be integrated?

RL: Manatee County has invested heavily in renovation and operation of the estate. The two entities share resources, but USF SM does not have plans on the horizon for property purchase or exchange.

Jay Patel (JP) commented that Gainesville is doing a lot with incubator enterprises, setting up permanent bases, and gaining economic stability. RL noted that USF SM has offered to allow the Sarasota County Economic Development Council (EDC) to utilize USF SM facilities such as the Viking Complex for business incubators. Some faculty members on the USF SM campus perform research, but Tampa is the primary research institution in the USF System.

Chris Miller (CM) described the Uplands neighborhood and the association concerns. The Uplands neighborhood is made up of about 100 houses between US 41 and the Bay and bordered by New College to the south and USF SM to the north. The neighborhood has concerns regarding light and noise pollution, transportation and access from US 41 via a “suicide” center lane. Twenty to twenty five percent of the housing is rental. Faculty, staff and students are among the residents. The community is split between those desiring new development to replace the blight and those who are concerned that change might bring increased noise and traffic. In general, new development on US 41 would be welcomed. On the question of receptiveness to bicycle transportation/ bikeways at the bay front or through the neighborhood, CM noted this is a double-edged issue. Improved bicycle connections would be good for neighborhood transportation, but some are wary of those riding through the neighborhood from outside.

Reference was made to Legacy Trail developed on old rail bed and Mike Lasche’s (local bicycle advocate) editorial piece in the Sarasota Herald February 23, 2011.

Suzanne Janney (SJ): New College is interested in starting a crew program and now has a sailing program. Students enjoy passive recreational use of the Upland area along the bay front. While New
College's current waterfront area focus is on restoring their seawall, they are interested in expanded opportunities for better north-south bicycle connections.

It was noted that both USF SM and the North Trail Redevelopment Partnership (NTRP) consider all of the USF SM property as integral to the corridor redevelopment effort, including those portions of campus north of the Sarasota County political boundary.

JP asked how the BRT line is planned in relationship to the USF SM campus. RL noted that USF SM has committed to providing property to locate the north terminus. Exact location of the terminus, whether at the campus edge or on the campus, has not been determined.

The question of high speed fiber line was brought up. It was noted that the University is involved in conversations regarding the line. The group agreed that having the line within the US 41 corridor would contribute to business potential/atraction.

JP: Each potential retailer is interested in understanding the number of students (current and planned) in the area. Having this data is important for many businesses as they evaluate the economic feasibility of locating within the corridor.

The character and safety of Bay Shore Road as compared to US 41 was discussed. Bay Shore Road is both more attractive and safer. US 41, especially as it transitions north into Manatee County, loses a sense of tighter scale and aesthetic appeal; the edges are poorly defined and planting is distinctly lacking. The increase in speed is marked going north.

What are the airport’s interests?

Rob Walker (RW): The airport has an FAA tower under design for an airport site across US 41 from the Hilton Garden Inn. The property north of Captain Brian’s (open land) is a future hanger site being purchased was purchased by SMAA. SMAA tenants along US 41 lease the land from SMAA & pay for the development/improvements to the property. SMAA typically obtains ownership of all improvements to the leased land at the end of the lease.

SBIA can handle up to a 747 aircraft and Air Force One flies in and out on occasion, but these are larger jets than can be handled on a regular basis. The major limiting factor is the aircraft landing/takeoff weight on runway – not length or width of runway. SBIA runways are rated RW4-22 (Category B-2/C-2 (Future), RW14-32 (Category D-4).

It was noted that, as part of the planning process, VHB would be mapping clear zones and FAA restrictions to potential development so that this is taken in to consideration. VHB requested SBIA plans for future development from Rob Walker.

Representatives asked if the dog track was under USF SM consideration. RL responded that it was not.

How far can students be expected to walk from campus to services?

VHB noted that a five minute walk is reasonable (about 1200 feet) or by bicycle a half to one mile assuming the safe and comfortable routes are available.

Are there trends showing students are now more willing to forego driving for other modes of transportation?
Some research is showing fewer age eligible students are getting a license and fewer of those that do get licenses own cars. It is also not typically a single factor such as a commitment to alternative transportation, but combination of incentives and disincentives that shapes the decision.

What is the New College residential experience with off campus access in this setting?

New College students are happy living on campus, but it does come with some issues. Many New College students take time off campus through national student exchange programs or study abroad. They do go off campus to shop, eat, and do community service. They may travel home for the weekend. Students report that they would go downtown more often and would gladly use transit if it were more readily available and connected them directly to desirable locations such as downtown. The access to the airport, especially with General Spaatz Boulevard completed is good. Student Affairs rents shuttles/vans on a special event basis. There are 825 New College students, of these 660 or 80% of the students live on campus. About half of the students have cars on campus.
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Student Support Advisory Group Introduction

Rick Lyttle introduced the Master Plan and work session schedule. The work session participants introduced themselves and their role at USF SM.

John Jennings introduced the consultant team, reviewed the Master Plan schedule and goals of Master Plan per Chapter 21 requirement.

Jean Garbier provided an overview presentation on sustainability and the role sustainability considerations play in shaping the planning process.

Work Session Discussion

Brittany Gleitsman and Courtney Coulter (Student Government) provided observations based on student surveys, student organization activity and personal experience.

This year student government has carried out three separate surveys (approximately 200 respondents). The survey results will be forwarded to VHB.

Facilities

Library, Academic and Study Space

Student respondents listed a dedicated USF SM library (on campus) and expanded quiet study area as the top two desired improvements. Having academic research, resource areas, and tutoring associated
with the library is also desired. In addition, students need places to meet with groups, for example for class group projects, group study, or student clubs. Jonathan Café is often full and too loud for working, particularly in the morning during Life Long Learning Classes. Having conference/work rooms for working with others would be great. Currently, students look for empty classrooms or frequently leave campus and meet together at apartments or local restaurants/cafes with Wi-Fi (Starbucks). More clubs are starting up – often based on majors – and these usually meet at member’s homes, but ideally would meet on campus if the appropriate space was available. There isn’t a posting or online signup method for checking on classroom status/availability or sign up process for using rooms – ad hoc search and use. After 6:00 pm there are no empty classrooms.

Selby Auditorium is small for events. A bigger flexible space is needed for student sponsored expos. An auditorium/conference center is needed. It would be great to have a place for dances or movies on campus.

Recreation
The new fitness room (exercise equipment) is enjoyed. Shower facilities are limited and students do not feel that comfortable using the available showers, so this may limit how much use the fitness area receives, i.e. lack of shower facilities discourages use between classes. Equipment is shared with faculty and staff. Expanded recreation offerings will require student shower facilities with lockers, places to plug in hair dryers, comfort for getting ready. A small recreation/game room is adjacent to the fitness room.

Students need more recreational activities, especially if residential component is added. A half court gym, volley ball, flat open field for pickup games of soccer, softball, basketball court would be good additions. Access to the waterfront and availability of water sports like kayaking or rowing would be a real draw. Students would like waterfront access similar to New College. Right now the area is fenced off and underutilized. Creating a bay front walk would be very appealing.

In survey results - water sports were #1 most desired recreation activity. Volleyball was #2. Interest in bocce ball and basketball was also strong.

Consideration should be given to offering sports programs that shadow what is currently being offered at the feeder schools. It was noted that MCC/SCF offers a full range of athletics.

Dining and other Student Services
Students would like to have shaded gazebos/outdoor study areas with power and plug in speakers for using laptop and iPods, tables and booths. It was noted that very few students currently use the shaded terrace; also they are commonly unaware of the barbeque area for student use. Student government is working on awareness of this and other amenities. Students tend not to go outside while on campus. Exterior spaces will need to be connected, active and inviting.

Counseling and Wellness Center is needed on this campus (versus the shared facility currently on the New College campus).

Interview rooms for Career Services will be needed to support growth and programs like the School of Hotel & Restaurant Management.

USF SM currently has 68 veteran students. As a group they have particular needs. Universal accessibility of the building is appreciated. Facilities specific to their needs would be welcome; including an area dedicated to their use for example an office/meeting room. Planning and designing to engage the full community is important.

If on campus housing is implemented, a full service kitchen and dining facility will be required.
**Student Center**

Students need something to do on campus. Without greater dining options or activities, they leave between classes for local restaurants or go home. Friends are sometimes made within a major, for example through work on group projects, but otherwise there is a tendency to come to class and then go home without a lot of interaction between students. A campus setting that provided spaces for gathering and student ownership would encourage students to stay and get involved. Student’s need space they can relax in, play, eat, make noise. While a student center or student controlled room was noted, this seemed to be a broader comment – that the whole campus should encourage more interaction between students (and among students and faculty), literally student movement beyond the classroom into the outdoor spaces.

**Office and Storage Space**

Both student affairs and student government noted the need for expanded office and club space. Ideally the club space would allow for offices and break out group space. The expansion to a four year program will require many new student services related to FTIC and sophomore students, including a different approach to attracting students, orientation, counseling and greater interaction with parents of students. The full scope of service expansion has not been defined yet, but is understood to require additional staff and facilities to accommodate the staff and interaction with students. Right now one of the advantages USF SM has over larger institutions is the “one stop shop” facility. Keeping services together and accessible, even as the school expands its population, is important. Storage and support space must along with increased office space.

**Transportation**

Crossing US 41 is a critical concern. Even turning into campus is seen as unsafe.

Some classes are only offered at the North Port campus. This is very inconvenient for the main campus students as driving between campuses can be a 1 hour commute. Going between campuses requires a car. Having a shuttle option would allow students to take better advantage of offerings on both campuses and amenities on the main campus and the time spent in transit. Use of off-campus lab space will present similar issues for general education students.

Housing immediately around campus is limited and expensive. Living further from campus makes for a more difficult commute that relies heavily on having a personal car. Having increased affordable options on or near campus would simplify commuting, allowing students without cars (international students referenced) to go to USF SM with greater ease, safety and enjoyment.

**Visibility/Image and Attracting Students**

Visibility and sense of campus identity need to be increased. The community still thinks USF Sarasota-Manatee is part of New College.

Students are attracted to this campus by the size and location. That USF SM is part of the USF system is a real draw. It is often noted that the size and faculty create a private school feel with a public school University degree. It is a campus with many success stories. Networking is good, connections are made and the faculty and advisors are accessible.

Today the median age of undergrads is 27. Graduate student median age is 35.

While students that attend enjoy the small-campus feel, they do not enjoy the “ghost town” feeling in the morning. Creating daytime student life is critical to recruitment and retention. Especially with
younger students coming in - prospective high school age students touring with parents on a Tuesday morning will want to see active hallways and classrooms, places for meeting other students. Today the facilities are very quiet during the mornings and hallways populated with senior learners.

The one stop shop nature of the building is logistically very good at providing services. The facility is new and well maintained. As a new place it is still finding its own character and mark of the users – it is “loosening up”. Faculty, staff and students describe the building character variously as “office building” or “hotel” like. There is a desire for a more traditional “campus feel” and a contrasting “student” focused campus spaces/areas, with allowance for students to control and shape the environment – use chalk on walks, play music, lounge in comfort.

**Communication**

Being able to post (posters, banners, etc) to communicate upcoming activities is a significant issue. How to most effectively communicate events, offerings, and services is an open question. Communication system is a challenge for student services and student government. Student government uses a student list serve with varying success – students identify email as their preferred way of receiving information (over Facebook, Twitter, etc.), but then ignore email because they receive too many emails from varying sources. Digital monitors are employed at a number of locations through the building. Physical design of facilities, for example channeling students through activity areas (St. Pete campus referred to as an example of this) or past targeted postings on their way to class would offer the opportunity to communicate in a targeted way with better coverage of the student body.

**Sustainability**

Students reported that the student government is actively supported in their sustainability efforts by Christian Wells and the Tampa based Office of Sustainability. They’ve attended conferences (Denver) and are active in promoting the “green fee”.

Students would very much welcome increased sustainability initiatives. They are excited to see the existing gain LEED certification and strongly support a LEED certification standard for all future buildings. Students support green fees for recycling, rain barrels, drinking fountain water bottle refill stations, retrofitting golf carts to be solar powered. Students would like to have garden areas/vegetable gardens. From a branding standpoint, students noted visible sustainability initiatives are a good draw in campus recruitment.

Students would like to have pedestrian walkways throughout the campus. Brittany Gleitsman recounted her recent walk to the seawall – her first time there in her three years on campus. It was beautiful! She saw nine turtles. Mark recounted his encounter during a walk around the pond with an eagle dropping a fresh caught fish from the air. Having designed pathway access with benches as part of an overall system of walks/fitness/nature trails would be a great way to bring the campus community in contact with the natural assets and beauty of the campus. The strength of the campus setting is a largely untapped resource for creating a distinct campus identity and programming advantages.
Recurrent Themes

A number of recurrent themes were identified through the series of work sessions:

1. **North US 41 Tamiami Trail Frontage**: visibility of institution, location and identity of gateways and related signage to both identify the campus and to act as gateway to Manatee going north and Sarasota going south, and safety of access, egress and crossing.

2. **Academic Facility Needs**: assessing utilization and availability/distribution of classroom, laboratory, library, and office space for varied USF SM populations, issues and potential for shared use with other institutions and private business.

3. **Housing and Student Support Services**: increasing demand triggered by move to four year program, an uncharted area for USF SM affecting staffing, program development and facilities.

4. **Food Service**: need for larger and more extensive food operation with introduction of housing, desirability of increasing diversity of options in setting and food selection. Importance of role food in keeping students on campus.

5. **Waterfront Access**: making more of the campus setting opportunities for recreation and campus identity.

6. **Recreation**: increase options for active and passive activity, engage campus community outdoors, provide dedicated, inviting indoor student recreational space.

7. **Land Acquisition**: identifying opportunities and strategies for growth, defining desirable edges and relationships with external campus elements.

8. **Environmental Assessment**: assessing limits for development due to environmental factors (especially along North Trail) and strategies for maximizing ecological strengths and health of natural systems.

9. **Opportunity for Innovation**: development as an “atypical” campus, connections to the community, sustainability initiatives, North Trail Redevelopment “model”.

---
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10. **Sense of Place:** Institutional identity and increased engagement of campus community with the full campus setting – interior and exterior spaces – and each other.

**Programming**

John Jennings asked, “How do we as a team develop the programming definition and clarification necessary to quantify a near and long term facility program?”

Rick noted that the move to a four year institution is separate from the move to introducing on-campus housing. Faculty office space related to growth in the academic program will be a real issue; however, the residential life/housing component may be a separate issue not necessarily tied to the increase in academic program/number of students. The research has not been done on quantifying program (staff or facility) needs.

Jean suggested that one model for developing program is to establish assumptions based on projected enrollment. Given enrollment numbers, facility standards such as identified by the State for academic space, by Carnegie Institute standards (as being used at USF Tampa) for housing, National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) for recreation, etc. as examples.

Rick noted that evening enrollment is projected to grow 3-5% annually. Daytime/traditional student enrollment will change more significantly with the move to four year program.

Enrollment data will be critical to projecting program and resulting demand for space. FPM will help identify resources/staff for establishing the enrollment projections.

**Master Plan Options and Land Acquisition**

Rick stipulated that the Master Plan process include development of at least one plan option that is implementable on land already owned by USF SM. How potential land acquisition is reflected on the Master Plan in documentation will be determined as the process progresses. In conversation regarding the Uplands neighborhood it was noted that there are approximately 130+/- homes situated between New College and USF SM. A substantial number of the residents are New College faculty, staff and students. Potential USF SM “edges” located along public right of ways were pointed out as providing not only identifiable public institutional edge, but alternative vehicular access points to the campus as well.

**Follow up**

1. VHB will provide USF SM FPM with meeting notes of all work sessions for their review and distribution.
2. All correspondence, data or other types of information should go through Rick and Rosana. Any additional comments or materials sent by work session participants directly to VHB will be forwarded by VHB to Rosana Ellana.
3. VHB will schedule biweekly “check in” conference calls with USF SM, day of the week to be determined (not Monday).
Appendix B-2:

April 26, 2011
Campus Interviews Recurrent Themes

Mission
- Need to articulate and celebrate our Mission and uniqueness
- Changing from Upper Division/ Graduate to full service 4yr Undergrad Program
- Significant Adult Learning Program / part of our identity and community connection
- Academic leadership – entrepreneurship, diversity, service oriented, fellowship/ collaboration
- Growing international student population
- Engage our host communities / be more active in revitalization of SR41 and neighborhoods
- Cost competitive
Campus Interviews Recurrent Themes

Campus

- Great campus facilities /new and in good repair
- Feels like and office complex/not a college campus
- Visibility from SR 41 poor / no public identity
- “Stranded Asset” / connections to community limited
- Two campus/ no sense of connection
- Maximize ability to expand

Program

- Land locked – need to look to acquisitions
- Program use deficiencies - Classes over 80
- Food service
- Student housing
- Place for students to “Hang”
- Laboratory Space
- Own Bookstore/ retail
- Recreational space /indoor and outdoor – on campus and off campus
- Student support services
- Quiet study space
- Library / Technology Info Center
- Faculty Offices
- Outdoor gathering spaces
Campus Interviews Recurrent Themes

Context
- Character of SR 41 - dying strip/back of house at airport
- Strong single family neighborhoods S and N
- Need “Walk to the Bay” / shared uses with County
- Maintain character of Campus Preserve
- Reinforce campus edges and gateways
- Add shade or covered pedestrian walks
- Enrich campus landscape

Transportation
- Access to Public Transit inconsistent
- Safety to and from SR 41 needs improvement/turn lanes, speed reduction
- Signalization for one intersection minimum
- Parking rarely full except evenings when campus use heavy
- Need to look at multimodal strategies – Zipcar, Ride share system, own “Bull Runner”, Better CAT services
- Pedestrian/Bicyclist access and improvements needed to N and S
Campus Interviews Recurrent Themes

Safety

- Improve access to and from SR41
- Improve business uses on SR41 or acquire lands
- Develop own USF campus security team

Proposed Working Program for Testing Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Non-degree</th>
<th>2020-2021</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Non-degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Programmed Facilities

- Main Building: 12,093
- Central Plant: 2,492
- Viking Bookstore: 3,225

Total: 126,856
### Proposed Working Program for Testing Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Program</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Existing GSF</th>
<th>Non-degree</th>
<th>Increase GSF</th>
<th>Undergrad 2020-2021 GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office (Dept/Admin)</td>
<td>37.0% Ex.</td>
<td>44,747</td>
<td>45,510</td>
<td>90,257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>33.0% Ex.</td>
<td>39,910</td>
<td>37,915</td>
<td>77,825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Admin.</td>
<td>9.0% Ex.</td>
<td>10,885</td>
<td>10,315</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Maint.</td>
<td>8.3% Ex.</td>
<td>10,038</td>
<td>9,492</td>
<td>19,530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Shared</td>
<td>12.2% Ex.</td>
<td>14,755</td>
<td>14,245</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>replace</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>500 seats</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Resource Ctr</td>
<td>200 cap</td>
<td>13,360</td>
<td>13,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining/Food Service</td>
<td>150/50 seats</td>
<td>15,760</td>
<td>15,760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing + Support</td>
<td>500 beds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Indoor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>3,173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>126,052</td>
<td>343,078</td>
<td>469,130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Working Program for Testing Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreational Facility</th>
<th>Existing GSF</th>
<th>Increase GSF</th>
<th>2020-2021 Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Field</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Bball</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Volleyball</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jog/Walk Trail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 mile</td>
<td>1 - 2 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayside facility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>627</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>1220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Notes

Attendees: Rosana Ellana – USF SM  
Rick Lyttle – USF SM  
Tony Call – VHB  
Jean Garbier – VHB  
John Jennings – VHB  
Barry Wilcox - VHB

Date/Time: 04/26/2011; 8:30 AM

Project No.: 61578.00

Re: USF-SM 2010 Campus Master Plan Update  
Phase 2: Alternatives  
Session 1 Opening Meeting

Place: USF Sarasota Manatee  
Campus Board Room

Notes taken by: VHB

Opening Meeting

1. The VHB planning team met with Rick Lyttle and Rosana Ellana in preparation for meeting with Executive, Steering and Advisory Committees.

2. VHB reviewed the PowerPoint presentation with Rick and Rosana for their comment and advice. Presentation outline:

   • Review of Recurrent Themes
   • Program Overview: Today and Projected
   • Context and Existing Conditions
   • Campus Plan Alternatives and Phasing Considerations
   • Existing Campus Master Plan Option (limited program implementation)
     o Single Building Option (limited program implementation)
     o Expanded Campus Master Plan Option

3. Rick Lyttle noted that most of the expected Phase 2 Work Session attendees also were present for the initial interview sessions. Attendees present for the first time will include David Eckel (Executive Committee – Representative for USF SM Community Leadership Council), Jane Rose (Academic Affairs Advisory Group – Dean College of Arts and Sciences, and Terry Osborn (Academic Affairs Advisory Group – Dean College of Education. Opening part of presentation will provide an overview of recurrent themes and interview input from Phase 1 Work Session.

4. Executive and Steering Committee members will meet together in the first session and will return at the end of the day for wrap up and review of comments from advisory groups.

5. It was noted that it was likely that the extent of proposed campus expansion (land acquisition) and increased physical program will be greater than many anticipate. The plan being presented is substantially...
different than previous plans and will take some thought and follow up discussion to elicit the broadest range of comments.

Objectives for the Phase 2 Work Session and post session follow up:

• Review and refinement/approval of the proposed program, and

• Agreement on plan direction/priorities.
Meeting Notes

Attendees: David Eckel – CLC
Rosana Ellana – USF SM
Ben Ellinor – USF SM
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Date/Time: 04/26/2011; 9:00 AM

Project No.: 61578.00

Re: USF-SM 2010 Campus Master Plan Update
Phase 2: Alternatives
Session 2 Executive and Steering Committees

Place: USF Sarasota Manatee
Campus Board Room

Notes taken by: VHB

Presentation:

1. Review of Recurrent Themes
2. Program Overview: Today and Projected
3. Context and Existing Conditions
4. Campus Plan Alternatives and Phasing Considerations
5. Existing Campus Master Plan Option (limited program implementation)
   a. Single Building Option (limited program implementation)
   b. Expanded Campus Master Plan Option

Master Plan Executive and Steering Committees – Questions and Comments

1. Is the bookstore sq ft adequate to meet future demand? Should it be more? Less?
   o In discussion regarding size of bookstore it was noted that the sf indicated (3,225 sf) is based on the size of the existing bookstore now serving both New College and USF SM. The future of college bookstores – now selling both merchandise and textbooks - is uncertain. Students will likely continue to increasingly purchase books on line and this will decrease the need for bookstore as a text book provider. Merchandise, other supplies may hold steady and/or expand into other areas. It was noted that programming will continue to include this sf as a placeholder.

2. Asking price for adjacent land parcels?
   o Hilton site could be as much as $10M
   o Ramada site is currently $7M
3. In discussing potential land acquisitions, it was noted that the used car lots (parcels on 41 adjacent to USF SM property) were likely available for comparatively less money and would provide frontage, though the parcel locations and size were not as conducive for development for campus or private use.

4. The move to expand north is the right direction. Like north/south orientation and expanded frontage on 41.
   - Expanding frontage on 41 and locating main entries at north (Self storage site) and south (Seagate) supports USF SM objectives to establish a visible identity on 41, increase likelihood of signalization at entries and improved landscape treatment of this section of the corridor with planted medians.

5. It was noted that Seagate Drive is a designated historic drive with restrictions on its modification. (AG)
   - VHB will confirm status and any restrictions. Historic designation of site is a critical information piece.

6. What happens to the main entry if the primary entries are moved north and south?
   - The main entry could remain as a ceremonial or visitor access drive, possibly with right in. right out access. Or it could be closed off in a very ceremonial way (keeping gate) with access to entry drop off through an internal north-south vehicular circulation.

7. Could the US 41 frontage be used for a higher and better use than parking, for example for retail?
   - The proposed parking structure could be wrapped on visible edge (either parallel to 41 or along Seagate) with retail that supports institutional needs and also serves the public, for example Starbucks, bakery or restaurant, or services such as dry cleaning. New FIU garage with retail at edge of campus was noted as an example.

8. Is proposed retail visible from US 41? Should it be more visible say by moving structure up hard against 41?
   - There is value and distinction in establishing a “green’ campus edge along 41. Appropriately designed and maintained landscape can be developed to allow views onto site.

9. Could Hilton actually be converted to dorm? How many rooms are in the existing Hilton Garden Inn hotel?
   - There are 135 rooms plus 10 suites, as well as 165 seat capacity dining, lounge and outdoor pool. This could equate to around 250 student beds.

10. Is there an option for housing without expanding north to the Hilton Garden Inn site?
    - The proposed building (northwest end of existing on proposed north south spine) could also be considered for housing. One scenario may include initial action housing (130 beds+/-) in the wing of the building extending north with dining, student services, recreation facilities facing the central quad. Long term the housing within this building might be renovated/reconfigured to accommodate office and academic space (important to plan for this at the time of initial design).

11. It was noted that on-campus housing is best option, but off-campus options are available. There was discussion on this point with acknowledgement that housing on campus makes sense, even is essential, but there is a concern for how on-campus housing would be funded and filled.
12. In developing alternatives, was a pedestrian bridge over US 41 and acquisition of airport frontage considered?

13. In looking at land acquisition with potential for definition of campus lands, control of edges, usable space, and compatible neighboring uses the team felt gaining more consolidated land on the west side of US 41 was preferable.
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Re: USF-SM 2010 Campus Master Plan Update
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Presentation:

1. Review of Recurrent Themes
2. Program Overview: Today and Projected
3. Context and Existing Conditions
4. Campus Plan Alternatives and Phasing Considerations
5. Existing Campus Master Plan Option (limited program implementation)
   a. Single Building Option (limited program implementation)
   b. Expanded Campus Master Plan Option

Student Support Advisory Group - Questions and Comments

1. Supports concept of parking on periphery and creation of a pedestrian core.

2. It was noted that abundant parking is currently a selling point for the campus. Will the parking continue to be as available? How many levels are proposed in the parking garage?
   o The proposed parking count is projected based on existing FTE: parking space ratios. As further analysis is carried out and the building program refined, the projected parking demand may increase based on the need for long term parking related to on campus residences. The number of spaces will also be affected by TDM measures – for example shuttle services, improved public transportation options, car pooling etc.
   o Parking garage as shown in the plans includes ground level plus three (four levels total).

3. The distances between the garages at the periphery and campus buildings are fine for able bodied users, but is handicapped accessibility considered in the plan?
   o The plan(s) shown in this presentation are “big picture” and do not identify specific parking type. However, accessible parking would continue to be provided in proximity to
building entries with smaller limited parking areas, for example accessible parking could be provided at the ceremonial drop off (main entry road) along with short term and/or visitor parking.

- Structured parking proposed on Seagate would provide good access to facilities with strong public participation such as the Auditorium.

4. **If the University continues to own the Viking property - what happens to it?**
   - Its usefulness for development is limited due to FAA/airport height restrictions and parcel size. However, it may offer opportunity in the near term/transition for uses such as surface parking/swing space.

5. **Where are dining venues located?**
   - The plan(s) proposes continuation of the existing café venue and exterior patio space and a new larger full service dining facility on the west side of the pedestrian spine serving both residential and campus at large populations – also facing onto the central open space quadrangle. Together, these venues activate the spine and feed activity onto the open space. The new dining facility might include general dining and special events dining room for say a group of 50. The seating capacity of the dining area could be phased to increase with the increase in residential and campus populations.
   - Additional quick/franchise venues such as Starbucks, Subway might be provided on the ground level of structured parking to animate the street/pedestrian level.

6. **Is there a plan to change the “office building” feel of the main building?**
   - While the plan does not address architectural style, the creation of a hierarchy and variety of adjacent open spaces (including courtyards) with the implementation of new buildings would do much to change the office park feel of the existing building. Currently, the building sits much like a typical office building on its own large yard.

7. **Does the plan include waterfront sites and access?**
   - Two options for access were noted. The first is on the north side of the Crocsley property line, and the other at the southwest corner of the campus where USF SM owns a residential lot. It was noted that options for access to the Bay will require coordination with the Manatee County. Consideration of negotiating access to the Crocsley inlet and pier was suggested.

8. The group was asked for their impression of the size/scope of the plan as it is shown expanding north. The group noted that the expanded presence on US 41 is absolutely critical to visibility of campus and a good move. The plan was characterized as big, yet flexible and this is a very positive aspect.

9. The group was also asked how they thought neighbors might react to the plan. It was noted that neighbors to the north may have issues with the adjacent recreation – noise and lights (if lighted at night). However, community access to recreation facilities could help with relations and may even be a revenue generator.
Meeting Notes

Attendees: Geoff Copeland – USF SM  
Rosana Ellana – USF SM 
Ben Ellinor – USF SM 
Laura Hoffman – USF SM  
Rick Lyttle – USF SM 
Alexis Upham – USF SM  
Pat White – USF SM  
Tony Call – VHB 
Jean Garbier – VHB  
John Jennings – VHB 
Barry Wilcox - VHB

Date/Time: 04/26/2011; 11:15 AM  
Project No.: 61578.00

Re: USF-SM 2010 Campus Master Plan Update 
Phase 2: Alternatives  
Session: 4 Administrative Affairs Advisory Group

Place: USF Sarasota Manatee 
Campus Board Room

Notes taken by: Barry Wilcox, Jean Garbier

Presentation:
1. Review of Recurrent Themes
2. Program Overview: Today and Projected
3. Context and Existing Conditions
4. Campus Plan Alternatives and Phasing Considerations
5. Existing Campus Master Plan Option (limited program implementation) 
   a. Single Building Option (limited program implementation)
   b. Expanded Campus Master Plan Option

Administrative Affairs Advisory Group
1. Did the team consider an urban model with parking below and building facility above?  
   o The dimensions of the campus typical building facilities do not match the garage 
   dimensions as well as the traditional downtown office building and so make this model 
   less functional in the campus setting as a means of increasing density and efficiency of 
   land use. Even the office model has been changing dimensionally from traditional 120’ 
   width (two bays of parking) to narrower 90’ as more emphasis is placed on increased 
   daylighting. Using building program in combination with structured parking is useful, for 
   example to animate the ground floor edge and providing office/vehicle storage for 
   functions such as parking services and security and will continue to be part of the 
   thinking in developing the plan.

2. Where would access to bay occur?  
   o The north side of Crosley is the most logical. Alternatively, access on the southwest 
   might be considered. The latter option might include acquisition of adjacent residences.
Access to the waterfront and north-south bikeway connections are related and will require discussion with the county.

3. The group was asked if the north-south axis made sense as a framework for growth. It was noted that this certainly improved the visibility on US 41, though there were questions regarding the nature of the edge. There was a question as to whether the pier and fence edge would be extended or taken down.
   - The fence edge could be extended along with a “green” edge. The landscaped edge would provide a distinguishing identifiable character for the institution that would set USF apart from adjacent commercial/airport uses.
   - If entrances (especially signalized) were established at north and south ends and edge strongly landscaped this would begin to establish a “calm” zone, similar to New College, along US 41. The effect would be increased with cooperation from airport side – with planting – and implementation of planted medians for section of 41 running parallel to USF SM/.
   - DOT works on warrant system. To the extent that parking is concentrated at north and south entrances the numbers may justify signalization at either end of campus.

4. Would the main gate remain?
   - Yes, though it might be more ceremonial and possibly with only right in right out movement.

5. It was observed that the conservation area had been reduced in the plan.
   - The area in question (west edge) was reduced for building with the intent that this area would be replaced elsewhere on campus.

6. There was discussion on the status of the preserve, whether this is underutilized land, and visibility if used as a building site. Also discussed was the viability of relocating tortoises in order to develop land.
   - VHB conducted a site visit (with gopher tortoise burrow cameras). The tortoise population has declined. Due to a respiratory virus, the population cannot be relocated to mix with another population risking spread of infection.
   - It was noted that the preserve may also be considered a long term land bank.

7. It was noted that underground utility connections are available from US 41.

8. What about acquisition of Easter Seals site? (north of bowling alley)

9. Do the plan and enrollment numbers take into consideration North Port facility and program?
   - The enrollment numbers include North Port students enrolled with USF SM as their home campus. The enrollment numbers do not distinguish between SM and North Port attendance, nor do the numbers include students attending class in SM that are registered as Tampa or St Pete students.
   - The concept plan to date does not address North Port. It will be included in the master plan - likely through a summary overview.

10. Previous master plans have included a 10 year and long range plan framework. Is this still the strategy?
    - Yes. The report will focus on the 10 year time frame, but will also include strategies for long range development (depicted in an illustrative plan).
11. The CDA (Campus Development Agreement) is due to expire in 2012. There is a downside if development over reaches the 10 year plan. Concerns regarding the financial feasibility of the 10-yr growth plan were noted. A five year plan at 250,000 sf would be covered under the current agreement (150,000 gsf new +10% leeway = up to 165,000 gsf) It was noted that while a longer range (10 year) plan might be more ambitious, the 5 year plan needs to be financially feasible.
   o Plans should be developed to show a phased development that includes an early phase that is within the current development agreement using land already owned.
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Re: USF-SM 2010 Campus Master Plan Update
Phase 2: Alternatives
Session 5 Academic Affairs Advisory Group

Place: USF Sarasota Manatee Campus Board Room

Notes taken by: Barry Wilcox, Jean Garbier

Presentation:

1. Review of Recurrent Themes
2. Program Overview: Today and Projected
3. Context and Existing Conditions
4. Campus Plan Alternatives and Phasing Considerations
5. Existing Campus Master Plan Option (limited program implementation)
   a. Single Building Option (limited program implementation)
   b. Expanded Campus Master Plan Option

Academic Affairs Advisory Group – Comments and Questions

1. Questions were asked regarding determining the effective FTE. The number of students taking classes online may skew the stated need for academic spaces if they make up a substantial portion of the FTE. In future, students taking online classes may be full-time students living on campus. Other factors discussed include the number of students taking classes at Sarasota Manatee (physical presence) with home campus at Tampa or St. Pete and conversely the number of SM students registered through USF SM taking classes in Tampa or St. Pete. Do these groups balance each other out? Need to fine tune the programming to exclude distance or internet learning students from facility assumptions.
   o VHB will work with Facilities and Institutional Research to confirm/refine projected enrollment numbers.

2. Having two access points at north and south ends on US 41 would be great. The expanded frontage is an advantage
3. Comments on expanding the campus to the north and moving parking to the edges were positive. Makes for a beautiful campus. The south-orientation makes sense for campus flow (pedestrian movement). Having parking at the perimeter avoids the “Tampa effect” parking within the center and difficulty to find proper lot and controls auto access to reduces the need for additional future traffic calming initiatives on campus.

4. The amount of development shown in the plans and the potential cost to implement were discussed. It was noted that acquisition of the Hilton could provide a whole resident package - resolving housing issues and providing frontage on US 41. It was agreed that food services would still need to be accounted for in another building as a shared on-campus residential dining and general campus dining service.

5. What if USF SM cannot get the Ramada site on the south? How does that affect the ability to implement the plan?
   - Depending on availability of other potential land acquisitions, not having the Ramada site could impact accommodation of parking and phasing implementation. There is potential for parking the smaller Viking site including (with land acquisition) the adjacent two used car sites.

6. Where is the access to the bay front?
   - The plan proposes bay access either along the north edge of the Crosley property or at the southwest corner of the campus. Access will involve discussion with Manatee County and will also involve the related issue of providing a north – south bicycle route – an interest shared by a number of parties.

7. The traditional campus arrangement of buildings and courtyards is preferable to the mega building. In experience working in a different institution with this type of setting (higher education in single large building) - students hated the arrangement. It felt like an extension of high school rather than a college/university.

8. How does the plan provide the “wow” factor for visitors and potential students? The group discussed access, arrival for various constituencies such as prospective students and visiting public, parking for specific users, and the nature of the campus edge. Having both sides of Seagate was seen as a big advantage in controlling the look and appeal of the campus entries/edges.
   - Wayfinding and landscape treatment of campus gateways, arrival drives, and pedestrian ways will be important in shaping the experience. The existing main entry drive may become more ceremonial and may be the preferred “arrival” point for prospective students with dedicated visitor parking, possibly reached through a campus drive rather than the current US 41 entrance. Programming for the visitor experience can work with the physical design to enhance the perception of the campus.
   - Designing and enhancing the campus perimeter landscape to be distinctly attractive and allow views into the campus – even as it fulfills a role as conservation land – will add to the “wow” factor.
   - Differentiating parking, for example providing short term, visitor, prospective student, or long term residential parking can be used to better accommodate the range of users within the available parking stock.

9. The assumptions underlying the proposed plan are positive. The use of green space to create an attractive setting is good.

10. The projected 10 –year program is surprising - larger than anticipated.
VHB will provide a copy of the presentation for the advisory groups to review as they follow up with discussion and will be working with Facilities Planning and Institutional Research to understand enrollment projections combined with utilization factors and how this may impact project program (especially academic/instructional space). The planning team will look to USF SM to provide direction on housing numbers.
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Notes taken by: Barry Wilcox, Jean Garbier

Master Plan Steering Committee

1. Rick Lyttle and VHB provided a summary of recurring themes and comments heard during the day’s work sessions. The groups expressed some “sticker shock” at the extent of program and the implications for development, but were generally positive about the plan concepts. Facilities and VHB will be going back with Institutional Research to review enrollment numbers in finer breakout and will use this information to adjust program assumptions and projections as seems fitting.

2. There must be an economy of scale in the program. There’s a critical mass needed to support certain facilities and uses. Whether or not USF SM is able to fund faculty needed to achieve academic program and class goals is key to the full program going forward. It will be helpful to have a timeline projecting administration and faculty by year.

3. The Development Concurrency Agreement (DCA) will expire in 2012. The current plan includes an additional 150,000 sf (with 10% leeway allowed). Ideally the 5 year plan would not exceed this sf program. Long term strategy illustrated through a build out plan that extends beyond the 10 year time frame is useful, but there is concern that the 10 year time frame reflect program that can be defended.

4. In current climate, finance will likely only support building #1 (building shown to west of existing building on north side of property (as dorm and student center). To build more will take strong justification in program numbers, utilization, etc.

5. It was noted that St. Pete had difficulty filling the first dorm initially. Food service was not included and it was a drawback for attracting students and making the project financially sound. St Pete housing took off through administrative decision. Students with lower entry qualifications than required for admittance to Tampa were allowed admittance to USF St. Pete based on
condition they lived on campus. USF SM will need to figure out how to guarantee dorms are filled from day one. Requiring certain groups of students to live on campus in order to make the finances work could be considered at USF SM. Pairing Living Learning Communities with housing options has been very successful especially for students at risk. What other ways might full occupancy be achieved?

6. The quality and life cycle cost/durability of the Hilton building were discussed.

7. The bookstore is currently viable because it serves New College and USF SM. The service contract is a package contract that includes all USF campuses.

8. The auditorium is a demonstrated existing need and should be included in the 10-yr plan.

9. A bikeway aligned along the most westerly roadway in neighborhoods south and north of campus connecting through Crosley with passive recreation at the bayfront seems a natural and desirable move.

10. The group discussed the projected program needs and capacity for the existing site to support the program. To create successful housing the University must provide the facilities that make living on campus attractive – such as dining and recreation.

11. Parking and recreation demands will push the capacity of the existing site. Existing preferred parking is on the north side of campus – closest to classrooms. Purchasing the Ramada site for parking (and possibly the used car lots combined with Viking site) for parking is a key step in providing parking to allow development of buildings. How much development and related parking could be supported on site before parking becomes the limiting factor?
   • Option to build a garage on site (west of Ramada site) is a possibility that allows more facility development on the existing site, but long term is not the best use of this site. It brings more parking further into campus and prevents future higher and better use campus buildings and open space on this site.

12. Can we disaggregate projections to show phased growth and thereby show when each building comes online and when acquisitions should occur?

13. Two near term options were discussed;
   A. Alternative A includes Buildings
      • #1 (west of existing building on north edge of site,
      • #2 on the proposed north south spine extending north from the west end of the existing building,
      • #3 northeast of the existing building , and
      • # 4 (auditorium) to the southeast
      • Put recreation on site #5.
      • Parking remains on sites #4, 6, and 7 (along the south side of the campus).
   B. Alternative B includes Buildings:
      • #1 (west of existing building on north edge of site,
      • # 4 (auditorium) to the southeast
      • #5 southwest of existing building along proposed north south spine,
      • Parking remains on sites #2 and #3 preserving a greater amount of existing program.
      • Recreation options are more limited.

14. The possibility of siting the dorm at Building #5 southwest site and utilizing the adjacent parking which is currently vacant at most times was discussed. It was noted that long term the residential
facilities would ideally have a stronger physical connection to each other and to recreation facilities if located together to the north in order to increase the intensity of housing activity and overall draw, as well as to distance student housing from existing residential neighborhoods.

15. VHB will look at these alternatives further as near term 5 year plans and will develop a phased approach to the programming summary.
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2010-2020 Campus Master Plan Update
Preferred Concept Presentation

July 11, 2011

Campus Interviews Recurrent Themes

Mission
- Need to articulate and celebrate our Mission and uniqueness
- Changing from Upper Division/ Graduate to full service 4yr Undergrad Program
- Significant Adult Learning Program / part of our identity and community connection
- Academic leadership – entrepreneurship, diversity, service oriented, fellowship/ collaboration
- Growing international student population
- Engage our host communities / be more active in revitalization of SR41 and neighborhoods
- Cost competitive
USF Sarasota / Manatee Campus Master Plan Update

Concept Alternative
Existing Master Plan
Out Parcel Parking

Building area in sq ft.
Existing Building 126,000
A-4 levels 75,000
B-4 levels 75,000
Total Sq. Ft. 276,000

Existing Parking
D-New Lot Parking 500
E-Parking Structure

USF: UNSTOPPABLE

USF Sarasota / Manatee Campus Master Plan Update

Concept Alternative
Existing Master Plan
100% are on site parking

Building area in sq ft.
Existing Building 126,000
A-4 levels 75,000
B-4 levels 75,000
Total Sq. Ft. 276,000

Existing Parking
D-New Lot Parking 400
E-Parking Structure 600

USF: UNSTOPPABLE
Previous Analysis

Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>2020-2024</th>
<th>2030-2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE men</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE FTE</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Total</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evening is highest demand and is basis for determining growth in academic/admin space. Percent increase in FTE remains unchanged.

Existing Programmed Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMU Main Building</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU Viking A</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU Viking B</td>
<td>3.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU Viking C</td>
<td>4.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU Control Plant</td>
<td>9.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU Viking Bookstore</td>
<td>4.982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Existing: 148.951

USF: UNSTOPPABLE
USFSM and Manatee County Vision 10 Year

- Parking Deck (240sp)
- 40-50 Room Hotel
- 30Kgsf Conference Center
- Crosley Museum
- USFSM Entrepreneur Center
- Phase 1 P-1 Parking Deck (300sp)
USFSM and Manatee County Vision Build out

- 40-50 Room Hotel
- 30Kgsf Conference Center
- Crosley Museum
- USFSM Entrepreneur Center
- Parking Deck (240sp)
- Parking Deck (900sp)

USF: UNSTOPPABLE
USF Sarasota-Manatee Sustainability Metrics

- Site Development / Landscape
- Infrastructure
- Transportation
- Energy
- Architecture
- Construction
- Operations
- Institutional Commitment

USF Sarasota-Manatee Sustainability Metrics

Landscape

- Ecological Communities
- Woodland and Wetland Preservation
- Tree Preservation and maintenance
- Landscape Connectivity and Corridors
- Water Body Protection
- Soil Preservation
- Efficient Irrigation and water conservation
- Stormwater Strategies and recycling

Site Design for
- Biodiversity
- Edge Transition
- Native Vegetation
- Street Trees

- Access to Public Spaces
- Pedestrian Network
- Open Community Connections
- Walkable Pedestrian ways and streets
  - Building Facades
  - Shade Trees
USF Sarasota-Manatee Sustainability Metrics

Infrastructure
- Adjacent, Infill or Previously developed Sites
- Water and Stormwater Infrastructure Efficiency
- Diversity of Uses
- Utility Corridors
- Stormwater Management Master Plan
  - Quantity
  - Quality
- Landscape Integration
- Heat Island Reduction-Parking Spaces Paving
- Materials
- Reduced Parking Footprint
- Regional Materials
- Reuse of existing site materials
- Recycled Content

USF Sarasota-Manatee Sustainability Metrics

Transportation
- Transportation Efficiency and Access
- Reduce Automobile Dependence
- Alternative Transportation / Travel Demand Modeling
- Transit Support and Amenities
- Campus Bike Network
- Campus Bike Storage and Racks
- Clarity in wayfinding
USF Sarasota-Manatee Sustainability Metrics

Energy
- Energy Efficiency in Buildings
- Energy Efficiency in Infrastructure
- Renewable Energy
- Carbon Neutral Design
- Carbon Neutral Construction
- Cost reduction and maximization of return on investment

USF Sarasota-Manatee Sustainability Metrics

Architecture
- Applying Regional Precedents in Urbanism and Architecture
- Compact development / create neighborhoods
- Designing building access to shape walkable pedestrian ways and openspace system
- Water Reduction and Efficiency in Buildings
- Greywater and Stormwater Reuse Strategies
- Site Design reflecting local environs
- Certified Green Building
USF Sarasota-Manatee Sustainability Metrics

Construction
- Minimize site disturbance during Construction
- Erosion and sediment control
- Construction waste management
- Local materials

USF Sarasota-Manatee Sustainability Metrics

Operations
- Purchasing
- Communication Services
- Cleaning Services
- Solid Waste Management
- Landscape Maintenance
- Hazardous Waste Minimization
- Dining/Food Services
- Transportation
- Comprehensive Waste Management
- Wastewater Management
USF Sarasota-Manatee Sustainability Metrics

Institutional Commitment

- Purchasing
- Vision – ACUPCC
- Develop an internal Advisory Committee
- Community Outreach and Involvement
- Outreach and engage campus community (Administration, Faculty, Students)
- Academic Programs
- Education Programs
- Environmental Sustainability Oversight
- Budgeting Commitment
- Procurement process and minimum standards
- Evaluation and Reporting
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Project No.: 61578.00

Re: USF-SM 2010 Campus Master Plan Update Meeting #3 Campus Advisory Work Committees Preferred Concept Presentation and Phase 3 Kick off

Place: USFSM Auditorium

Notes by: Jean Garbier, VHB

Introduction and Presentation

Rick Lyttle (USFSM) provided an introduction to the presentation, including an update on schedule and progress since the last master plan meeting in April.

VHB presented the latest development of the master plan including:
- An overview of the past meetings – mission, planning/interview themes, site analysis and existing conditions, the current master plan and alternatives presented in April,
- The updated program used as a basis for site planning,
- The preferred concept plan review by phase (5 year, 10 year, and long range), and
- An overview of sustainability considerations that will be used in drafting the Goals, Objectives and Policies Report.

An alternative plan, developed based on meetings between Dr. Guilford, Rick Lyttle and representatives from the County was also presented. This alternative included additional program elements – conference center and hotel, with additional parking.

(See copy of the presentation attached to these notes.)

Discussion

Following the presentation, the Advisory Work Group participants posed questions for clarification and offered comment.

The plan looks great. It is unfortunate that we haven't solved the problem of getting to the bookstore internally through the neighborhood in the five year plan (without land acquisition).
Dr. Guilford noted that this internal connection would be accomplished with the Ramada site acquisition. Priority would likely be the Hilton Garden site acquisition, as with this purchase the University would obtain both land for expansion and facilities available for University program use (for a lower price than the option of purchasing the Ramada site). The Ramada site, while also of value to USF expansion, currently has a higher asking price and would require additional investment to be useful even as parking (building demolition).

The preferred concept has improved on the alternatives presented in the last session. How are vehicles accommodated on the campus where internal circulation and service access are required? Vehicular circulation on campus was noted. Connection within campus is a road, but is shaded and designed to have a character similar to the walks. Certain walks will serve service functions and special limited vehicular access, for example, events, move in –move out days. VHB noted that the plan places a preference on accommodating pedestrians first, then vehicles.

What is the possibility of adding medians on Route 41?
John Jennings noted that the discussions with Manatee County regarding the Crosley property may be a prompt for the county to pressure DOT improvements.

Dr. Guilford noted that there has been some additional movement on potential for a signal at the main entry. Sarasota County transportation is looking for turn around option for buses at the USF entry. Doing this requires a signal. However, the loss of PECO infrastructure changes the University’s ability to help with implementation of Route 41 improvements.

The University needs increased USF visibility on 41. How will the campus define the edge and make it visible? It was noted that good visibility requires slowing people down – placing roads on a “diet” in addition to the actual edge treatment. Rick Lyttle noted that the plan as shown doubles the USF frontage along 41.

Why is the proposed parking structure on the north end of campus not closer to the need, i.e. core academic campus?
John Jennings explained that this proposed structure would largely be serving housing and those that are on campus long term. The planners looked at alternative locations. These increased the impact on adjacent neighborhoods.

The parking proposed near 41 would have a huge demand. Is there any parking proposed on the other side of 41 at the airport site? No. The plan focuses development in contiguous parcels on a single side of 41 out of consideration for pedestrian and vehicular circulation and defining strong campus edges.

Have estimates been done on the proposed development of the plan. Preparation of estimates has not been included as part of the current master plan scope.

Has there been any change in agreements addressing the preserve areas on campus? VHB has confirmed presence of gopher tortoises on the preserve sites. Their numbers have been reduced since the original designation. Dr. Guilford noted that he personally feels preservation of the conservation area is the better approach to the campus edge (vs. establishing development close to 41). VHB noted that the preservation allows for land banking this property for the future.

Was an option for stacking academic functions above structured parking considered? VHB looked at this option in a couple of locations along the south edge of campus. Access issues and the quality of ground connections for pedestrians and campus activity connections proved this option less desirable.
How does the plan provide pedestrian connection between proposed parking area on the south edge of campus, proceeding south to New College?

There will continue to be a pedestrian connection on 41 – though improved. In the build out scenario the connection could be provided on the west side of proposed retail and the bookstore is proposed to move closer to campus core within the redeveloped garage site retail.

Has there been discussion about Lakewood Ranch?
The discussion has focused on the main campus area and has not addressed program planning for other potential or expanded sites. It was noted that VHB has visited the North Port site.

Coordination with Manatee County and Crosley Estate Lands

Dr. Guilford reported on his meeting with President Judy Genshaft. He presented the master plan in phased sequence – 5, 10 year and long range plans. President Genshaft expressed desire to make the purchase of the Hilton site and preference for expanding to the north and was positive in her response to the plan.

In meetings with Manatee County, the County has suggested a hotel with option for practicum use by USF programs and an Entrepreneur/Innovation Museum celebrating inventor Crosley paired with facilities for USF Business programs. USF has proposed a shared conference center and discussed how these facilities might be accommodated to provide mutual benefit. The county reacted positively to the proposed boathouse and dock on the north edge of the Crosley site. They like the idea of increased activity on the water. The county administration is involved at a high level.

Next Steps

The University will review and discuss the materials presented over the coming two weeks. Additional thoughts and comments are welcome from the Advisory Committee members.

The next step for VHB campus planners will be to refine the concept plan – testing general infrastructure and transportation/circulation implications - and to begin drafting the Goals, Objectives and Policies Master Plan Report for University review this September.
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Re: USF-SM 2010 Campus Master Plan Update
Meeting #3: Community Advisory Committee
Preferred Concept Presentation and Phase 3 Kick off

Place: USFSM Auditorium
Notes by: Jean Garbier, VHB

Introduction

Rick Lyttle provided an introduction to the presentation and update on the schedule.
John Jennings and Jean Garbier of VHB presented planning process update, the preferred concept plan, and sustainability considerations (see attached presentation).

Discussion

The Community Advisory Group representatives provided the following questions and comments:

How does the program methodology relate to program increase?
It is the basis for increase in program, that is existing program function is increased at the same percentage as projected FTE. In addition, certain new program elements such as auditorium and housing are included based on given assumptions. These assumptions are the basis for the program and plan. However, it is recognized that factors such as increased utilization, changes in programs, funding, etc. may affect both the required gsf expansion and timing of expansion.

It was noted that proposed (and existing) parking on the south side of campus are set back from the property line. Does the University acquisition strategy include the Uplands?
The Uplands are not part of the acquisition strategy of the preferred concept plan.

Does the University have an established plan regarding LEED certification for campus buildings?
The existing main campus building is LEED Existing Building certified. University standard is to design new buildings to meet LEED Silver certification at minimum.

What is the nature of the proposed retail? Is the purpose to provide revenue for the University?
The intent is to develop student-oriented retail serving public/students (USF and New College) including a redeveloped bookstore. The retail would support both institutional programs and the community. Development is imagined as public/private partnership. The intent is to provide rent/revenue for the University, services for students, and convenience for the community. The plan is looking for a win-win, for university/private/community.

It was noted that New College master plan also includes plans for retail in this area. New College representative, John Martin, noted the number of shared services currently provided – bay front access, library, health and counseling, and security. He suggested that the institutions should revisit opportunities for additional shared facilities including recreation facilities (recreational fields). New College would like to improve the Circus Hall of Fame site (3 acres). Short term this might present a site for recreation space. He suggested that the institutions will benefit from joint dialogue.

Does the plan adhere to FAA requirements for development? The plan has taken the requirements, including height restrictions, into consideration. (Note subsequent to the meeting - Additional FAA recommendations regarding land use (on non-airport lands) may influence ultimate land use decisions. Further inter-agency/institution discussion on this item is recommended.)

Rick Lyttle asked if the airport had long term acquisition plans for USF properties. Airport representatives were not aware of any particular plans for such acquisition. It was noted that current design efforts for the new control tower are at 30% design stage.

Chris Miller commented that the Uplands neighbors will favor the plan to expand north rather than into the Uplands neighborhood, but there may still be push back/anxiety regarding the impact of campus development on wildlife habitat and any adjacent development that could affect the Upland community.

What is the schedule for demolition of the Viking “T”? Rick Lyttle noted that the demolition is scheduled for this summer. Uplands Association will be notified regarding the scheduled dates. The alley will be left open during demolition and fencing will be located on the opposite side of the corridor.

What about the potential for pedestrian connections – school and public – through Uplands? Some Uplands neighbors may have concern regarding potential for disturbance during large events, concerts, etc. if circulation is accommodated through the neighborhood. It was noted that passageways could be gated or otherwise operated with controlled access during events or by time of day.

Next Steps
Rick Lyttle outlined the process for approval of the master plan. The draft Goals, Objectives and Policies Report will be prepared over the next month and half and will be under review by the University this September.
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