

EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT

University of South Florida St. Petersburg

**Master Plan Update
BR-506/SA#91605.03**

Sasaki Associates, Inc.

With

2002 Consultant Team
TECO/BGA, Inc.
George F. Young, Inc.
Icon Consulting Group, Inc.

and

2000 Consultant Team
Bosek, Gibson & Associates, Inc.
Chance Management Advisors
Dyer, Riddle Mills and Precourt, Inc.
Icon Consulting Group, Inc.

September 2000
Updated April 2002

INTRODUCTION

The Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) provides a status report on the implementation of the Campus Master Plan and highlights current issues that should be addressed in the Master Plan Update. The Master Plan for the University of South Florida - St. Petersburg (USFSP) was completed in 1995 and amended in 1997. As required by the State University System, the University must update the Master Plan every five years. The EAR identifies the scope of the Master Plan Update.

Since the completion of the Master Plan in 1995, USF has been reorganized and restructured giving the regional campuses more autonomy. As a result of the restructuring, master plans for all campuses have been delayed after an initial start in 2000.

Since 1995, USFSP has been in the process of carrying out the recommended goals, policies, and objectives of the Master Plan. In that time, USFSP has accomplished many projects and have been able to test the effectiveness of the Master Plan as a tool for implementation. The EAR identifies these project accomplishments as well as some of the implementation issues that have made it difficult to achieve certain goals, policies, and objectives.

The Five Year Master Plan Update provides the opportunity to re-evaluate the recommendations of the Master Plan and to revise them to reflect current issues and concerns both on-campus and in the host communities. The EAR is a vehicle for identifying the major new issues, which ultimately may require the addition, deletion, or refinement of earlier goals, policies and objectives. Changes in University policies, such as designation as a four-year institution and the addition of housing can have wide ranging affects, particularly changes in the academic mission and enrollment projections. In some cases, policies or actions initiated by the host communities, such as the redevelopment port, affect the University plans and must be addressed. Other issues arise out of the ongoing development on campus and the evolution of the institution over time.

The EAR incorporates our understanding of development projects completed since 1995 and provides an overview of the current issues facing USFSP. Concurrent with the development of the EAR, the status of the existing campus systems (infrastructure, utilities, transportation) was researched for the Data & Analysis report. This more detailed research into the current issues may reveal additional material that should be incorporated into the EAR.

For the purposes of the Master Plan Update, it will be important to define "Existing Conditions" since many projects will be in design and construction during the planning process. We suggest that all projects that will be in construction in fiscal year 2001/2002 be considered "existing" since few parameters can change once a project is in the ground. This will allow us to focus our energies on defining and documenting "future" projects. The definition of this cut-off point does have several repercussions that should be considered, however. Traffic and parking data, which has been collected, will need to be adjusted to reflect the likely conditions with new projects in place. Utility and infrastructure data may need similar adjustments depending on when data has been collected. The Concurrency Agreements with the Host Communities may be affected by whether projects are considered already completed or still outstanding in the Master Plan Update. Base maps will be brought up to date to include some new projects as existing and some as future depending on the definition of the cut-off date

1. ACADEMIC MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY

THIS SECTION MUST BE UPDATED BY USFSP

Introduction

The mission of USFSP has transformed since 1995 in ways that will have a profound effect on the development of the campus. The transition to a four-year institution and the introduction of housing will change the land use pattern of the campus and result in new types of facilities. The goal to achieve greater fiscal self-sufficiency reinforces the need for flexibility in locating facilities funded by the entrepreneurial efforts of the University. Interdisciplinary teaching and research will be supported by connectivity of areas and places inherent in the plan.

Goal Statement (1995):

The University of South Florida is committed to the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, and public service with special consideration for programs and activities addressing the opportunities and needs of the metropolitan areas it services with its multiple campuses

Implementation of Objectives:

Implementation of Policies:

Recommended Actions

Note possible solutions to resolve implementation issues or methods to study them in the Master Plan Update.

Areas of Concern

Note any new issues that will affect the Master Plan Update and that might require new Objectives and Policies.

2. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

THIS SECTION MUST BE UPDATED BY USFSP.

Introduction

The expansion of degree programs and the shift to a four-year undergraduate enrollment, reflect the University's goals to attain a larger "traditional" enrollment profile. The full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment of the University is projected to be approximately 3,353 FTE through 2008-2009, an increase of 2,147 FTE (178 percent) over the actual FTE enrollment of 1,206 as of the baseline enrollment year of 1998-1999. If enrollment growth is extrapolated to 2011-2012 (ten years from this writing), the FTE enrollment is projected to be approximately 4,800 FTE students, or four times the 1998-1999 enrollment. Graduate enrollment is projected to remain at a relatively level proportion of about 12 to 13 percent of total enrollment.

In the 1995 plan, the projected ten-year FTE enrollment (year 2003-2004) for the St. Petersburg campus was 3,000. The current projected enrollment for 2003-2004 in the plan update is 2,150, or approximately 28 percent less than was estimated as the ten-year enrollment target in 1995. Thus, while ten-year growth is not as robust as was envisioned in 1995, the current projection of ten-year enrollment growth (3,353 FTE) indicates a substantial "spike" in the latter years of the current planning period, reflecting the full absorption of a four-year undergraduate program.

Goal Statement (1995):

The Academic Program goal of the University of South Florida is to provide high quality academic programs to meet local, state, and national needs.

Implementation of Objectives:

-

Implementation of Policies:

Recommended Action:

Areas of Concern:

Policy 5 is very similar to Policy 8 and one or both should be revised or deleted.

3. URBAN DESIGN

INTRODUCTION

The basic urban design framework set forth in the 1995 plan remains as the guiding principle for campus development in the plan update. The plan is structured around unified and interconnected system of public spaces, quads, courtyards and pedestrian concourses that are defined by coherent building edges. The framework for the organization of building sites, open spaces and circulation is the St. Petersburg street grid. In some cases, the streets remain open for vehicle use. In the heart of the campus, bounded by First and Third Streets, Sixth Avenue and Bayboro Harbor, the street corridors are converted to pedestrian concourses. The Central Lawn on the site of Second Street South and the pedestrian concourse on Seventh Avenue South, remain as key elements of the urban design plan. A detailed design for these areas has been approved by USFSP and is to be implemented in late 2002. Progressive increases in campus density are encouraged in the urban design element so as to enhance campus vitality, conserve limited land resources for facilities growth, and animate the functional connections between areas of the campus.

The relocation of the Physical Plant area to the First Street South side of the campus will remove the cooling plant from a location near the library. Recently implemented Waterfront Park improvements were also highlighted in the 1995 plan. Arcades and breezeways at the ground level of the buildings provide protection from summer sun and downpours. Building heights will be mainly in the range of three to five stories, partly in deference to the airport runway approach pattern over the south side of the campus, and partly to reflect the most efficient and humanly-scaled profile for academic buildings.

GOAL STATEMENT (1995):

The Urban Design goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is to integrate with and enhance the urban fabric of downtown St. Petersburg where the city meets Bayboro Harbor.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

The University has successfully implemented most of the Urban Design Objectives and Policies with one major exception. The concept of the Central Lawn (Objective 3 and Policies 2 and 5) as well as some related policies have not been achieved; however, detailed design work has been completed with the first phase of implementation scheduled for late 2002. A major difficulty continues to be funding and coordination with the local government to obtain approvals for the street closings that the Master Plan recommends. There have also been difficulties funding other landscape improvements and new parking facilities.

Another important element of the Urban Design is the access to the bayfront and connections to the north and south. While some bayfront improvements have been made, not all the desired connections are in place.

- **Objective 3:** *Establish an open space hierarchy founded on the development of the Central Lawn as illustrated in the 10-year plan, with other pedestrian open space corridors following the former street grid extending from the Central Lawn.*

Policy 2: The University shall give priority to siting the proposed new facilities in positions indicated to provide near term spatial definition to the Central Lawn and the East-West Promenade in order to effect the completion of the core area urban design within the 10 year planning time frame.

Policy 5: The University shall implement site improvements to establish the Central Lawn and East-West Promenade during the 10 year planning time frame as shown in Figures 3-a through 3-c.

Policy 7: The University shall replace existing parking areas located within proposed open space with increased parking facilities as shown on Figures 3-a and 3-b. The University shall work with the City of St. Petersburg to effect the street closures and street narrowing as outlined in this plan element and the Transportation Element within the 10 year planning time frame.

Policy 9: The University shall explore procedures for funding campus landscape framework improvements independent of individual buildings construction projects, while at the same time monitoring site design funded through new building project budgets for consistency with the overall campus landscape design intent. For example, a campus site implementation and maintenance fund supported by an established set percentage of new building cost (say 5 percent) could be created to allow funds to be distributed in a targeted manner, prioritized for funding development deemed to have the greatest potential for impact and improvement of the campus. The intent shall be to implement a campus landscape framework that is visibly composed as a whole rather than a collection of individual, unrelated small landscape pieces.

Policy 10: The University shall coordinate with the host community regarding issues related to the urban design character of the University/host community context area as described in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element.

Policy 11: The University shall work with the City of St. Petersburg to effect the street closures and street narrowing as outlined in this plan element and the Transportation Element within the 10 year planning time frame.

- **Objective 5:** *Preserve and enhance the open space adjacent to the bayfront and its connections with areas to the south and to the north.*

Policy 13: The University shall enhance the open space adjacent to the bayfront and its connections with areas to the south and north through the development of an esplanade walk along the seawall edge from Poynter Park to the campus boathouse.

Recommended Action:

- Continue planning efforts that move the campus towards the creation of the Central Lawn and related open spaces that organize the Urban Design Framework.
- Reconsider options for creating an on-going fund for implementation and maintenance of landscape framework improvements.
- Reassess the need for structured parking and focus funding efforts on creating a garage if deemed necessary and explore options for shared off-site parking.

Areas of Concern

The Master Plan Update should review and consider writing new Objectives that match Policies 8, 10, 11, 12, and 18.

4. FUTURE LAND USE

INTRODUCTION

The 1995 Master Plan established frameworks for land use and for the accommodation of facilities programs for the USFSP campus based on projected enrollment profiles through the 2003-2004 academic year. The land use patterns and facilities programs are the essential determinants of how the campuses impact their surroundings because they define infrastructure, circulation and other systems that tie the campuses to their communities. Further, the future land use patterns shown in the 1995 plan balance the functional relationships and densities of uses with the basic site characteristics of each campus. The intent in each case was to maintain an effective academic core area, to pursue a diverse mix of uses in and at the periphery of the core that strengthen academic life, and to define the systems of open space that unify the civic structure of each campus. That intent will remain paramount in the Master Plan Update.

The plan update also needs to account for changing dynamics in the community area outside of the campus. The 1995 plan was predicated on collaborations and programmatic linkages between the University and other institutions and agencies in the area (e.g., USGS, All-Children's and Bayboro Hospitals, DEP, NOAA and others). It is assumed that such connections will continue to be important. The 1995 plan emphasized linkages to the west with the hospitals, and to the east with agencies and the City on the peninsula. Since 1995, the area of St. Petersburg north of 5th Avenue South has undergone revitalization, as has the area west and south of Bayboro Harbor.

Given the limited land are of USFSP and the limited potential for acquiring land immediately adjacent to the campus, objectives and policies which support higher densities and careful consideration of land use will be required.

GOAL STATEMENT (1999):

The Land Use goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is to organize campus land uses in close and logical proximity to one another and compatible with adjacent land uses in the community.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

The University has had some success in implementing the Land Use Objectives and Policies, however there are several that have been persistently difficult. First, issues with uses along the bayfront continue to be an issue. The conditions on the Peninsula where the University shares land with several other entities, are not ideal. The University has been unable to secure an easement or land trade from the state for new FDEP space on the peninsula. At the other end, the project to improve the open space between Poynter Park and the boathouse on the Peninsula has not been fully funded.

Policy 19 under Objective 11 is not implemented, and the only record of soil and topographic compatibility is to be found per project in each project's records. The University has not been able to secure funding to expand the Campus Activity Center to accommodate more public event uses (Objective 4, Policy 27) or to relocate service and utility uses along First Street by the airport (Objective 5)

- **Objective 1:** *Ensure that the bayfront open space use is protected and enhanced, as described under the Urban Design Element.*

Policy 3: Policy 3: The University shall effectuate a trade of land with, or secure an easement from, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) to provide the open space at the northwest end of the peninsula, contingent on redevelopment of the FDEP site for new, expanded space by FDEP.

Policy 26: The University shall designate the open space area adjacent to the bayfront between Poynter Park and the boathouse on the Peninsula as a protected open space not to be built upon except for structures and improvements ancillary to its use as a park-type area for the campus; the University shall effectuate improvements in the shore edge and the open space to achieve the park type environment.

- **Objective 11:** *Ensure that future land uses are compatible with and appropriate to topographic and soil conditions on campus.*

Policy 19: The University shall maintain a data base of existing soils and topographic conditions, which shall be updated on a regular basis, and as additional data developed for future construction projects become available.

- **Objective 4:** *Provide for public event uses in the expanded Campus Activity Center located on the northeast edge of the campus where public access and visibility is prominent and opportunities for shared parking are available.*

Policy 27: The University shall program and design the expanded Campus Activity Center to accommodate public event uses and public access to such uses and programs as may be staged to attract the general public.

- **Objective 5:** *Locate service and utility uses along First Street across from the airport, abiding by applicable airport zoning restrictions.*

No Policies associated with this Objective.

Recommended Action:

- The University should renew or increase efforts to work with city and state officials to settle land-use issue on the St. Petersburg campus. Especially in regards to the non-university uses on the Peninsula.
- The importance of the Campus Activity Center expansion should be re-assessed. If it is still a valid program objective, alternative funding sources such as student fees, and private funding opportunities should be explored.
- Proposed new uses, such as housing should be considered in the context of the 1995 land use proposals.
- Review objectives and policies to ensure that the limited land resource is rationally planned to accommodate future growth.

Areas of Concern

Policy 9, which relates to Objective 9, should be reconsidered, as there are no conservation areas on the St. Petersburg campus. Also, Policies 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 22, 23, 24, 30, 31, and 32 should be reviewed and if found to still be valid for the Master Plan Update, should have Objectives written to relate to them. Objectives 3, 5, 7,8, and 15, have no policies to support them and should be re-assessed. Also, Objectives 6 and 8 are very similar and one should possibly be deleted.

It is anticipated that the projected ten-year enrollment profile for the St. Petersburg campus will differ markedly from the ten-year projections used as the basis for the 1995 plan. The basic difference is that St. Petersburg will become a four-year undergraduate campus, as contrasted to the two-year upper division undergraduate enrollment assumed in the 1995 plan. The profile and rate of undergraduate growth has potential impacts on the land use and program requirements that will likely cause changes in at least three areas. Associated with the transition to a four-year institution, plans are under consideration to provide on-campus housing. Suitable sites will need to be identified for housing as well as support facilities such as recreation and parking.

5. ACADEMIC FACILITIES

INTRODUCTION

The USFSP plan was amended in 1997 to incorporate a proposed new Pediatrics Research Center (50,000 gross square feet) and the Florida Center for Teachers (20,000 gross square feet), both now complete and occupied. The Amendment also subtracted a 15,000 gross square foot Daycare Center, and 67,000 gross square feet of Academic/ Faculty office space from the 1995 plan. The offsetting areas of the additions and subtractions to the 1995 plan did not require an amendment. Two outparcels, the Bayboro Tower and Fountain Inn properties, that had been earmarked for acquisition in the 1995 plan were excluded as part of the Amendment. In this update, the Fountain Inn is once again being considered for academic uses and efforts are underway to secure funding to acquire the facility.

GOAL STATEMENT (1995):

The Academic Facilities goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is to maintain a compact and coherent academic core zone readily linked with the academic and research functions of the affiliated institutions and agencies and provide academic facilities required to meet the needs of the projected student enrollment.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

The University has only partially completed its efforts to reassess the formulas for academic space calculation. The rest of the academic facilities Objectives and Policies have been implemented.

- ***Objective 6:** Phase development of future academic facilities in such a way that there will be adequate instructional and research facilities available for incremental growth and change in student enrollment at all levels.*

Policy 7: The University shall take into consideration comparative analysis for academic space formulas and shall reassess methods used to calculate space projections.

Recommended Action:

- Revise enrollment projections.
- Methods for calculating space projections should be formalized and a system for periodic updates of space needs.

Areas of Concern

The Master Plan Update should delete Policy 4 because it unnecessarily duplicates ideas expressed in the Policies of Section 15, the Architectural Design Guidelines Element. Also, Policies 5 and 6 are vague and do not relate directly to any specific Objective. Table 5a should be revised to indicate new academic space needs.

The academic requirements for a four-year undergraduate program will vary from those discussed in the 1995 plan. The most significant variable will be the extent to which space currently being utilized in the late afternoon and evening can be captured for daytime use by the expanded enrollment. For planning purposes, an assumption or projections need to be made by the University as to the amount of existing space that can be used in the daytime and the amount of new space that will be necessary. A parallel consideration is whether the space will need to be organized differently on the campus to serve the projected new enrollment. Fundamentally, it should be assumed that the academic and support program will continue to occupy the compact, core-oriented arrangement in the 1995 plan, taking advantage of the proximities and “collegial scale” inherent in the St. Petersburg campus.

However, the new program could result in the need to test new sites for academic and support facilities, in particular, housing.

Objectives and policies associated with the acquisition of the Fountain Inn will need to be incorporated in the master plan documentation. Also, the Science and Technology Center proposed in the update will need to be located and appropriate objectives and policies cited.

6. SUPPORT FACILITIES

INTRODUCTION

Approximately 92,000 GSF of support facilities were projected in the 1995 plan as amended in 1997, of which 13,800 have been constructed. The Campus Development Agreement (April 1998) authorizes 13,800 GSF of support facilities through 2003-2004. Changes in the mission of USFSP will require an analysis of the required facilities to support housing and a four-year academic institution. In support of the new mission and housing, a 90,000 GSF Student Center is to be included in the master plan update.

GOAL STATEMENT :

The Support Facilities goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is to provide a full complement of support functions in close proximity but peripheral to the academic core.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

While many of the Support Facilities Objectives and Policies have been implemented the expansion of the Campus Activity Center has not been constructed. The need for this expansion will need to be verified. The proposed Day Care Center has now been provided off site at the YMCA. Objectives associated with this objective will need to be reconsidered.

- **Objective 1:** *The expansion of the Campus Activity Center should be located to provide public access and visibility from Fifth Avenue, and campus access and visibility from the Central Lawn*

Policy 1: The University shall provide support facilities as described on pages 6-1 and 6-2, and as shown on Figure 6-a. The timing and phasing requirements and priorities for these facilities are established in the Capital Improvements Element.

Policy 2: The University shall identify and secure funds for future support facilities as described in the Capital Improvements Element.

- **Objective 2:** *The Day Care Center should be located north of the Sixth Avenue campus drive in the northwest block of the campus with good vehicle access on a site removed from urban arterial traffic.*

There are no Policies associated with this Objective.

Recommended Action:

- The University should look for alternative means of funding some of the support facilities recommended as long as they are still valid program objectives in the new Master Plan Update. Support facilities necessary to support a four-year institution with housing will also need to be considered.

Areas of Concern

The Objectives for this section are too specific and the policies too general. They should be reversed to achieve more uniformity with the rest of the Master Plan document. All the Policies and Objectives in this section should be reviewed and re-aligned.

As with the academic space requirements, expanding enrollment as well as efforts to utilize campus spaces more efficiently during the day, will alter how the 1995 and 1997 master plans discuss support spaces.

7. HOUSING

INTRODUCTION

USFSP, as a result of a detailed housing study, will pursue the addition of housing on the campus during the planning period. The exact details, number, location and types of housing were still under consideration at this writing but will need to be explored during the development of the plan update. The 1995 plan, before its amendment in 1996-97, included a provision for “guest lodging” related to visiting scholars, conferences, etc., which is a category for which USFSP will need to provide direction.

GOAL STATEMENT :

The Housing goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is to reinforce the environment for community students and encourage the maintenance of a broad-based off-campus living pattern throughout the St. Petersburg/Pinellas community.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

Most of the University’s Housing Policies have been implemented successfully, while the remainder have not been successful due to lack of funding. This is particularly true in the case of Objective 2, Policy 2 which refers to the need for guest lodging on-campus. Funding difficulties have led the University to back off its pursuit of this type of housing for the time being, though it is not desirable to delete altogether. The same applies to the Objective and Policy regarding the provision of apartment units for single parent households.

- ***Objective 2:** To seek opportunities and provide capacity to accommodate guest lodging for participants in University programs of durations from a few days to a full school year.*

***Policy 2** The University shall undertake market and financial feasibility studies as necessary to ascertain the efficacy of providing various forms of "guest lodging" for visiting teachers, scientists, scholars, etc., potentially utilizing space gained in proposed acquisitions of facilities such as Bayboro Towers and the Fountain Inn.*

- ***Objective 3:** The University shall formulate an agreement by which approximately 16 apartment-type units for single-parent households will be constructed on campus in conjunction with the construction a Day Care facility to serve the campus community.*

***Policy 1:** The University shall formulate an agreement by which approximately 16 apartment-type units for single-parent households will be constructed on campus in conjunction with the construction a Day Care facility to serve the campus community.*

Recommended Action:

- The goal statement will need to be revised to reflect USFSP’s initiatives to provide on-campus housing.
- The University should re-assess its need for “guest lodging” particularly in relation to whether this function needs to be accommodated on campus or if there are off-campus opportunities for this.
- At this writing it is understood that USFSP will not acquire the Fountain Inn or Bayboro Towers for housing uses, therefore, policies 2 and 3 should be reworded or relocated in the report. (The Fountain Inn is to be acquired for academic uses).

- The Day Care facility has been constructed as part of the YMCA and is no longer valid for inclusion in the master plan; however, USFSP needs to advise on the provision of single-parent housing elsewhere if that is still a valid aim.
- The University should define the number of on-campus beds to be provided and locations should be identified for the housing in the context of the limited land resource available for academic and support functions

Areas of Concern

Policies 3 and 5 are not related to any specific Objective. They should be revised and possibly re-written.

The issue of University policy regarding housing on or directly adjacent to campus is unresolved and may not be necessary given the proposals for on-campus housing.

8. RECREATION & OPEN SPACE

INTRODUCTION

USFSP continues to implement the recreation and open space proposals of the 1995 master plan having made several improvements over the past few years. Changes to the USFSP mission and the plan to provide on-campus housing may result in the need to provide additional recreation and open space to support student activities. Such changes will need to be explored with the University in the context of other operational and funding strategies.

GOAL STATEMENT :

The Recreation and Open Space goal of the USFSP campus plan is to ensure the provision of adequate and accessible recreation facilities and open space to meet the future needs of the University.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

The University has been able to provide much of the Open Space recommended in the 1995 Master Plan, however there are several outstanding Objectives and Policies that have not been implemented. They have been unable to implement a private donor program to fund landscape and recreation improvements and maintenance. Lack of funding as well as difficulties with coordinating street closures and other approvals have kept some of the major open spaces recommended in the 1995 Master Plan from being implemented. Objective 2, Policy 2 is partially implemented. Some initial open spaces have been created, however funding and approvals have until recently been unavailable for the Central Lawn and other integral spaces. Planning is underway to implement the initial phase of the Central Lawn later in 2002.

- **Objective 1:** *Provide recreational facilities and open space to meet campus community demand through the coordinated use of public and private resources.*

Policy 1: The University shall establish a private donor program for the purpose of contributing to the development and maintenance of on-campus recreation and open space facilities and shall coordinate the distribution of these funds with other public University funding sources.

Policy 3: The University shall establish within the 10 year planning time frame a hierarchy of campus open spaces including; the Central Lawn, the East-West Promenade, peninsula open space, recreation field, and Bayfront Esplanade as described on pages 8-1 and 8-2, and on Figure 8-a. The timing and phasing requirements and priorities for these improvements are established in the Capital Improvements Element.

Policy 4: The principal open spaces, the Central Lawn and the East-West Promenade, shall be identified by the University as priority projects with phased implementation to be initiated within the first five years of the planning time frame.

- **Objective 2:** *Provide increased facilities to serve on-campus recreation needs.*

Policy 2: The University shall implement recreational facility improvements as identified on pages 8-1 and 8-2, and on Figure 8-a. The timing and phasing requirements and priorities for these improvements are established in the Capital Improvements Element

- **Objective 3:** *Provide increased opportunities for on-campus access to varied, high quality open spaces.*

There are no Policies that relate to this Objective.

- **Objective 4:** *Coordinate with the host communities to promote provision of adequate recreation and open space off-campus to serve the campus community living in the context area and to ensure continuity of campus open space resources within the larger regional open space system.*

Policy 8: The University shall meet with City and County officials on a periodic basis to review the status of recreation and open space facilities and to explore ways to facilitate coordination in the provision of those facilities. The University shall pursue interlocal agreements and memoranda of understanding as needed to provide for the joint use of recreation and open space facilities.

Policy 9: The University shall promote the development and improvement of community recreation facilities by the host community in the belief that these facilities will enrich the quality of life for those living within the University context area. The University shall begin discussions with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) regarding the redevelopment of the FDEP site in order to extend the open space system onto the parcel of land on the northwestern corner of the peninsula, proceed with the purchase of Fountain Inn and Bayboro Towers property, and maintain communications with City regarding possible development.

Comment: This Objective and related Policies are partially implemented. Coordination with city and state officials needs further consideration.

Recommended Action:

- Recreation and open space requirements for the potential on-campus population should be explored.
- Planning and funding for the campus should be reviewed in the Master Plan Update to establish its potential for continued success.
- The Private donor program should be implemented effectively as a way to reach open space goals more quickly. Options for naming of recreation and open spaces should be aggressively pursued.

Areas of Concern

Policies 1, 5 and 8 should be reviewed to determine which Objectives they relate to and whether new objectives or policies need to be written to cover the issues.

9. GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE ELEMENT

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT SUB-ELEMENT

On the whole, the University is in compliance or in the process of complying with, goals and objectives of the stormwater element policies contained in the 1995 Campus Master Plan. A total of eight retention ponds are currently serving the campus. The existing municipal stormwater sewer system that is serving the Campus is functioning satisfactorily.

The City of St. Petersburg performed a comprehensive study of their entire stormwater management conveyance system in 1994. The level of service standards established in the Campus Development Agreement are appropriate for designing future stormwater management systems on Campus.

Goal Statement (1995):

The Stormwater Management goal for the St. Petersburg campus plan is to provide an adequate stormwater management system that accommodates future University stormwater needs while correcting any existing facility deficiencies.

Implementation of Objectives:

All Objectives have been implemented.

Implementation of Policies:

All Policies have been implemented.

Recommended Action:

The University should request that the City of St. Petersburg provide information and notification of construction of the proposed 10-ft by 6-ft and two 7-ft by 6-ft culverts along Third Street.

At the appropriate time, the University should relocate the existing 15-inch RCP located beneath the site north of the library (Ethics Center building in the 1995 plan).

The University should construct the stormwater treatment facilities necessary to comply with State and local standards.

A treatment credit accounting system should be established for the Campus.

A physical inspection and survey of the storm sewer system in Basin B-12 (peninsula area) should be conducted to determine the actual physical condition of the facilities and to complete the mapping of the facilities.

Studies, Standards Manuals and Development Agreements initiated since the 1995 Master Plan should be incorporated into the Master Plan as part of the EAR-based update.

Areas of Concern:

It appears that all buildings that are proposed to be constructed during the current ten year program can be easily connected to the City's and the University's stormwater system. In at least one instance however, it will be necessary to modify or re-align an existing 15-inch RCP to traverse the site north of the library (former site of the ethics center).

POTABLE WATER SUB-ELEMENT

The City of St. Petersburg currently provides potable water to the St. Petersburg campus. The City has expressed confidence that sufficient potable water service levels are available to adequately serve the campus for the next 10 years. Additionally, reclaimed water is available to the campus to reduce potable water demands. For these reasons, minimal improvements will be necessary since the responsibility for providing potable water to the campus rests with the City of St. Petersburg. The proposed housing program should be reviewed with the City to ascertain if the additional demand would change their conclusions.

Goal Statement (1995):

The Potable Water goal for the St. Petersburg campus plan is to provide an adequate potable water system that accommodates the future University potable water needs while correcting any existing facility deficiencies.

Implementation of Objectives:

The following Objectives have not been implemented due to appropriate timing of implementation or availability of funds:

- *Objective 1: Provide at a minimum an average level of service of 0.25 GPM per 1,000 gross square feet of building area.*
- *Objective 2: Provide adequate fire protection with a goal of 3,000 GPM for four hours.*
- *Objective 3: Cooperate with the City of St. Petersburg Water Department and all appropriate State and Federal agencies to ensure safe and sufficient water supply at a cost effective rate.*
- *Objective 4: Develop and promote a water conservation program.*
- *Objective 5: Maintain an acceptable operating pressure range throughout the system.*

Implementation of Policies:

The following Policies have not been implemented. Policy 10 has been partly implemented.

- *Policy 7: The University shall, through its capital improvements program, ensure that when a project requires relocation of utilities, that those utilities be appropriately upgraded and replaced as necessary in accordance with the capital improvements program as described in Capital Improvements Element (Table 14-a).*
- *Policy 8: The University shall prepare, as appropriate, a technical design standards manual to ensure the compatibility of future lines for ease of on-going maintenance.*
- *Policy 9: The University shall investigate if any existing lines (installed prior to 1980) that are to be relocated, replaced or removed have the potential to contain asbestos or are also known as "transite".*
- *Policy 10: The University shall prepare and promote a water conservation program as follows:*
 - *Require the use of xeric landscaping techniques, including the maintenance or installation of selected vegetative species, low irrigation and compact hydradzone concepts, shall be required for all new building and ancillary facility construction.*
 - *Install a sub-metering system on existing and new facilities to be able to monitor accurately the amount of water being utilized in the various facilities.*

- *The University shall create an awareness program of water usage utilizing the information above.*
- *The irrigation system shall be upgraded to be controlled by a computerized, rain-sensitive system.*
- *Opportunities to coordinate with the host communities in providing a reclaimed water irrigation system should be explored, if ever extended to the University.*
- *Use of collected stormwater or building "gray" water for landscape irrigation purposes shall be explored.*
- *Use of efficient low water volume plumbing fixtures in new and renovated University buildings.*

Recommended Action:

Continue implementation of Objectives and Policies.

Areas of Concern:

None at this time.

SANITARY SEWER SUB-ELEMENT

The City of St. Petersburg provides sanitary sewer service to the St. Petersburg campus. Dames & Moore completed a Campus Sanitary Sewer Assessment Study. Based on the information addressed in this study, the sanitary sewer system is adequate to provide the required level of service for the campus over the 10-year study period.

Goal Statement (1995):

The Sanitary Sewer goal for the St. Petersburg campus plan is to provide an adequate sanitary sewer system that accommodates the future University sanitary sewer needs while correcting any existing facility deficiencies.

Implementation of Objectives:

Objective four has not been implemented due to appropriate timing:

- *Objective 4: Resolve minor utility conflicts including the proposed expansion of the Campus Activity Center and proposed parking garage located at the southwest corner of First Street and Fifth Avenue through coordinated detailed utility study and building design.*

Objective five has been partially implemented:

- *Objective 5: Correct any existing sanitary sewer deficiencies.*

Implementation of Policies:

Three Policies have not been implemented:

- *Policy 2: The University shall develop a preventative maintenance program for existing lines by June 30, 1995. The Facilities Maintenance Element of the adopted master plan shall be amended as needed to incorporate the provisions of this maintenance program.*
- *Policy 4: The University shall establish an emergency and routine repair and replacement program of existing sanitary sewer system lines by June 30, 1995.*

- *Policy 8: The University shall investigate if any of the existing lines (installed prior to 1980) that are to be upgraded, removed or relocated have the potential to contain asbestos or are also known as "transite". Appropriate action will be taken by the University to have these lines removed, remediated, or replaced by a certified contractor or be allowed to remain.*

Recommended Action:

The Master Plan should be modified to reflect that service is being provided by the City, and as such, requirements for maintenance and repairs should be delineated to show these responsibilities.

Areas of Concern

Overall, the Master Plan is being followed as much as possible.

SOLID WASTE SUB-ELEMENT

The City of St. Petersburg is responsible for the collection of solid waste on the St. Petersburg campus. The burnable waste is transported to the Pinellas County Refuse to Energy Incinerator located in Pinellas Park. The non-burnable, non-recyclable, solid waste is transported to the Pinellas County landfill. The City of St. Petersburg currently has a mandated ten percent recycling program of all solid wastes.

Goal Statement (1995):

The Solid Waste goal for the St. Petersburg campus plan is to provide for future University solid waste collection and disposal requirements in a safe, cost effective, environmentally sound, and an aesthetically satisfactory manner.

Implementation of Objectives:

The following two Objectives have not been implemented:

- *Objective 2: Procedures to reduce University-generated solid waste and increasing recycling and reuse programs shall be defined.*
- *Objective 3: Establish or modify the existing solid waste collection locations for easier service and to avoid potential pedestrian conflicts.*

Implementation of Policies:

The following Policies have not been implemented:

- *Policy 2: The University shall establish a level of service of 0.015 cubic yards per square foot annually for solid waste collection.*
- *Policy 3: The University shall establish a unified screening program for solid waste collection locations. Included will be the implementation of aesthetic coordination as well as standardized solid waste containers.*

Recommended Action:

Complete formal implementation of Objectives and Policies through program development.

Areas of Concern:

There are no areas of concern at this time.

10. UTILITIES

STEAM/HOT WATER SUB-ELEMENT

INTRODUCTION

A gas-fired central boiler plant located in the main central utility plant and individual hot water/steam systems on the remaining portions of the campus provide heating. The recently constructed Children's Research Center is served by an independent heating system while the Center for Teachers is connected to the main heating loop.

Goal Statement :

To provide adequate heating to the facilities in the most cost efficient manner, providing for flexibility in the future growth of the campus.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies have been implemented.

- *Objective 1 To correct existing deficiencies in the hot water distribution system.*

The policies associated with Objective 1 are all implemented.

Comment: This Objective is not fully implemented. While many corrections have been made, there are still improvements to be made.

Recommended Action:

- Identify major deficiencies in the Hot Water System and plan for corrections that will last through a long-term planning period.

Areas of Concern

Policy 6 does not relate to any Objective. Also, Policy 4 should be revised to add reviews by FPC and Physical Plant. Map 10-d should be revised, and should detail both hot and cold systems.

The heating plant currently functions with only one boiler. The installation of a second boiler, to provide for a minimal level of firm capacity should the main boiler fail, should be reviewed especially if the main heating system is to be maintained for a significant period of time. The existing boiler is also nearing the end of its service life. Evaluation of decentralization of the east campus system should be considered for consistency with the direction for the remainder of the campus.

Installing direct digital controls on the main heating system should be reviewed to optimize the heating system and to help improve system reliability through system trending and diagnostics for system performance.

The proposed creation of a support services building and the associated boiler relocation should be considered relative to the distribution system and opportunities to improve / address capacity issues.

CHILLED WATER SUB-ELEMENT

Introduction

The Central Utility Plant was significantly modified in 1998 to serve the main campus and provide cooling capacity for the Children's Research Center and Center for Teachers. The other buildings constructed on campus are served by independent systems.

The chiller plant will most likely be relocated to the proposed Support Services Building. This will entail the relocation of the most recently installed chiller equipment.

Goal

To provide adequate cooling to the facilities in the most cost efficient manner, providing for future growth of the campus.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies have been implemented except for the following:

- *Objective 1: The existing chilled water plant equipment will be relocated to the new chilled water plant location and expanded.*

There are no Policies related to this Objective.

Comment: The plans to build a new chiller plant have not been implemented for lack of funding but continue to be an objective.

- *Objective 2 The existing chilled water distribution system will be extended to accommodate future buildings and renovated buildings. Adequate facility capacities to meet future needs have been detailed in the GRGV chilled/hot water study.*

Policy 1: The University shall implement chilled water improvements as identified on Figure 10-a. The timing and phasing requirements for these improvements are established in the Capital Improvements Element.

Comment: The University has done all that can be done for chiller capacity until a new chiller is added. Figure 10-a should be updated for the lines to the new buildings built on campus since 1995.

Policy 8: The University's Physical Plant Department will be responsible for reviewing all proposed development projects to ensure that adequate chilled water capacity exists.

Comment: The Master Plan Update should include USFSP review in the text of this Policy.

Policy 10: The University shall institute a policy for replacing ozone-depleting refrigerants with environmentally safe refrigerants.

Comment: The refrigerant currently used (R-123) has been approved for use until 2020. The University plans to continue its use rather than using the non-ozone depleting R-134 which is less efficient.

Recommended Action:

Areas of Concern

Currently, the older underground chilled water piping is scheduled to be replaced and extended to the KRC and MSL facilities located on the peninsula adding a significant load to the existing chiller plant. The proposed underground pipe routing needs investigation. The current 2000 ton chiller plant arrangement will provide approximately 80% firm capacity.

The relocated chiller plant will need to be appropriately sized and installed based on the minimum level of firm capacity required and the timing of the new buildings and renovated facilities. The chilled water piping infrastructure will need to be modified and appropriately connected to adequately support the future anticipated campus growth.

Finally, the controls integration of all campus buildings and implementation of chilled water system monitoring at the buildings for chiller plant optimization based on the building conditions should be reviewed. Currently the chilled water system is experiencing low temperature differentials potentially impacting the future chiller plant pumping and cooling capacity. Documentation of actual system loads and usage profiles will also further define the development of the chilled water system infrastructure.

ELECTRICAL POWER AND OTHER FUELS SUB-ELEMENT

Introduction

New services have been added from the FPC distribution system to provide electrical power to Pediatric Research Facility, Florida Center for Teachers and Campus Activity Center.

Goal

To expand the existing utility owned power distribution system to meet the needs of the University.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented with the exception of the following:

- *Objective 2: Provide energy design guidelines for new buildings proposed in the master plan.*

Policy 3: A phasing schedule should be developed for upgrading the existing electric power supply capacity and distribution system to meet future University needs when required. The adopted campus master plan shall be amended as needed to reflect any changes to the timing and phasing requirements.

Comment: Objective 2 and the related Policies 3 and 10 have not been implemented. Policy 3, requiring a phasing schedule for upgrading existing power capacity, is an on-going effort by FPC and USF.

Policy 10: The University's Physical Plant Department will be responsible for reviewing all proposed development projects to ensure that adequate electrical energy capacity exists.

Comment: Objective 2 and the related Policies 3 and 10 have not been implemented. Policy 10 is carried out by FPC, not by Physical Plant. The Master Plan Update should reflect that.

Recommended Action:

- The University should formalize the responsibility for reviewing development projects for concurrency with electrical energy capacity, whether it is physical plant, FPC or another entity.

Areas of Concern

Under Policy 2 there should be a mention that energy design guidelines should comply with the Florida Energy Code and USF Standards. Policy 5 should be revised to delete the life cycle cost analysis.

There is adequate electrical service capacity to the campus to accommodate the 10-year program through the extension of the existing FPC primary distribution system and the use of individual building metering. Primary metering exists for a portion of the campus.

Future plans would be to convert existing FPC overhead line between 5th and 7th Avenue on 2nd Street.

Issues identified include a lack of emergency power and power quality.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUB-ELEMENT

Introduction

Since 1995, new telecom services were extended from existing infrastructure for the Pediatric Research Facility, Florida Center for Teachers and Campus Activity Center.

Goal

To provide each existing building and planned new buildings on the St. Petersburg campus with appropriate communications connectivity.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented with the exception of the following:

- *Objective 1: To plan, design and implement communications infrastructure at the St. Petersburg campus in order to correct existing deficiencies and to meet the voice, data and video communications needs.*

Policy 1: The University shall expand the north campus infrastructure from the Davis building to the northern most boundary, then east and north encompassing all properties owned by the campus and possible future connections to medical facilities (or other University related facilities) in the area.

Policy 2: The University shall provide adequate copper connectivity for voice, multi-mode fiber for data, and single mode fiber for video/data to all buildings on the St. Petersburg campus.

Policy 3: The University shall upgrade wiring in all buildings to the current and/or appropriate technical levels.

Comment: These policies are on-going. The University is trying to upgrade their system so that all buildings have single-mode fiber and multi-mode fiber. Also they have been upgrading from category three wiring to category 5+ (see Policy 3). Policies 5 and 7 are also on-going.

Recommended Action:

- The University should re-assess its planned improvements to ensure that upgrades and expansions are on track.

Areas of Concern

Improvements have included a rebuild of the main telephone room in Davis Building and addition of single mode fiber.

Capacity for additional expansion is limited and future planning should include the provisions for an additional wiring center at another location in proximity with planned growth to minimize extensive infrastructure improvements. Near term plans need to include an expansion of the infrastructure to serve the Marine Science Building in the peninsula area.

This facility also provides data services for All Children's Hospital

11. TRANSPORTATION

TRAFFIC

INTRODUCTION

The updated master plan will follow in concept the proposals of the 1995 plan notably:

- the removal of the segments of Second Street South and Seventh Avenue South to make way to the “pedestrianized” Central Lawn and Concourse.
- Removal of the segment of Sixth Avenue South between Second and Third Streets South

At this writing, Third Street South was being narrowed to two moving lanes.

Parking changes will be the result of campus growth and displacement of surface lots by new buildings. Importantly, the addition of housing on campus will result in the need for additional parking. In response, USFSP may need to charge for parking in order to fund new facilities such as garages and may need to establish shared parking partnerships with surrounding land owners, institutions and the City.

GOAL STATEMENT (TRANSIT, CIRCULATION & PARKING):

The Transit, Circulation and Parking goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is to provide adequate vehicular/transit access to the campus within the urban street grid and provide adequate parking on or adjacent to the campus.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented with the exception of the following:

- *Objective 1: Reduce the impact of the various road closures on the off-campus roadway network.*

Policy 13: The University shall coordinate with the City, County, and FDOT to establish the timing and phasing requirements for the vacation and road closures of the existing public roads to be implemented in conjunction with the campus master plan. Transit and parking facilities on campus shall be constructed and organized in a manner consistent with the master plan and shall be implemented in accordance with the Capital Improvements Element.

Comment: This policy and objective are considered only partially complete as the roadways have not been closed yet.

- *Objective 2: Reduce the impacts off-campus of future traffic generated by the 10-year master plan.*

Policy 14: The University shall establish p.m. peak hour LOS standards for on-campus roadways consistent with the City at LOS of "D".

Comment: The University considers this Policy and Objective to be only partially implemented while some effort has been made to reduce future traffic on campus other options have not yet been implemented.

- *Objective 3: Provide a safe, efficient transportation system considering the needs of motorized and non-motorized vehicle parking.*

There are no Policies associated with this Objective.

Comment: This Objective has no Policies to support it. It is only partially implemented as not all the recommended traffic improvements have been made on-campus.

- *Objective 4: Reduce the impact of future on-campus parking demands while meeting the needs of future University requirements.*

Policy 3: The University shall evaluate the feasibility of convenient shuttle systems to the campus from identified remote parking lots.

Comment: This Policy and Objective are not implemented specifically because the campus is too small to warrant a campus shuttle system.

- *Objective 6: Ensure that transportation system improvements shall be coordinated and phased with the University's future land uses.*

There are no Policies associated with this Objective.

Comment: The review of this Policy is on-going.

- *Objective 7:*

Policy 1: The University shall evaluate and implement enhanced mass transit opportunities with the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA) to provide service to the campus along Fourth Street South, Fifth Avenue South, First Street South, and Third Street South, as well as possibilities of internal campus roads.

Policy 4: The University shall coordinate with PSTA in identifying available funding programs to assist in implementing this enhanced mass transit service to the campus.

Policy 6: The University, in conjunction with the host community, shall evaluate the opportunity to encourage student residential housing in the adjacent context area of the campus consistent with Housing Element Policy 7. More adjacent housing will reduce both parking and traffic generation demands. Opportunities for "partnering" with the private sector to construct this student housing should be explored.

Policy 8: The University shall coordinate with the City of St. Petersburg and Pinellas County to evaluate other options and strategies for reducing the dependence on the personal automobile. If any of these proves to be economically feasible and practical, the University shall amend the adopted campus master plan to incorporate these strategies onto the overall transportation plan.

Policy 9: The University shall coordinate and cooperate with the host community and surrounding property owners in phasing and timing road improvements. Once the timing and phasing requirements and priorities for these improvements have been determined, the

University shall amend the adopted campus master plan as needed to reflect these requirements.

Comment: Coordination and cooperative efforts with the City and County authorities needs to be carried out to ensure that these Policies can be implemented, if still appropriate.

Recommended Action:

- The University should look at coordination with the city and county in terms of what can realistically be accomplished and then set priorities accordingly.
- A traffic analysis should reveal any outstanding traffic issues on campus that need solutions as well as future areas of concern based on the recommendations for future land uses found in the Master Plan.
- The impact of on-campus housing should be assessed both in terms of parking requirements and the theoretical reduction in peak hour trips to the campus.

Areas of Concern:

Policies 2, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 19, 17, 20 and 21 have no Objective to relate to. Policies 10, 11, 12, and 20 may be unnecessary and should be reviewed for relevance to St. Petersburg. Policy 16 is very similar to Policy 10 and one should probably be deleted.

PARKING

INTRODUCTION

The USFSP campus is fully integrated into the urban environment with most of the parking demand taking place during the evening, between 6:00 and 9:30 p.m. In September 2000, there was an estimated 200-space surplus on campus during the peak period, growing to 400 spaces off-peak. However, since that time, on-street parking has gradually been eliminated through various streetscape projects (6th Avenue between 1st & 3rd Streets, 2nd Street between 5th & 6th Avenues, 3rd Street between 5th & 11th Avenues). There is no estimate as to how much on-street parking was removed, and it is quite possible that the surplus noted above was eliminated as on-street parking demand has been shifted to campus lots. Additional parking will be removed as buildings are constructed on the main surface lot on campus. Parking conflicts occasionally arise between the Fish and Wildlife Conservation (FWC) and USFSP on the peninsula.

With regard to demand, the headcount for USFSP is expected to grow to 4,800 by the end of the planning period.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented with the exception of the following:

- *Objective 1: Provide increased parking capacity without significantly increasing the acreage required for the parking facilities.*

Policy 1: The University shall program a multi-level parking facility to be constructed as dictated by actual campus growth. This facility shall be located east of the Campus Activity Center near the Bayfront Auditorium complex.

Comment: Due to lack of funding the University has not been able to construct the parking garage; however, preliminary discussions indicate that such a facility may be possible in the next planning period.

- *Objective 2: Provide methods to reduce the impacts and demands of future on-campus parking.*

Policy 5: The University shall evaluate and implement, as appropriate, mitigation techniques. These programs may include the following:

- *Utilization of compact parking spaces;*
- *Revise parking rate fees on campus so lots and structures closer to the campus center will have higher parking rates, thus encouraging the utilization of commuter or remote parking lots;*
- *Explore the possibility of establishing remote parking lots off-campus and shuttle systems to these lots;*
- *Evaluate academic classroom schedules to encourage more classes to be scheduled in off-peak hours, thus reducing parking demands by "reusing" the same parking space.*
- *Encourage use of mass-transit system.*

Policy 6: The University shall evaluate and analyze parking policies for rates and restrictions. With revised parking programs and pricing policies, mass transit opportunities will become more desirable.

Comment: This objective and these policies have only been partially implemented.

- *Objective 3: Locate and program on-campus parking facilities to be accessible to the various land uses and circulation systems while minimizing pedestrian-vehicle conflicts.*

Policy 2: The University shall establish design guidelines and signage for traffic circulation to the parking structure and lots to avoid potential confusion and conflicts with pedestrians.

Comment: This objective and policy have not been implemented due to lack of funding.

Recommended Action:

- The University needs to re-assess its approaches to parking utilization and capacity. The construction of a garage should be set as a priority. This meets several objectives, such as minimizing acreage devoted to parking, as well as reducing pedestrian/vehicular conflict points. Funding options should be explored including new rate structures. Opportunities for more efficient utilization should also be explored.
- Regarding methods to decrease the impacts of parking on-campus, the University should devote resources to the ones that have the most potential for success. For example, working towards closing the roads recommended for closure in the 1995 master plan for the Central Lawn, could help decrease the potential for pedestrian/vehicular conflict.

Areas of Concern:

The major change occurring on the USFSP campus is a gradual shift over the next five years from an upper-level only institution to a full four-year institution, and the associated need for housing and parking. The changed status will increase the number of students on campus for classes during the day as enrollment and course offerings increase.

PEDESTRIAN and NON-VEHICULAR CIRCULATION**INTRODUCTION**

The goal of creating a safe pedestrian environment on the USFSP campus will be partially achieved through the creation of the Central Lawn. Construction is set to commence in late 2002.

GOAL STATEMENT :

The Pedestrian and Non-Vehicular Circulation goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is to adapt and convert the urban street grid on the campus to a safe and unified system for pedestrian and non-vehicular movement.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented with the exception of the following:

- *Objective 1: Provide on-campus pedestrian and bicycle way connections to off-campus pedestrian and bicycle ways where the campus interfaces with the city along and crossing First Street, Fifth Avenue, Third Street and Fourth Street.*

Policy 8: The University shall establish pedestrian connection between Poynter Park and points north along the campus bayfront.

Comment: This policy has only been partially implemented due to inadequate funding for connections to off-campus pedestrian routes.

- *Objective 2: Coordinate locations for future pedestrian and non-vehicular circulation facilities to be developed on and off the campus with recommendations made by the University Police Department.*

Policy 3: Record shall be made by University Police of actual observed pedestrian flow. Such campus wide observations should be scheduled biannually to assess any changes in pedestrian and non-vehicular movement patterns which may merit changes in prioritizing implementation of new pedestrian and non-vehicular facilities. Additional observations should be scheduled during periods of new campus development which may affect patterns of pedestrian and non-vehicular movement.

Policy 6: The University shall give priority to the establishment of pedestrian ways at the edge of the Central Lawn, the walk connecting the Campus Activity Center and the new Library, the East-West Promenade, and the Bayfront Promenade.

Policy 7: The University shall require ground-level pedestrian arcades to be provided in buildings which front on the Central Lawn and the East-West Promenade (See Capital Improvements Element Table 14-a, for funding).

Policy 9: The University shall include bicycle commuter facilities in the programming for all parking garages. Commuter facilities shall include locked covered storage and lockers at minimum, and may include showers and bicycle rental facilities as well.

Policy 12: The University shall implement a campus-wide blue light emergency telephone plan to complement existing University Police escort services in accordance with the capital improvements program as described the Capital Improvements Element.

Comment: This Objective and these Policies have only been partially implemented. Current proposals for parking garages and new facilities will provide opportunities to address many of the objectives and policies.

- *Objective 3: Coordinate locations for additional lighting and improvements in lighting delivery with recommendations made by the University Police Department.*

Policy 4: The University shall consult the University Police Department in determining locations for additional lighting along pedestrian and non-vehicular circulation routes. University Police acting as environmental design consultant (CPTED) to Facilities Planning and Construction shall provide input to identify areas in which they feel a risk factor exists. Their input will be based on on-site observation and crime data.

Comment: Coordination of University Police and Facilities Planning to improve safety on campus through lighting and other improvements is only partially implemented. The proposed Central Lawn and East / West Promenade provide opportunities to address some of the inherent criteria.

- *Objective 4: Coordinate with the City of St. Petersburg to provide pedestrian and non-vehicular circulation facilities based on the extension and perpetuation of the established city sidewalk grid to meet both the aesthetic and functional needs of the users and to encourage increased pedestrian and bicycle movement on campus.*

Policy 1: The University shall coordinate with the City of St. Petersburg in the systematic implementation of on-campus pedestrian and bicycle facilities to ensure continuity of such facilities within the larger regional system of pedestrian/bicycle facilities as described in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element. The proposed improvements to pedestrian and non-vehicular circulation facilities are described on pages 11-7 through 11-9 and illustrated on Figure 11-e. The timing and phasing requirements and priorities for these improvements are established in the Capital Improvements Element.

Policy 2: The University shall encourage development of off-campus extensions of campus pedestrian corridors, particularly extension of the East-West Promenade west to the medical area.

Comment: These elements of this policy have only been partially implemented but improvements along Third Street and the proposals for the Central Lawn will address some of the issues.

Recommended Action

- Lack of funding for vehicular improvements such as garages and street closures has slowed progress towards a pedestrian campus, however, with the completion of the Central Lawn in early 2003, many of the objectives and policies will have been addressed. Efforts should be made to accomplish any pedestrian and bicycle improvements that can be separated from vehicular funding requirements, such as the establishment of the blue-light emergency system.
- More coordination with University Police is advisable in an effort to keep up-to-date records on pedestrian and bicycle patterns and needs on-campus and directly off-campus. The relationship between University Police and the administration should be more formalized so that the University Police can function more as safety consultants as projects are being implemented.
- The University should work to maintain more formal ties with City officials in order to ensure that its pedestrian improvements link it logically to the larger context of the city.

Areas of Concern:

Policies 7, 9, 10, and 11 should be reviewed and revised, as they do not correspond to any specific Objective.

12. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

INTRODUCTION

USFSP has complied with the coordination requirements in the effectuation of the Campus Development Agreement and will continue to pursue policies set forth in the 1995 plan for continuing intergovernmental coordination.

GOAL STATEMENT :

To achieve the goals, objectives and policies of the campus master plan through the use of joint processes for collaborative planning, decision making, and coordinating growth and development with local agencies and governmental entities.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented except for the following:

- *Objective 1: To establish a process for the reciprocal review by University and local government officials of growth management plans, campus master plans, and plan amendments.*

Policy 1: Upon adoption of the campus master plan, The University's Office of Facilities Planning and Construction shall arrange a series of meetings with City and County planning officials for the purpose of negotiating the appropriate terms and conditions of this reciprocal review process. Every effort will be made to formalize the terms and conditions of the reciprocal plan review process through an interlocal agreement or memorandum of understanding.

Policy 2: It shall be the policy of the University that proposed amendments to local government comprehensive plans which have the effect of changing land uses or policies that guide the development of land within the designated context area surrounding the University, affect the provision of local services, or which otherwise impact University facilities and resources, should be submitted to the University's Office of Facilities Planning and Construction for review.

Policy 4: University planning officials shall meet with officials from City and County on a regular (at least annually) basis, or as required for the purpose of coordinating planning activities. Other local, regional, state and federal agencies shall be invited to participate in these meetings as appropriate.

Comment: This Objective and related Policies are partially implemented. There have few instances where amendments would warrant a courtesy review by City and County officials given the limited nature of the changes. The process of reciprocal review has not been formalized and the annual planning coordination meetings recommended by the 1995 Master Plan have not taken place with regularity. However, USFSP enjoys an excellent relationship with the City and County which may limit the need for a formal process.

- *Objective 2: To establish a reciprocal development review process to assess the impacts of proposed campus development on significant local, regional and state resources and facilities, and to assess the impacts of off-campus development of university resources and facilities.*

Policy 1: It shall be the policy of the University that proposed development within the context area which has the potential to impact or affect University facilities and resources shall be transmitted to the University's Director of Facilities Planning for review.

Policy 2: The University's Director of Facilities Planning shall meet with City and County officials to establish the criteria and thresholds for development proposals which would be subject to review by the University. It is the intent of this policy to establish in the form of an interlocal agreement or memorandum of understanding mutually agreed upon thresholds for review which would allow both the University and host and affected local governments to review significant development proposals within the context area. Established thresholds for review will allow for exceptions to the review process for development proposals which are mutually agreed to be not significant.

Policy 3: Upon receipt of an application for a development order proposed for the context area, the University's Director of Facilities Planning shall assess the potential impacts of the proposed development on University facilities and resources. Findings shall be remitted in writing to the appropriate local government.

Policy 5: When it has been determined that proposed development within the designated context area would have an adverse impact on University facilities and resources, University officials will participate and cooperate with City and County officials in the identification of appropriate strategies to mitigate the impacts on University facilities and resources.

Comment: There have been few changes to the context area of the St. Petersburg campus that would require the type of review recommended in this Objective and related Policies, however, there is still no formal process for reciprocal review of context area projects by University Facilities Planning.

- *Objective 3: To increase on-going coordination between the University and public agencies to create a better campus, community and environment.*

Policy 4: The University shall coordinate with the city departments to secure the internal street closures enabling these arteries to be reduced to low intensity access drives and pedestrian paths as well as to provide pedestrian/bicycles to other facilities, neighborhoods, and areas in the city. The University shall follow the City's established review process for requests to vacate the rights of way on these streets.

Policy 5: The University shall investigate possible locations for off-site parking lots, including leasing opportunities and land acquisition for new parking facilities. The University and PSTA should work together to promote ridership by disseminating information at registration, through target mailings, and at appropriate locations and events on and off-campus.

Comment: There have been some difficulties obtaining the approvals for the desired street closings, as well as coordination of traffic, transportation and parking planning with local officials. USFSP is currently working to identify off-site parking locations.

Recommended Action:

- Identify and initiate contact with the appropriate City and County officials with whom coordination meetings regarding planning of campus improvements should be reviewed as well as

those contacts who would be in a position to alert the University to changes in the context area that might affect the campus. These relationships and coordination efforts should be formalized in some way to ensure consistent planning coordination.

- The University should make the traffic improvements on- and directly off-campus a high priority and establish contact with the appropriate City and County officials to make the improvements possible.

Areas of Concern

This section should reflect the University's relationship with the adjacent airport.

13. CONSERVATION ELEMENT

The USFSP campus is located along Bayboro Harbor which is designated as an Outstanding Florida Water and also recognized as a Manatee habitat area. This designation will require that stormwater treatment be provided at a volume of at least 50 percent more than what is required for standard retention areas. In addition, given the fact that Bayboro Harbor is identified as an Outstanding Florida Water, it is classified as a conservation area requiring a management and monitoring plan.

Goal Statement (1995):

The Conservation goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is to be a model for conservation policies to improve the environment and improve air, water and open space quality in the vicinity of the campus including Bayboro Harbor.

Implementation of Policies and Objectives:

The University has implemented the majority of the policies stated in the St. Petersburg master plan.

Recommended Action:

It is recommended that Policies 6, 7, 11, 12, 21 and 27 be revised as part of the Master Plan update.

Areas of Concern

Policies 1, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 27 and 30 should be reviewed and either re-written to match one of the existing Objectives or have new Objectives added to clarify their aims.

14. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

INTRODUCTION

The University has accomplished a significant number of projects recommended in the 1995 Master Plan, and others are programmed in the Capital Improvement Plan.

GOAL STATEMENT :

Provide educational and support facilities to all enrolled students in a manner that protects the investment and maximizes the use of existing facilities and promotes orderly, planned campus development.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented except for the following:

- *Objective 3: To use the Capital Improvements Element as a means to meet the needs of the University for the construction of capital facilities to correct existing deficiencies, to accommodate desired future growth and to replace exhausted or obsolete facilities.*

Policy 10: The University shall make provisions for the replacement and renewal of capital facilities when it is determined that the facility is nearing the end of its useful life.

Comment: The University has only been able to partially implement its policy of replacement and renewal of capital facilities as needed.

Recommended Action:

- Identify areas in most urgent need of replacement and prioritize them accordingly.

Areas of Concern

NONE

15. ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

INTRODUCTION

The architectural design guidelines set forth in the 1995 plan remain valid for the update. Proposed changes in land and building uses will need to be reflected in the guidelines.

GOAL STATEMENT :

The Architectural Design Guidelines goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is to create an architectural environment that reinforces and enhances the urban fabric where St. Petersburg meets Bayboro Harbor.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented except for the following:

- *Objective 3: Establish standards for building siting and linkages in accordance with the measures documented in this plan element.*

Policy 17: The University has established and will continue to effectuate a priority program for implementing accessibility improvements based on implementation priorities identified in the American Disability Act Accessibility Guidelines Study previously undertaken by the University in accordance with the capital improvements program as described in the Capital Improvements Element. The following priorities for implementing accessibility improvements have been established by the University:

- *Ensuring accessible routes from designated parking spaces to facilities;*
- *Ensuring accessible classrooms, offices, housing, and restrooms; and*
- *Ensuring accessible campus routes between facilities.*

Comment: The USFSP has only been able to partially implement its stated policy to ensure campus-wide ADA accessibility; however, upcoming projects will enable the University to work toward the previously established objectives.

- *Objective 4: Establish guidelines for architectural treatments along the campus edges in accordance with measures documented in this plan element, and the Urban Design Element and the Landscape Architectural Design Guidelines Element.*

Policy 2: The University shall undertake a periodic review of the guidelines to determine whether they are being fulfilled in the actual development of campus facilities. The determination should be based on whether the design as executed satisfies the master plan objectives. The review should occur after at least two buildings/site development projects have been developed to form an ensemble with one another and with existing buildings and campus spaces.

Comment: The University has only been able to partially implement this policy which stipulates a periodic review to ensure that the architectural design guidelines are being followed.

Recommended Action:

- Continue improvements to achieve ADA accessibility.
- Link improvements to new and renovated building budgets.
- Create a process of design review during the design process that ensures compliance with architectural design guidelines.
- Revise the guidelines to reflect changes to the land and building use elements of the update.

Areas of Concern

The following Policies need revision or they need more specific Objectives written for them: Policies 1, 2, 9, 12, 15, 16, and 17.

16. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

INTRODUCTION

The 1995 landscape guidelines in the plan update remain valid for the update but will need to reflect changes to land use and building location criteria.

GOAL STATEMENT :

The Landscape Architectural Design Guidelines goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is to create a unified, interconnected spatial environment that blends with and complements the surrounding urban fabric

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented with the exception of the following:

- *Objective 1: Establish the overall conceptual framework as described in this plan element under Framework for Landscape Architectural Guidelines and Landscape Guidelines for Design Intent.*

Policy 3: The University shall establish a campus wide pedestrian and bicycle circulation system in accordance with guidelines outlined in this plan element under Landscape Standards: Walkways and Bicycle Ways.

Policy 16: The University shall coordinate with the City of St. Petersburg and the Bayboro Medical complex in establishing standards for the extension of the East-West Pedestrian Promenade from the campus west to the Medical Center in accordance with procedures identified in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element.

Comment: The campus wide pedestrian and bicycle circulation system is currently in process, though not complete. USFSP will begin Phase I of the Central Lawn and the East/West pedestrian promenade in late 2002, which will contribute to the 1995 objectives.

- *Objective 3: Establish the standards for selection of furnishings, lighting, and graphics as described in this plan element under Landscape Standards - Furnishings, Lighting, and Graphics.*

Policy 6: The University Facilities Planning and Construction, in coordination with campus representatives from Physical Plant and Architecture, shall identify and establish campus standards for furnishings and lighting based on criteria outlined in this plan element under Landscape Standards: Furnishings, Lighting.

Policy 7: The University Facilities Planning and Construction, in coordination with campus representatives from Physical Plant and Architecture, shall review the existing graphics system plan in light of master plan analysis and criteria established in this plan element under Landscape Standards :Graphics and shall confirm or revise existing campus graphic standards.

Comment: It is understood that no specific standards have been established for the campus. USFSP will need to advise.

- *Objective 4: Establish the standards for campus edge treatment as described in this plan element under Landscape Guidelines for Design Intent - Campus Edges, and Streets and Parking Lots.*

Policy 15: The University shall coordinate with the City of St. Petersburg and adjacent institutions to establish a cross sectional standard for boulevard edge treatment including lighting, pedestrian walks, bicycle lanes, and planting of Fourth Street and Fifth Avenue in accordance with procedures identified in Intergovernmental Coordination Element.

Comment: Campus edge treatment is usually accomplished on a project by project basis and the process of coordinating with other entities to establish a consistent edge is still on-going.

- *Objective 5: Establish the standards for treatment of retention and stormwater management facilities as described in this plan element under Landscape Standards - Drainage and Retention.*

Policy 12: The University shall provide surface drainage retention to augment subsurface vault detention as outlined this plan element under Landscape Standards: Drainage and Retention .

Comment: Drainage improvements are made on a project by project basis and are progressing as funds allow.

- *Objective 6: Establish the proposed landscape framework within the 10 year planning time frame through a systematic approach to implementation which emphasizes the formation of the larger campus framework over the independent development of building specific landscape treatments. Highest priority will be placed on the implementation of the core open space framework on two axes; Second Street and Seventh Avenue.*

Policy 1: The University shall place highest priority on establishing the core open space framework including the Central Lawn and the East-West Pedestrian Promenade within the first five years of the planning time frame.

Comment: As part of the Campus wide pedestrian and open space network (see Objective 1, Policy 16), the conceptual design for the Central Lawn and the East-West Pedestrian Promenade have been approved by USFSP and the first phase of construction will commence in late 2002.

- *Objective 7: Establish options for funding campus site improvements independent of individual building projects.*

Policy 13: The University shall explore procedures for funding campus landscape framework improvements independent of individual building construction projects, while at the same time monitoring site design funded through new building project budgets for consistency with the overall campus landscape design intent. For example, a campus site implementation and maintenance fund supported by an established set percentage of new building cost (say five percent) could be created to allow funds to be distributed in an established targeted manner, prioritized for funding projects for the greatest campus impact and good. The intent shall be to implement a campus landscape framework that is visibly composed as a whole rather than a collection of individual, unrelated small landscape pieces.

Comment: This policy and related objective remain key aims for USFSP.

Recommended Action:

- The Central Lawn and East West Promenade will serve as precedents for future improvements.
- The University should formalize policies of using the same furniture, signage and plant guidelines used on the Tampa campus, or make a concerted effort to create official guidelines for St. Petersburg.
- Edge treatments need to be more uniform with more coordination with adjacent users to ensure that the campus' edges are clearly delineated.
- Funding for landscape framework improvements should not be reliant on building projects. The University should attempt private fundraising, through campaigns and the consideration of naming possibilities for donors.

Areas of Concern

Policy 2 should have an objective written to match it.

17. FACILITIES MAINTENANCE

GOAL STATEMENT :

To provide for properly functioning buildings that are readily maintainable.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented except for the following:

- *Objective 1: To have building exteriors which have a minimum useful life of forty years without the need for major repair or replacement efforts in that period.*

Policy 1: The University shall utilize and improve upon criteria that has been established in the USF Design and Building Standards (based on the Construction Specifications Institute, 1988 Edition) and the latest version of the SUS Cost Containment Guidelines (1994) for new construction and renovations. This document consists of specifications for materials and fixtures which have proven to be cost effective from both an initial capital and maintenance cost standpoint.

Policy 3: The University shall review existing buildings by means of the formal and automated Facilities Audit Program, currently being implemented. This program establishes standards for the review of existing systems components and the resultant prioritizing of maintenance and improvement projects.

Comment: Standards were under review in September 2000, the current status of which will need to be ascertained. While the newer buildings will likely meet the proposed standards, some of the older buildings may not and their potential for demolition or renovation should be considered. There is currently no formal and automated Facilities Audit Program on-line.

Recommended Action:

- The University should automate the Facilities Audit so that accurate assessments can be made about building life spans to inform the capital funding process.

Areas of Concern

One area of concern is that none of the Policies match the Objectives. The entire section should be rewritten to align them more closely. Also, there is a question about whether Policies 9, 10, and 11 are still valid program Policies, or whether they need to be revised to be more accurate or less specific.

18. COSTAL MANAGEMENT ELEMENT

The campus is located within the existing urban grid network of downtown St. Petersburg. The southern boundary of the campus is the existing seawall edge of Bayboro Harbor. For ease of circulation and maneuvering, the marine sciences peninsula has an existing impervious surface perimeter abutting the seawall. The academic portion of the campus abutting Bayboro Harbor is set back with an open space buffer extending from the peninsula west to Poynter Park. Enhanced utilization and expansion of this green space is proposed by extending it into the peninsula and terminating it with the extension of First Street South.

Goal Statement (1995):

The Coastal Management goal of the St. Petersburg campus plan is for campus development to enhance access and improve the environment of the Bayboro Harbor waterfront as well as strengthen emergency preparedness for the campus.

Implementation of Objectives and Policies:

All of the Objectives and the Policies that relate to them have been implemented except for the following:

- *Objective 2: Improve pedestrian access to the Bayboro Harbor waterfront by coordination with the Poynter Park and proposed new campus open space.*

Policy 7: The University, through its master plan program, shall provide enhanced access to the academic portion of Bayboro Harbor waterfront. This open space should be coordinated with the Poynter Park to the west and the open space plazas within the new campus greenways and plazas.

Policy 8: The University shall evaluate, as appropriate, opportunities for the public to have access to the peninsula. Concerns regarding safety and on-going working conditions of the peninsula should be considered.

Comment: USFSP has made some improvements to the pedestrian access of Bayboro Harbor. The process of creating new campus greenways and plazas as well as formalized pedestrian access to the peninsula are on-going though limited by lack of funding.

Recommended Action:

It is recommended that Policies 2. 5. 6. 8. 9. 10 and 13 be revised as part of the EAR-based Master Plan update.

Areas of Concern

NONE