

**University of Virginia
Master Planning Council
Meeting Minutes
September 11, 2003**

Attendees:

Adam Daniel
Catherine Neale
Cheryl L. Gomez
David Reid
E. Clorisa Phillips
James E. Tolbert
Jon K. Oliver
Karen Van Lengen
Karin Wittenborg
Bill Ashby (*for Patricia Lampkin*)
Patricia Lampkin
Richard Kovatch
Robert P. Dillman
Warren T. Leback
Wayne Cilimberg
William (Nick) E. Carter
Connie Warnock
Mary Hughes (*Executive Secretary*)
Ed Ayers

Guests:

Anna Towns
Jo Lawson

Interim Chair Mary Hughes called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. and announced that the date of the October 30 meeting had been changed to November 6 (this meeting was later cancelled). The first order of business was an update by Anna Towns on the relocation of Varsity Hall. Charged by the Board of Visitors to find a less costly alternative to the Randall Hall site previously discussed, Facilities Management reconsidered a range of possible sites over the summer, a process in which several Master Planning Council (MPC) members participated. In all, twelve locations were investigated and ranked. With no one alternative proving to be more feasible or cost effective, the majority favored demolition over relocation. The issue will be presented to the Buildings and Grounds Committee of the Board on October 2.

Mary Hughes reviewed the flow chart diagramming the sequence of steps in the planning process for University building projects, focusing on the role of the MPC in recommending sites for new facilities. Wayne Cilimberg reminded Ms. Hughes of the role played by the Planning and Coordinating Council Technical Committee (PACC Tech) in providing a forum for public information and comment on proposed building sites before they are approved by the MPC Executive Committee (Leonard Sandridge, Colette Sheehy, and Gene Block).

Tom Leback, Capital Program Manager, then made a presentation on the capital outlay process for gaining state approval for construction projects over \$1 million. There are three ways to initiate capital outlay projects:

1. Project is included in the state budget plan approved by the General Assembly in even-year sessions.

2. Project is submitted as a budget amendment to the General Assembly in odd years.
3. Project is submitted for an emergency authorization between General Assembly sessions.

Mr. Leback explained that it takes the University nineteen months to prepare its six –year capital program (27 months including interim state reviews of the plan, General Assembly action and authorizations taking effect). For example, the 2006-2012 plan is due to be submitted to the state in April/May of 2005. To initiate the planning process, Bob Dillman will send a letter to Deans in March 2004 asking for a list of their priority building projects. To be considered for funding in the first biennium, a project must have a completed budget plan describing where the funds will be coming from, among other items. The Deans' collective priorities and budget plans are submitted to Gene Block, Colette Sheehy and Leonard Sandridge for review and ranking in priority order. The plan is finalized by winter of 2005 and then must be approved by the Board of Visitors before it is submitted to Richmond.

Jo Lawson, Capital Program Planner for Facilities Management, then provided further explanation of the budget planning process that is the first step in getting a project included in the first biennium list of funding priorities. She passed out copies of the form, which can be downloaded from the Facilities Planning and Construction website. Facilities Management provides assistance to Deans in answering the questions on the form. This initial planning process usually takes 8-12 weeks. Ms. Hughes clarified that if the proposed building site is not on the University's master plan, the site selection must come before the MPC as an amendment to the master plan in the process described above before it can be included in the first biennium list.

Connie Warnock, Assistant to the University Architect, reviewed the build-out plan for the University, indicating areas that are likely sites for new University facilities, including potential building sites available on University-owned land as well as some areas where land acquisition might be likely in the future.

The minutes of the August 14, 2003 meeting were approved and the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.