

2                   **CHAPTER 21 (FORMERLY 6C-21)**

3                   **PUBLIC COMMENT DRAFT**

4                   **(JANUARY 6, 2008)**



8

9

10                   **Florida Board of Governors**

11                   **CAMPUS MASTER PLAN 21**

12                   **REGULATION WORKGROUP**

13                   **Campus Master Plan 21 Regulation Workgroup Project Website**

14                   <http://consensus.fsu.edu/bog-firc/21.html>

15

16

17

## 2 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

3  
4 In response to a Campus Master Plan Lessons Learned Report in 2007<sup>1</sup>, the Board of Governors convened  
5 a work group to review and propose revisions as appropriate to the existing 6C-21 regulation governing the  
6 campus master plan process. The Workgroup, representing university, local government and community  
7 legal, planning and facilities expertise and perspectives, met six times between May 2008 and January 2009.  
8 The Workgroup conducted survey research, invited expert presentations to inform their findings and  
9 recommendations and developed consensus advisory recommendations to the Board of Governors and  
10 staff on ways to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and fairness of Campus Master Plan process.

11  
12 Following presentations on the campus master experiences to date, including the 2007 BOG Campus  
13 Master Planning “Lessons Learned” report (<http://consensus.fsu.edu/bog-fcrc/cmp.html>), the Workgroup  
14 agreed to nine findings as the basis for its review and update of the existing 6C-21:

- 15  
16 1. While there are exceptions, generally the current campus master planning process, which includes  
17 the 2005 changes, is producing campus master plans that are consistent with the host local  
18 government comprehensive plans. However there are planning areas and issues where  
19 improvements can be made.
- 20 2. Concurrency trust funding, overseen by the Board of Governors, has proven to be an essential  
21 ingredient for agreement and success between universities and their host local governments. It has  
22 also contributed to a more constructive and cooperative university/local government (“town-  
23 gown”) relationship.
- 24 3. The existence of concurrency trust fund money for improvements has enhanced the ability of SUS  
25 campuses to negotiate campus master plans and campus development agreements with host local  
26 governments. From a local government perspective, this funding has allowed the campus and host  
27 government to collectively address the scope of the impacts and provide payment for the campus’

---

<sup>1</sup> “The BOG should undertake a collaborative rule development process to implement the 2005 legislative changes and clarify procedures and issues. The BOG should engage the SUS offices of general counsel and SUS planning and operations staff along with representatives from cities, counties and communities and utilize the services of the FCRC Florida Consensus Center, a statewide service program based at FSU and UCF.”

<http://consensus.fsu.edu/bog-fcrc/cmp.html>

2 share of these impacts. However there are planning areas and issues related to concurrency trust  
3 funds where improvements can be made.

- 4 4. Transportation and off-campus housing impacts appear to have been the most prevalent areas of  
5 conflict between SUS universities and host local governments. Fire and policing, water and sewer,  
6 energy and environmental features and concerns and related special facilities issues may present  
7 future challenges.
- 8 5. Constructive university/host government relationships may be grounded on engaged leadership and  
9 effective communication on many levels on both the part of the local government and university.
- 10 6. The quality and timeliness of University public outreach and communication on master plans and  
11 development agreements may contribute to better relationships between SUS campuses and their  
12 host local governments.
- 13 7. The approach taken by Universities and their host local governments for the concurrency  
14 proportionate fair share of the costs of impacts and improvements within “context areas” needs to  
15 be considered in updating the 6C-21 campus master plan and campus development agreement  
16 regulations.
- 17 8. While there is an overall statutory master plan template, there exist variations in how each SUS  
18 campus has implemented the law (e.g. how branch campuses are treated, etc.). These should be  
19 addressed by the Workgroup in considering changes to the 6C-21 regulation and potential  
20 recommendations for statutory changes.
- 21 9. The transparency of information and communication on campus master plans and development  
22 agreements and the use of open workshop formats for reviewing the plans and agreements with the  
23 public have enhanced the “town/gown” relationship and may have helped to minimize the number  
24 of challenges to the plans and development agreements.

25  
26 The Working Group sought to review the current rule language and refine it based on experiences with  
27 campus master planning to date. This included proposing deletion of data and analysis requirements that  
28 were difficult to ascertain or not useful or unnecessary for good planning. For instance, data requirements  
29 for fire lanes, inventory of off-campus parking, classification of roadways on campus, size and surface  
30 material (of pedestrian facilities), and inventory of violent crimes, were deleted as not necessary within the  
31 campus master plan. It also included adding concepts and nomenclature to bring it in line with  
32 contemporary thinking on issues such as multimodal transportation and sustainability. The Workgroup  
33 agreed to be guided by the following drafting principles in their review and refinement of the existing 6C-21  
34 regulation:

- 35  
36 • The Workgroup process should strive for agreement on recommended rule language that could be  
37 incorporated into an updated Chapter 21 Regulation;

- 2 • The focus of the Workgroup process is to seek consensus in updating and enhancing the campus  
3 master planning process as currently set forth in the BOG’s Chapter 21 regulation. To the extent  
4 there are issues beyond the scope of the regulation that the Workgroup agrees require legislative  
5 attention in F.S. Chapter 163, these should be captured as additional legislative recommendations for  
6 consideration by the BOG;
- 7 • Drafting Recommendations should be designed to produce timely, meaningful, equitable and quality  
8 campus plans and development agreements;
- 9 • Drafting Recommendations should be designed to support meaningful collaboration and  
10 engagement among university, local government and community interests;
- 11 • The tasks and responsibilities of universities, local government, the Board of Governors, the  
12 Department of Community Affairs and citizens should be considered, and if needed, clarified;
- 13 • The Work Group and its drafting groups should consider relevant best practices in developing their  
14 recommendations; and
- 15 • The Work Group and its drafting groups should consider reducing or eliminating unnecessary costs  
16 in plan preparation in developing its recommendations.

17

18 What follows is a draft “redline” version of the existing 6C-21 regulation and  
19 a “clean” draft version. Note that the Board of Governors is in the process of  
20 revising its regulation numbering and 6C-21 is referred to as Chapter 21 in  
21 this draft.