

The University System of Georgia Board of Regents

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA MASTER PLAN

July 22, 1999





The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	Sep	otember	⁻ 29, 199	8		
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan					
Subject	i.	i. Table of Contents				
From	Aye	Ayers/Saint/Gross				
То	University of Georgia Consultants					
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202	i I	TABLE	E OF CO RY OF 1	NTENTS THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		
410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519		I.A I.B	Histori Overvi	c Buildings and Grounds ew of the Institution		
Architecture and Engineering Heery International						
999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367	II	GOAL	S AND F			
Fax 404/875-1283		II.A II.B II.C	Princip Admin	tional Mission Statement and Strategic Plan bles for the Physical Plan istrative Confirmation by the Cross Team of the Board of Regents		
Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444						
Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726	III	EXIST	ING CAN	IPUS CONDITIONS Introduction		
Fax 404/876-6858		III.A	Campı	us Buildings and Grounds		
Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797			III.A.1	Campus Physical Setting III.A.1.a. Topography - Elevations III.A.1.b. Landforms Views and Landmarks III.A.1.c. Drainage III.A.1.2 Vegetation III.A.1.d. Edges and Entry Points		
Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380			III.A.2	Land Use Land Use Map University Land Holdings UGA Facility Leases		
			III.A.3	Building Use and Condition		
			III.A.4	Open Space and Pedestrian Circulation		
			III.A.5	Vehicular Circulation and Parking		
			III.A.6	Athletic and Recreational Facilities		

- III.B **Campus Infrastructure**
 - **III.B.1** Utilities
 - III.B.2 Stormwater
 - **III.B.3** Communications

III.C **Community Setting**

III.C.1 Regulatory Issues

III.C.2 Environmental Issues

- III.C 2.1. Natural Resources Audit
- III.C.2.2. Hazardous Environmental Conditions III.C.2.3. Protection and Restoration of Historic and Natural Sites

IV FUTURE CAMPUS REQUIREMENTS

- IV.A **Description of Future Academic Program**
- IV.B Space Needs Analysis to Target Year
- IV.C **Parking Space Projections**
- IV.E **Campus Infrastructure Projections**
- IV.F **Proposed Land Acquisition / Disposition**

V PRELIMINARY PHYSICAL MASTER PLAN

- V.1 **Exploration of Concept Alternatives**
- V.2 **Selection of Preliminary Physical Master Plan**
- V.3 **Precinct Studies**
- V.4 **Review of Proposed Plan Objectives and Attributes** Parking Existing / Proposed Diagrams

VI PHYSICAL MASTER PLAN

VI.A Land and Building Use

- VI.A.1 Proposed Land Use VI.A.2 Building Use
- VI.A.2 Building Use VI.A.3 Proposed Development Density
- VI.A.4 Future Development Zones / Recommended Land Acquisitions

VI.B Vehicular Circulation and Parking

VI.B.2 Bus and Bicycle Circulation

- VI.C Open Space and Pedestrian Circulation
- VI.D Athletic and Recreational Facilities
- VI.E Campus Infrastructure
- VI.F Comprehensive Plan Existing and Proposed Diagrams Prescribed Edges

VII IMPLEMENTATION

- VII.A Cost Estimate
- VII.B Capital Improvement Program and Phasing Plan
- VII.C Physical Master Plan Design Standards Site Design Standards Architectural Design Standards
- VII.D Planning and Review Process

CREDITS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

APPENDIX (SEPARATE BINDER)



Technical Memorandum

Date	March 11, 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	The History of the University of Georgia, Section 1
From	Ayers/Saint/Gross
То	University of Georgia
Amhitacts and Campus Diannars	The following is a summary of the major points in the University of Georgia's history. There

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410347-8500 Fax 410347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404881-9880 Fax 404875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404876-7726 Fax 404876-6858

ThafficEngineering **LRE Engineering** 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404888-8800 Fax 404876-7797

Academic Programming **Paulien & Associates** 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303832-3272 Fax 303832-3380 are four sections: 1.1 Introduction

1.2 Foundation, Survival, and War: 1784 through 1866

1.3 Reconstruction and Modernization: 1866 through 1932

1.4 The Contemporary University: 1932 through 1997

THE HISTORY OF UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

1.1. Introduction

1.

The University of Georgia is one of the nation's oldest centers of higher-education. It's campus is a site of considerable history and beauty. Designing new buildings and grounds in the proximity of such an important living-legacy carries enormous responsibility on the part of the university community, its architects, landscape architects, planners and builders. Fortunately a comprehensive history of the development of the University of Georgia exists. Joel Thomas Bowen, Jr.'s, Ph.D. dissertation, Room to Grow: An Historical Analysis of the Physical Growth at the University of Georgia, 1785 to 1990, constitutes a valuable chronicle of the history of the institution and the development of its physical form. It is recommended that individuals who are charged with the responsibility of overseeing the future growth of the campus thoroughly familiarize themselves with the content of this document. While the text which follows attempts to provide a comprehensive summary of the history of the institution, it should not be substituted for a thorough understanding of the development of the University of Georgia campus. Readers familiar with the Bowen text will recognize the extent that this document is intended as a summary of much of the information contained therein.

The history and evolution of the American university is intimately tied to the land and visions of an ideal landscape. Whereas the European university developed with strong ties to the city, its American counterpart typically developed at a distance from urban centers. The general pattern for foundation of American colleges and universities in the 18th and 19th centuries involved the removal of centers of learning from populated areas. The founders of early colleges argued that the corrupting influences of alcohol, gambling, and other vices associated with the city could be avoided by locating universities in rural locations. Additionally, it was surmised that the fresh air and plentiful land found in the wilderness would insulate against disease while providing natural resources for the maintenance of the institution.

Many of today's most prestigious institutions of higher learning had modest origins situated on the frontiers of the new nation. Eleazer Wheelock's log-cabin at Hanover New Hampshire would evolve into Dartmouth College. Father Sorin's log chapel situated on the shores of St. Mary's and St. Joseph's lakes near South Bend, Indiana would one day become the University of Notre Dame. The University of Georgia was no exception to this genre of foundation myth. The first building constructed by Josiah Meigs, was "an indigenous log structure twenty feet square and one and one-half stories high." (Bowen, pp. 22)

The intention of the founders of the nation's first universities, however, was not to perpetuate the institution as a rustic outpost for intellectual ideals. During the early years of the republic, the classical world of ancient Rome and Greece exerted a profound influence over the American mind-set. The new nation sought to model itself after the attributes of these great societies. New towns founded in America became known by the names of Rome, Syracuse, Carthage, Troy, Ithaca, and Athens. During the early 1800's, Greek Revival architectural styles reinforced the connection between these distant places and their new-world namesakes. It was as if America was to return to first principles — the new nation would shed centuries of historical encrustation by returning to the "true ways" represented by a distant classical past. This ideal when imposed upon the landscape was to exert a taming effect upon the wilderness. The rustic origins of many towns and campuses quickly became replaced by many a Parthenon nestled within a bucolic landscape (see Figure 1).



Figure 1: Girard College (1833-1848), Philadelphia Pennsylvania

The importance and pervasive nature of these Classical ideals can often be lost on the contemporary mind-set. The transformation of the landscape from wilderness into a civic setting in the 18th and 19th centuries constituted no small feat. Descriptions of Athens, Georgia in the early 1800's provide a clue as to the difficulty involved in actually converting the primitive American forests into an urbane town. Despite its name, Athens "had tree stumps in the middle of Front Street," (Bowen, pp. 27) in the early part of the 19th century. The early Athenians working principally with beasts

of burden and human muscle no doubt tempered their ideal visions of an heroic Athens with the circumstantial conditions of the particular Georgian landscape in which the town was to be situated. Thus, the picture of Athens that they painted in brick and stone made accommodations for preexisting natural conditions — a boulder too large to move, a hill or a valley in a particular location, or a spring which might provide necessary drinking water for future inhabitants. In this sense, the ideal of a classical landscape shared an almost organic relationship with the lay of the land.



Figure 2: This Painting by George Cooke Depicts Athens and the University in 1840.

Athens, Georgia might one day evoke the pretensions of her sister city, but simultaneously she would be uniquely married to the land upon which she was sited. Thus, we can begin to understand that the device of classicism as applied to college towns and campuses through out the country was very much intended as an instrument through which to view, comprehend, and tame a small portion of the vast frontier of a new nation.

Following the Civil War the art of landscape in America became even more absorbed with the principles of classicism. While the intentions of the first generation of settlers in the new nation may have been survival — to beat back the wilderness and to establish towns on the frontier — subsequent generations began to appreciate the need for refining a vision of an American landscape. The World's Colombian Exposition, in Chicago, of 1893 and Senate Parks Commission of nearly ten years later were two factors that reshaped American consciousness concerning the design of cities, campuses, and their buildings. If the architecture and landscape of the early nation paralleled that of the Greek city-state or the Roman Republic, then the character of design that had evolved during the early years of the 20th century could be seen to parallel to that of Imperial Rome. McKim Mead and White's designs for Columbia University, Cram Goodhue Ferguson's plan for the William Rice Institute (later Rice University), and Cass Gilbert's University of Minnesota became the benchmarks for a new kind of campus that bore strong relationship to the palatial gardens of the French Enlightenment. By 1920's, American architects were capable of producing campus designs that rivaled their European precedents. Charles Platt's designs for the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana were to constitute a modern-day Versailles on the prairie (see figure 3). The Leavitt plan for the University of Georgia paralleled this trend of "City Beautiful" visions for a college campuses.



Figure 3: Plan, University of Illinois

The reason behind such elaborate machinations of the landscape was certainly something more than merely making campuses appear pretty. Nor can the reasons for this heroic effort be explained away simply in terms of accommodation of the various functions of a university. At the very heart of the American campus tradition, prior to the Second World War, was the notion that the physical form of an institution in some way offered an embodiment of the intellectual community's ideals and aspirations. Thomas Jefferson's design for the University of Virginia is probably one of the most important illustrations of this idea (see Figure 4).

While the university evolved as a pedagogical entity — shaping what was to become the intellect of America, the campus evolved as a form which both tempered and tested the physical manifestations of those intellectual ideals. Jefferson's "academical village" was not only intended as a pleasant setting that would enhance one's appreciation of the Virginia countryside, it was intended to instruct the student. At face value, Jefferson's collage of architectural elements and peculiar formal conditions were intended to serve as an architectural lesson — then considered an essential part of



Figure 4: View of the Rotunda From the University of Virginia Lawn

any cultured person's education. Related to the specific formality of Jefferson's buildings and grounds, yet allotted equal importance was the notion that the formal order of the place conveyed the institutional order of the university to the student (regardless of whether or not that person would ever pick up a T-square and try their hand at architecture). And, as the institution of the university was meaningless outside the context of society at large, the seemingly banal formal order of the campus was intended as a microcosm of or a paradigm for the outside world.

The formal structure of the grounds with its central lawn opening onto rugged wilderness suggested the agrarian ideal that Jefferson sought for the new country — unspoiled nature and nature tamed in proximity and resolution. The lawn was ringed by pavilions — houses in the form of temples — lodgings for the professors —-counterparts to the yeoman farmer. The colonnade provided continuity between the pavilions by tying the individual to the whole. But, at the climax of the composition we find Hadrian's Pantheon dedicated not to the pagan gods, nor as Palladio had rendered it in the service of Christianity, rather we find this temple dedicated to that most sacred quality of the enlightenment — knowledge.

Following upon Jefferson's lead, many subsequent campus designs would strive to become the physical embodiment of the philosophy of the scholarly community. The spatial disposition of these campuses can be understood as a three-dimensional morality play both reflecting and projecting institutional aspirations. Today, probably no where is this phenomena more easily observable than at the nation's service academies. At the United States Naval Academy, in Annapolis, Maryland, (an example of "City Beautiful" principles applied to campus planning) Ernest Flagg configured an elaborate and moving message in his designs for the campus (see Figure 5).



Figure 5: Plan, U.S. Naval Academy

Bancroft Hall (the residential group) and Mahan Hall (the academic group) anchor the two extreme ends of a large open green. These buildings are connected by a straight path that stretches across the green and forms the east-west axis of the space. Many times a day, midshipmen move back and forth along the path between the two building groups. On their daily trek, the midshipmen pass monuments and memorials to naval heroes, reminding them of the attributes of the good sailor. At the mid-point of their journey between dormitory and classroom they cross another axis — one which is the product of an alignment between the chapel and a large boat basin (unfortunately the basin was insensitively land-filled during the 1960's and 70's in order to provide sites for classroom buildings). While the axis between the residential and academic groups might be understood as a daily, or mundane axis, the alignment between chapel and water is most certainly understood as a sacred axis. The temple form of the chapel enters into direct dialogue with the basin — as if the temple were imbued with anthropomorphic characteristics — it oversees the ships about to set sail as well as those returning from a long voyage. The layout of the Naval Academy does not merely solve a functional problem. In fact, it might be argued that the functional disposition of the residential and academic groups might have been improved had they been located in closer proximity. Nor is it likely that the Admirals charged with the task of building a service academy would have sought to merely create a "pretty" setting for their enterprise. Rather, the disposition of campus buildings is best understood when one considers their arrangement as a spatial narrative that embodies the ideals and aspirations of the institution. In this sense, the buildings and grounds of the institution become an inseparable component of the academy's pedagogical mission. Just as books in the library assist in the instructional mission of the institution, the buildings and grounds can be "read" and lessons can be extracted from their formal disposition.

Following the Second World War American college campuses adopted a significantly different attitude towards the landscape than had been traditionally been held. No longer was the landscape seen as a vehicle for the expression of the values of the institution rather it was increasingly seen as a commodity to be exploited. Modern earth moving equipment no longer necessitated designs to respond to the natural circumstance of the land, rather boulders could be moved, hills and valleveled, and water even could be made to run up-hill. Following the World War, architects were schooled less and less in the traditions of their art form and their knowledge of landscape traditions became even more limited. Architects became preoccupied with functional aspects of a building at the expense of understanding the complex matrix of cultural factors that played a role in determining built form. Consequently, many architects considered the exterior appearance of their buildings to be directly the result of the disposition of internal activities — the "exterior" was a result of an "interior." While this might seem to make sense in pragmatic terms, that is from a sense of optimizing the efficiency of the building's interior, the impact of many of these buildings upon the overall character of a campus could be devastating, even impractical. Unlike the American campus of the years leading up to the Second World War, most post-war campuses, buildings and landscapes, appear disjointed, often times inhumane. Many buildings of this period needlessly compete against one another for attention on campus. Unlike their predecessors, many post-war educational buildings fail to work together and with the landscape to create a congruous appearance of the institution. The buildings of this period are often characterized by cold, or corporate, appearances. Interior spaces often bear no connection to the exterior world — they are hermetically sealed. It is no wonder that the academic community of the later half of the 20th century regularly complains about fragmentation and isolation within the university. It is not surprising that interdisciplinary centers have formed with great regularity since the 1960's on college campuses around the nation in order to create a forum for exchange of ideas. If the campus of today is perceived of as fragmentary, we should not fool ourselves by thinking that it is merely an accidental product of the evolution of the institution. For the most part, we have designed our campuses to isolate disciplines from the broader landscape of the university community.

The challenge for the next generation of campus designers is how to correct nearly four decades of campus architecture and landscape design that failed to understand the physical environment of the institution as connected to the pedagogical mission of the university. Critical to this is a return to an understanding of the land and the symbolic potential of landscape. At the close of the 20th century, we are becoming ever more aware of both the practical and moral imperative concerning sustainable design. Land and resources are ever more scarce in the modern university. Ironically, the university community finds itself back in the leadership game — what is a vision for a sustainable landscape of the future?

1.2 Foundation, Survival, and War: 1784 through 1866

The University of Georgia was founded in the spirit of many early American colleges and universities. The new nation required leaders in order to assure its survival and in the latter part of the 18th century a Classical education was seen as a prerequisite for leadership. In 1784 the State of Georgia created a governing board to oversee the foundation of a state university. The Senatus Academicus, as it was named, became the governing board for the proposed university. In the following year, on the 27th of January, the charter of the University of Georgia was granted by the state and Abraham Baldwin, a graduate of Yale, was elected president of the new institution. The preamble of the university's charter underscored its mission as an institution founded to build character and provide leaders, "public prosperity and even existence (of free government) very much depends upon suitably forming the minds and morals of their citizens." (Schulyer, pp. 59) (see Figure 6)



Figure 6: Preamble of the University of Georgia's Charter

Initially it was thought that the new university would be located on a tract of land set aside by the legislature in an area that became the town of Greensborough. Land in the vicinity of Greensborough was sold as a means of establishing a financial basis for the university. For nearly ten years the "University of Georgia existed largely on paper, with a charter, a president, two governing bodies, an abundance of land, and a small amount of cash reserves due mainly from the sale and lease of the Greensborough lots." (Bowen, pp.17) In 1794 a committee was established to review the location of the University and to fill vacancies on the Board of Trustees. For two years the committee disputed the location of the university only coming to agreement on the present site in 1796. An article in the Augusta Chronicle on July 25, 1801 gives a detailed account of the site that was selected.

"For this purpose the tract, containing six hundred and thirty three acres, was purchased of Mr. Easley, by Mr. Milledge, one of the committee, and made a donation of to the Trustees; and it was called Athens.

It lies, of course, in the county of Jackson, and is distant from Augusta, a west course, and by the post road, ninety miles; and is adjacent to a tract of five thousand acres belonging to the trust.

The site of the University is on the south side, and half a mile from the river. On one side the land is cleared; the other is wood-land. On the cleared side are two ample orchards of apple and peach trees; forming artificial copses, between the site and the river, preferable to the common under growth of nature.

What little vapour rises at any time from the river is always attracted by the opposite hills, towards the rising sun.

About two hundred yards from the site, and at least three hundred feet above the level of the river, in the midst of an extensive bed of rock, issues a copious spring of excellent water; and, in its meanderings to the river, several others are discovered.

On the place is a new well built framed dwelling house: entirely equal to the accommodation of the President and his family. There is also another new house, equal to a temporary school room.

The square of the University, containing thirty-six acres and a half, is laid off so as to comprehend the site, the houses, the orchards and the spring, together with a due proportion of the wood-land.

A street is also laid off upon the northern line of the square, adjoining a village of lots in that direction. Besides the spring in the square, which is convenient to the village, there is one in the street and another back of the lots.

Another street is also laid off on the western line of the square, and bounded upon more lots in that direction; and which will be supplied with water from springs forming another branch on the wood-land side.

A large avenue is also laid off in front of the site; and bearing a southerly direction.

The situation has an extended horizon on three sides. Up the river, northerly, the site is bounded by ascending hills.

The sky, in general, is clear and azure; the air dry, elastic and vivifying; and a fact in our natural history not before known, is, that the air in that elevated region of our state, during the warm months, is felt from the westward and not form the southward; and when it comes from the latter, it is considered as a certain symptom of approaching rain."

At the turn of the century, Josiah Meigs, another Yale graduate, was appointed president of the university and set out to commence building on the chosen site. Meigs ordered the clearing of land and oversaw the platting of the new college town — Athens (see Figure 7). In the early years of the institution, "classes recited under the shade of a large oak, a curious Georgian version of the grove of Academe." (Schulyer, pp. 59) In 1801, President Meigs commissioned the construction of a three story brick building (known first as Franklin College and today as Old College) patterned after Connecticut Hall at his alma mater (see Figure 8). It is likely that President Meigs brought back the plans for the new building after a trip to New England. Though the pattern of this first permanent building is clearly reminiscent of the Connecticut Hall, its disposition on the campus followed a pattern more akin to the location of Nassau Hall, at Princeton, or Old East, at the University of North Carolina.

At Yale, Connecticut Hall formed a portion of a line of buildings known as the "Old Brick Row." This line of buildings was consciously built in order to form an urban wall to New Haven's town-square— the Green (see Figure 9). At Athens, as at Princeton and Chapel Hill, the university's first building was not located on the edge of a town-square, rather it was situated directly within an open green space at considerable distance from a public thoroughfare.



Figure 7: Plan of Franklin College and Athens in 1803



Figure 8: Old College (1806) Modeled after Connecticut Hall

The intention of the placement of Old College greatly differed from its cousin in New Haven. Old College was meant to be seen as a building in a landscape removed from the activities of the civic life of Athens, while Yale's "Old Brick Row" existed cheek-by-jowl with the town's major civic space. The parallel between Athens, Princeton, and Chapel Hill might be continued in terms of the relationship of the town's edge to the university proper. At Princeton, Nassau Street serves to divide the borough into two districts (see Figure 10) one containing the town and the other a large tract belonging to the university, while at Chapel Hill, Franklin Street performs much the same duty. In Athens, Front Street (later Broad Street) performed the task of separating "town and gown" (See Figure 11). One side of the main thoroughfare in each of these towns would eventually be divided into individual parcels to serve as sites for homes, businesses, and other activities of the town, while the opposite side of the street would remain ostensibly one large parcel that would be conceived of in terms of an open park, field, or campus.



Figure 9: Central Part of New Haven, Figure 10: Plan, Princeton University Connecticut



Figure 11: View of North Campus From Front Street (1880's)

During its early years the university struggled to remain financially solvent. In the early 1800's most of the finances of the university were underwritten by the sale of land in Athens. The War of 1812 played a role in lowering student enrollment to a critical level. State funding for the institution also waned during the hostilities with Britain. Between 1812 and 1819 the University struggled to keep its doors open. In March of 1818, the board of trustees commissioned a new home for the president, and a brick structure which would contain a chapel, library, and scientific equipment. In 1821 another brick structure, Philosophical Hall, was added to the campus plan, and in 1823, New College was built. By 1824, the university began to enjoy some prosperity with over one-hundred students enrolled in the institution. In 1830 fire destroyed the existing wooden chapel and a chapel was rebuilt in 1835 by James R. Carlton and Benjamin Towns. This classic Greek Revival structure became such a landmark of the campus and surrounding community that the city's boundaries were measured from a midpoint located at the base of the chapel steps, extending in a 360 degree radius several miles away. (Figure 12)



Figure 12: 1908 Photo of the UGA Chapel

The University of Georgia nurtures a long history of maintaining beautiful campus grounds. The very beginnings of maintaining beautiful grounds started with the mere beginnings of the University. Before the University's Charter was written, Abraham Baldwin suggested that "a plat of land where agricultural experiments might be made and observations in Botany and Natural History be taken". This "plat of land" that was to be provided by the proposed college, did not take form until 1831 when the University's first botanical garden was sited northwest of campus. The true boundaries are not known, but it was believed to be roughly contained in the present city block bounded by Broad Street on the south, Finley Street on the east, Pope Street on the west and Reese Street on the north. The garden was described in the reminiscences of Samuel Boykin, a student of Franklin College during the years 1848 to 1851.

"The garden was cool and shady, and many benches in localities of rural beauty, invited rest and quiet conversation. The eye roamed with delight through the winding walks into shady dells and over flowerbeds of exquisite beauty. Near the center of the garden was a cool spring, delightfully shaded by trees with benches around it, where the college boys, after quenching their thirst were fond of sitting, to chat and crack jokes. At almost every turn some pleasant surprise greeted the eye... as of a charming retreat or a splashing waterfall or a placid little lake with a graceful willow growing beside it."

The garden continued to serve the University and surrounding community until September 1856 when it was sold and the proceeds applied towards the costs of constructing an iron fence around the campus (portions of which still remain on northernmost border of campus), and some additional

ornamental trees and shrubs for the grounds. Although this first garden did not survive, many other events and personalities over the years have contributed to building a history of maintaining beautiful grounds.

The classical education offered at most institutions of higher-learning in the early 1800's employed memorization and recitation as a principle tool of instruction. Unlike the contemporary university, the curriculum of this time period did not engage matters of temporal or popular appeal. Learned men, it was postulated, were able to become leaders by means of a rigorous immersion in the traditional lessons of the past. Since all classical texts contained a moral lesson, it was thought that a thorough understanding of these documents would prepare young men for their future as leaders. There was a strong religious influence on the classical curriculum of all universities at this time. Even UGA, a very public institution, had two churches (in addition to the chapel) that actually existed on campus, and daily chapel sessions were required of students almost to the middle of the 20 th century.

Throughout America young academics began to use their extracurricular time to discuss and debate the contemporary issues of their day. Literary societies and debating clubs formed in order to engage popular topics and to exercise the students' speaking skills. The University of Georgia was no exception. In 1803, the Demosthenian Literary Society was formed. Demosthenian Hall (see Figure 13) was built in 1824 to house the activities of the society.



Figure 13:Demosthenian Hall (1836)Figure 14:Phi Kappa HallFollowing the lead of these early rhetoricians, in 1836 the Phi Kappa Literary Society (see Figure
14) built a temple-like structure directly across the college yard from Demosthenian Hall forming a
cross axis to the quadrangle-like green. The particular arrangement of debating societies at the
University of Georgia is perhaps the earliest example of a campus architecture tradition that was
repeated at Princeton with the construction of Whig and Clio Halls in 1837, at Eumenean and
Philanthropic Halls at Davidson College in 1949, and eventually at Oxford College (originally
Emory College), in Oxford, Georgia. In each case the debating society buildings were sited in
direct relation to one another about a significant campus axis. At Princeton, Whig and Clio, stand
side by side as if each were metaphorically a participant in an debate facing a landscaped audience
of Canon Green. At the University of Georgia, Davidson, and Oxford, these analogs for debaters
face-off squarely creating a cross-axis for a larger campus composition.

The traditions of a classical education, in each of the above campus compositions, were emphatically stated by means of a significant campus building, Nassau Hall, in the case of Princeton, or Old College, at Athens, which generated the principal axis or organizing feature of the campus. In a remarkably poetical manner, the literary societies provided these campuses with a cross-axial alignment which might be interpreted as a counterpoint to the aloof ideals of a classical education. By mid-century the debates would become so popular as to spill over onto the campus proper in the guise of contests of physical provess. (Bowen, pp. 49)

Enrollment at the University of Georgia declined as the Civil War approached. In the fall of 1863 classes were canceled and the university did not re-start operations until 1866. During the War, campus buildings were used as hospitals and lodgings for refugees. In 1865, the university was occupied by Federal troops.

1.3 Reconstruction and Modernization: 1866 through 1932

Following the Civil War, the University of Georgia struggled to resurrect itself. During the 1850's Andrew A. Lipscomb, ascended to the university's highest office. After the war, Lipscomb proposed a reorganization of the university in order to increase student enrollment. Following the Civil War the traditional American Classical system of education had been upset. Leadership, as it was increasingly understood, was not only the province of a classical course of study. In 1862, the Morrill Land Grant College Act established funding for an agricultural, mechanical, and military college in every state loyal to the Union. Following the Civil War, land grant institutions were established in the onetime Confederate states. The effect of the Morrill Land Grant was to introduce a more populist and practical educational mission in American universities. No longer was education something aloof, it was to become something useful. Fearing a time limitation for the selection of the Land Grant institution, Governor James M. Smith, designated the University of Georgia to be the recipient of the Agricultural College in 1872.

Educational reforms swept the country in the last quarter of the 19th century lead by Charles William Eliot, who was elected president of Harvard in 1869. A major component of the educational reforms popularized by Eliot was the reorganization of curricula into a system of electives. In the 1870's under Lipscomb's leadership, the University of Georgia experimented with this novel form of higher-education. One of the mitigating factors that seemed to validate an elective system was the students returning to campus from the Civil War seemed more mature and exhibited a greater ability to take responsibility for their actions than their pre-war predecessors. By the mid-1870's the University of Georgia's experiment with the elective system came to an end as the campus was once again reorganized under Chancellor Tucker.

There are many evidences to show that the University and the Athens community had an early interest in gardens and landscape design. Another seed for the tradition if maintaining beautiful grounds was planted in 1881 when Chancellor Mell visited P.J. Berckman in Augusta (the designer of Augusta National Golf Course), and asked him to recommend someone to design a landscape plan for the campus grounds. Berckman volunteered to do the job himself at no expense to the University and even donated many of the ornamental trees and shrubs used in the plan. Around 1891, the first garden club in the United States, the Ladies Garden Club of Athens, was founded by twelve Athens women. The Garden Club of Georgia later claimed Athens as its state headquarters.

Congress passed the Hatch Act in 1887 which funded agricultural experiment stations at universities throughout the nation. In 1888, the Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station was located in Athens. Eventually, bowing to pressure, politicians moved the station to Griffin, Georgia. The 1890's saw incremental improvements and renovations to many of the campus buildings. "Old College, also called the Summey House after the family that managed it and "Yahoo Hall" after the childish boys who lived in it, was in such dilapidated condition that students were allowed to live there rent-free." (Bowen, pp. 84) Numerous times Old College was targeted for demolition narrowly escaping destruction each time.

At the turn of the century, the campus consisted of an assortment of buildings in a variety of styles set within a broad landscape (see Figures 16 & 17). Walter B. Hill was appointed Chancellor in 1899 and began an era of progressive reforms. Hill courted the New York philanthropist, George Foster Peabody, who eventually became the university's first significant benefactor. Peabody gave \$50,000 for a new fireproof library, in 1902, and in 1905 suggested the University engage the services of Charles Wellford Leavitt, a New York landscape architect, in order to devise a plan for the university's future growth.



Figure 16: Plan of UGA in 1899



Figure 17: View of North Campus in 1900

Charles Wellford Leavitt (1871-1928) was educated in Connecticut and Pennsylvania and opened his office in New York in 1897. Many of Leavitt's commissions were country estates located in New York and California. His most notable commissions were the gardens for the Walter P. Chrysler Estate, in King's Point, and the Formal Gardens for the Lillian Sefton Dodge Estate, in Mill Neck. Leavitt also executed some important civic commissions, most notably, improvements to the Gate of Heaven Cemetery in Mt. Pleasant, New York. Leavitt's career was unexpectedly cut short when he contracted pneumonia and died in 1928. (for a brief biographical sketch see: MacKay, pp. 252-253)



Figure 18: 1905 Leavitt Plan

Leavitt's plan for the University of Georgia was unveiled in January of 1906 (see Figure 18). The Beaux-arts composition featured a strong axial arrangement highlighted by a centrally planned

domed chapel building. The Leavitt plan divided the campus in to five sectors: the Academic Group, the State Department Group, the Engineering Group, the College for Women, and the Agricultural Group. (Bowen, pp. 111) Leavitt proposed that Old College be razed and the quadrangle space be extended in a southerly direction. The chapel was proposed as a terminal feature of the new quadrangle's main axis. Leavitt drew upon the mythology of Athens, when he configured the Engineering Group. He had intended that the buildings in this group were "to be modeled after the Acropolis," in Athens, Greece. (Bowen, pp. 117) Leavitt's plan also solidified the location of the Agricultural School. He proposed that new buildings be built on a prominent site overlooking Athens. Additionally, the plan sponsored the acquisition of additional lands which expanded the size of the campus and insured the Agricultural School's relationship to the university.

Leavitt's plan made use of the natural features of the land. Deep ravines that had previously separated portions of the campus were to be bridged and would form natural vistas as a counterpoint to the formal order of plan. Leavitt also used the Tanyard Branch ravine as a site for the relocation of athletic fields. The natural contour and bowl shape of the ravine were eventually formalized with the construction of Sanford Stadium in 1929. Although many aspects of Leavitt's plan were followed other recommendations, such as the demolition of Old College and the creation of a monumental quadrangle remained on paper. Leavitt's plan remains the most significant formal plan in the University of Georgia's history.

Leavitt conceived of the grand plan as a physical embodiment of the institution's ideals and aspirations. Significantly, he located a monumental chapel at the heart of this composition and not a library building as had been the tradition since Thomas Jefferson's, University of Virginia. Perhaps the longing for moral leadership, an element that has never been completely eradicated from the Southern mind-set by modern times, informed Leavitt's decision to use such heraldry. As the university continued to grow under the influence of Leavitt's skillfully executed plan, the university was nurturing its own skills of landscape design. A young program was born under the direction of one of the university's own faculty members who was also a landscape architect. In 1928, the undergraduate program for Landscape Architecture was established as a part of the College of Agriculture in the Horticulture Department with Hubert B. Owens as its Director.

1.4 The Contemporary University: 1931 through 1997

Hubert B. Owens continued to be a great influence through the landscape designs he created for campus. One of his most important contributions being the design of the Founder's Memorial Garden. The garden began development in 1941 to commemorate the twelve women responsible for starting the first Garden Club. The garden and the Greek Revival house it surrounded became the headquarters of the Garden Club of Georgia in 1963. Another Owens design to have a large effect on campus was his early 1950's planting design around the Agricultural Extension Building. This project spurred occupants of other buildings on campus to become interested in the beautification of areas immediately around their buildings.

When Governor Richard B. Russell signed the Reorganization Act of 1931, the state government was significantly streamlined. Paralleling the reorganization of the State Government, the Board of Regents struggled with the idea of consolidating the state university system or dividing it into a series of smaller autonomous institutions. In 1932, the three major schools occupying the Athens

campus were the state university, the state agricultural college and the state normal (or teachers) school. Following a prolonged debate the schools were officially reorganized into a consolidated University of Georgia with Steadman V. Sanford appointed its first president.

Despite a period of economic distress, enrollment at the university was on the rise. Owing to a scarcity of employment opportunities, enrollment at the university increased from 1,855 students in 1932, to 2,903, in 1936. Within that time-frame, from 1933-1934, the university system's budget decreased by 21 percent. (Bowen, pp. 136) Following a trend found at many of the nation's state supported institutions of higher-learning, the University of Georgia applied for Works Progress Administration (WPA) and Public Work Administration (PWA) funding. During the Great Depression an additional seventeen buildings were added to the 1934 inventory of thirty-four buildings. Many campus improvements, such as landscaping and the paving of sidewalks and roads were directly the result of New Deal programs. Many of the buildings built during the 1930's and 1940's were executed according to the designs of Robert H. Driftmier, a professor of agricultural engineering, and his architect Roy Hitchcock. Driftmier and Hitchcock's buildings constitute one of the first departures from the Leavitt plan. Although the buildings were built in a derivative of the Neo-Classical style, the siting of the structures did not serve to reinforce Leavitt's intentions. "Driftmier and Hitchcock scattered the new buildings around the entire campus in what appears to be an irregular pattern or plan." (Baldwin, pp. 144) One of the first buildings built by Driftmier and Hitchcock was Clark Howell Hall, a PWA project. PWA financing also permitted the renovation of both Moore and New College (see Figures 19 & 20).



Figure 19: 1939 Aerial Photo of North Campus



Figure 20: 1939 Aerial Photo of South Campus

While New Deal projects fostered improvements to the campus, the university lost its accreditation due to political infighting between the Governor and the Board of Regents. Recovering its academic reputation dominated all aspects of university life during the early 1940's. Following the election of Ellis Arnall to the Gubernatorial seat the university's accreditation was restored. World War II caused business as usual to grind to a halt. The campus was designated as one of four Naval pre-flight training schools in 1942. Requiring larger gymnasium and pool facilities, the Navy built a new structure in Tanyard Branch west of Sanford Stadium. South campus also became the site for additional housing to fulfill the Navy's needs. The undated Blue Key map (see Figure 21) drawn at the beginning of the Second World War illustrates the extent of facilities following the building boom of the New Deal. By 1947, the Plant Operations Map, drawn by Edwin P. Kenny, (see Figure 22) illustrates the extent of growth incurred during wartime including nearly 200 units of temporary housing erected to accommodate the Naval aviators.



Figure 21: Blue Key Map (Date Unknown)



Figure 22: 1947 Plant Operations Map

With the close of the Second World War, building activities again dwindled despite a shortage of housing and the need for a new library building. In 1949, the State Legislature approved the creation of the University System Building Authority and gave it the power to finance campus projects. As soon as the powers of the Building Authority were confirmed in court, the university broke ground for new housing. The first of these buildings designed by Driftmier and Hitchcock were completed in 1952. Ironically, when the university found its funding for a new library building, in part due to the philanthropy of Mrs. Ilah Dunlap Little and in part due to state funding, the site selected for the structure was to concur with the location of the domed chapel in the Leavitt plan. Though the location of a library at this critical site would alter the iconography of Leavitt's Beaux-arts plan, symbolically it suggested a campus order that was more in tune with the iconography appropriate to a state institution.

In 1953 the University System Building Authority mandated campuses to commission long-range master plans that would anticipate and govern campus growth for a period of ten years. The Atlanta firm of Aeck and Associates was engaged to provide a plan (see Figure 23) for the Athens campus. "The Aeck plan physically represented the direction that state and local officials wanted to grow." (Bowen, pp. 168) It also represented a total departure from the planning techniques that had been employed by architects and landscape architects working on the campus since the Leavitt plan. Additionally, the types of buildings represented in the plan represented a departure in character and concept from the types of buildings that had been built on the campus during the preceding 150 or so years. The Aeck and Associates plan was inspired by European modernism, the architec-

ture and urbanism of Le Corbusier, Mies van der Rohe, and Walter Gropius. The buildings illustrated in the plan, a fine arts center on north campus, a modern science center complex, a new administration building were conceived of as mega-structures, at a scale which dwarfed the original campus buildings. Unlike the earlier arrangement of buildings of the campus of the University of Georgia, the buildings proposed by Aeck and Associates did not give form to the exterior landscape spaces. Rather, the spatial continuum of the campus landscape would be interrupted by a picturesque composition of volumes and abstract planar surfaces the result of the internal disposition of functional proximities. A significant modern landscape design during this period was Thomas Church's 1955 design for the Georgia Center for Continuing Education.



Figure 23: Aeck Associates Campus Development Plan, 1953

The Aeck plan was significant in that it has governed the growth of the campus since 1953. Aeck and Associates updated the campus master plan in 1967 (see Figure 24). In the production of the 1967 plan, the earlier scheme for the campus was essentially adapted to address a variety of new conditions. Probably one of the most innovative aspects of the 1967 update was the proposal for a campus-wide rapid transit system. The Aeck team realized that new roads and parking facilities could only partially deal with the traffic problems encountered by the campus. In order to connect various disparate portions of an ever expanding campus a "people-mover" type system was proposed. Dependable rubber-wheeled computer-controlled vehicles moving along a track would have permitted pedestrians to traverse the campus without impacting local traffic. The system received considerable attention, but was never designed or implemented. During the period from 1967 to 1980 the campus again expanded with the construction of a 259,500 square foot Coliseum, numerous laboratory and classroom buildings. High-rise dormitories were introduced onto the Athens campus as early as 1961, and the demeanor of the once quaint campus began to resemble that of a small city. During this period "functionalism" and "flexibility" were the watchwords of campus planners. Tradition had been discarded in favor of a "progressive" planning agenda.



Figure 24: Aeck Associates Campus Development Plan, 1967

Running parallel with the massive building surge the Grounds Department was busy providing landscape designs to fill the spaces on campus between new buildings. Many people have left their mark in the history of the UGA Landscape. One of whom was Brooks Whigington of the UGA Grounds Department whose influence spanned from 1940's to 1960. In the 1960's, Duncan Callicut became UGA's first landscape architect and deserves much of the credit for UGA's beautification. He is responsible for extensive tree planting on campus, with the oaks lining Lumpkin as an example. Duncan Callicut was followed by a landscape architect to carry on the tradition through to 1985. There have also been some significant landscape designs by private firms one of which is Robinson Fisher's 1989 design for the Mary Kahrs Garden west of the Ecology Building. Since 1985, UGA's current landscape architects, under the leadership of Dexter Adams, have stepped up to continue the legacy and have succeeded in bringing the standard of landscaping at UGA to an unmatched high. The University of Georgia is known far and wide for the beauty of its landscape. This tradition has only strengthened over the years and will continue to under the supervision of such quality leadership.

In 1980, the university's "self-study," a requirement of accreditation, undertook an examination of the campus planning activities. A six person committee convened to review planning policies and procedures. The committee report "focused on 'this indeterminate degree of growth through an increased measure of natural order, efficiency of use, and overall beauty.' The committee defined four main goals of their efforts: (1) to identify building and outdoor areas worthy of preservation; (2) to identify problems and recommend solution to the current campus planning process; (3) to

develop a "process" for making planning policy; (4) to establish clear "concepts," or guidelines, which would drive planning policy decisions." (Bowen, pp. 209). The committee also recommended that the campus community become more active participants in the planning process. From its beginnings in 1784 with little more than a few trustees, a president, a charter and some land, to the present day campus covering over 600 acres of land and accommodating over 27,000 students, the University of Georgia has transformed well beyond its founders expectations. Visitors to the Athens campus can still see classes held beneath broad canopies of campus trees in much the same manner that Plato conversed with his pupils on the outskirts of another Athens, in the groves of Academe, over two-thousand years ago. The original log building is long gone and Old College remains as a witness to the campus' past, however the University of Georgia of today has grown into a complex and energetic city of scholars.

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	December	12, 1997		
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan			
Subject	Historic Buildings and Grounds, Section I.A.5			
From	Ayers/Saint/Gross			
То	University of Georgia			
	Full docum	nentation of these historic resources is included in the Appendix.		
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519	1. UNIVE The follow districts or buildings. A.	RSITY OF GEORGIA HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS ing are the University of Georgia buildings and grounds that are national historic landmarks. The following (Figure I A.5) documents the locations of these Seney Stovall Chapel/ Lucy Cobb Chapel		
Architecture and Engineering Heery International	B. C.	Margaret Hall Lucy Cobb Institute Pusiness Services Puilding*		
999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367	D. E. F.	Arch and Fence Treanor House / John A. Cobb House*		
404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283	G. H.	Wilson Lumpkin House / Rock House* Bishop House / Bishop Cottage		
Landscape Architecture	I.	Meigs Hall / Old Leconte Hall		
Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan	J.	Moore College		
Atlanta, GA 30309	K.	New College		
404/876-7726	L.	Old College / Franklin College		
Fax 404/876-6858	M.	George Peabody Hall		
	N.	Waddell Hall / Philisophical Hall		
Traffic Engineering	0. D	Georgia Museum of Art / Peabody Library		
LRE Engineering	P.	Changel		
1475 Peachtee Street, Suite 220	Q. D	Chaper Demosthering Hell		
404/888-8800	K.			
Fax 404/876-7797	ა. T	Pin Kappa Hali		
	1. 11	Academic Building		
Academic Programming	U. V	While Hall / Whitehall Headquarters"		
Paulien & Associates	V.	Old North Communa (District)		
899 Logan Street, Suite 508	۷۷. * اممین	Old Norul Callipus (District)		
Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272	docum	ents included in the Appendix.		
Γαλ ουσίοσζοσου	2. NEIGH	BORING HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS		
	There are a	a number of national and local historic buildings and grounds in the		
	neighborho	oods surrounding the university including: Downtown Athens, Dearing Street,		

Hull Street, Broad Street, Henderson Avenue, Milledge Avenue, Oconee Street, Oconee Hill Cemetery, Bloomfield Street, the David Barrow School, and University Heights.





Not to Scale 10/9/98

Historic Resources Documentation

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure (I A.5)



The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	10/7/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Overview of the Institution (Section I B)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia
	The objective of this work element is to provide information on the overall dimensions and

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture

Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The objective of this work element is to provide information on the overall dimensions and physical characteristics of the campus. This information is based on the current issue of the University of Georgia Fact Book (1997).

Overview

In 1785, Georgia became the first state in the nation to grant a charter for a statesupported University. From its meager beginnings in 1801, when a site was selected and classes were held in a log building, the University of Georgia has grown to become a major teaching, research and service institution.

I. Key Factual Information

A. Academic Size

- a. Full Time Equivalent 28,262 (Fall 1997), 28,226 (Fall 1998)
- b. Total Headcount 29, 693 (Fall 1997), 30,009 (Fall 1998)

B. Total Area of Campus(es)

- a. Main Campus 605 acres
- b. Related Areas 684 acres
- c. Statewide land holdings (30 locations) 41,860 acres
- d. Total UGA Land Holdings 43,149

C. Number of Buildings

332 Main Campus buildings

II. Satellite Campuses

A. Coastal Plain Experiment Station

A satellite campus of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, the 5,868 acre Coastal Plain Station, located in 3 southwest Georgia counties, is committed to provide research opportunities and education in agricultural and environmental sciences. The Coastal Plain Station strives to promote both economic viability and global competitiveness of Georgia agriculture, while also fostering environmental stewardship and wise management of natural resources, and ensuring the production and distribution of safe food, feed and fiber.

B. Georgia Experiment Station

Located in adjacent Spalding and Pike counties, the Georgia Experiment Station, with 1,291 acres of land, is a premier agricultural research center within the southeast. The Georgia Station addresses research, extension, and educational needs of the State of Georgia through the following University programs: Crop and Pest Management, Food Safety and Quality Enhancement, Urban Agriculture, Applied Plant Genetics, and Environmental and Natural Resources.

C. Georgia Branch Stations

There are eight Agricultural Branch Stations, which occupy 5,361 acres of land, within the State. These Stations house varying types of

agricultural functions which are characteristic of the particular Georgia climate and region in which the land is located.

D. Cooperative Extension Service

The Cooperative Extension Service, through The University of Georgia, operates several 4-H camps throughout the state. These camps occupy 1594 acres, in 4 counties, within the state of Georgia.

E. School of Forest Resources

The Warnell School of Forest Resources has land holdings throughout the state, occupying 22,686 acres of land in 10 Georgia counties. These land holdings are for the purpose of educating students in the School of Forest Resources on the wide variety of forest types within the state.

F. Institute of Ecology

The Institute of Ecology has a 137 acre land holding in Newton county. This site, referred to as McGarity Wetlands, is used to educate the students of the University on the ecological systems unique to this wetland situation.

G. Marine Resources Facilities

In the coastal counties of Chatham, McIntosh (Sapelo Island) and Glynn, the Marine Resource Department occupies two land holdings of 694 acres. The Institute of Oceanography is located on the Chatham county site, while a Fisheries Extension can be found in Glynn County.

H. College of Veterinary Medicine

567 acres, in four counties, are occupied by the College of Veterinary Medicine. Most of these land holdings are farms on which the students of the College may obtain hands-on experience with animals typical to a farm setting.

III. Funding / Endowment Resources

- A. From the State of Georgia 45.8%
- **B**. From the Counties of Georgia 1.3%
- C. From Federal Appropriations 1.4%
- D. From Student Tuition and Fees 12.2%
- E. From Sales, Services, and Miscellaneous Sources 3.3%
- F. From Gifts, Grants, and Research Contracts 27.8% (State, Federal, and Private includes Student Aid)
- G. From Auxiliary Enterprises 8.1%
- **H**. From Endowment 0.1%

IV. Distinctive Features of the University

The main defining feature of The University of Georgia is the historic North Campus. With two lush quadrangles surrounded by majestic buildings and filled with stately old hardwood trees, North Campus has long been recognized as the heart of the campus, due to both its powerful history and grand beauty. The North Campus quadrangle is where the first University of Georgia building, a simple log structure, was located in 1785. The boundary for the city of Athens was literally drawn by placing a compass on the Chapel of the University, located on North Campus, and drawing a radius around it. In juxtaposition to historic North campus is the contemporary East Campus, which is also very distinctive of The University of Georgia. In comparison, East Campus is a mere infant, with all but two of its buildings being less than four years old. East Campus, with the Ramsey Student Center, Georgia Museum of Art, and Performing Arts Center, has proven itself to be an active and vital addition to not only The University, but the surrounding community as well.

V. Research or Other Affiliations

The University of Georgia through it's research foundation conducts research that is sponsored by federal and state governments, corporations, foundations and associations (public and private), international governments and their affiliates. Additionally, some sponsored funding routes through other collaborating colleges and universities. This funding totals in excess of \$200 million each year.



The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	December 10, 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Institutional Mission and Strategic Plan, Section II.A
From	Ayers/Saint/Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The following are the highlights of the current University of Georgia Mission Statement and Strategic Plan, 1995 - 2000.

1. THE MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

The University of Georgia is a land and sea-grant university as well as the state's flagship institution of higher education. The following are its stated core characteristics:

1.1 Integration of Three Missions

The integration of teaching, research, and service is a defining characteristic of the university as a land and sea-grant institution.

1.2 Commitment to Undergraduate Learning

The university has increased the presence of senior faculty in the classroom and intends to deepen its commitment to undergraduate students by creating a better learning environment

1.3 Pursuit of Scholarship

The University embraces a broad array of scholarly inquiry in the form of research and creative works in most fields of advanced studies.

1.4 Call to Service

Throughout its history, the university has brought its expertise to bear on a host of public service programs affecting Georgians in every county.

1.5 Balancing Act on Enrollment

To cope with the escalating demand, the university has correspondingly raised admissions standards in order to maintain a balance between enrollment growth and the quality of the learning environment.

1.6 A Culture of Quality

With the state's support, the university aspires not only to maintain but also to improve the quality of its faculty and staff by raising salaries to region-leading levels.
1.7 Advocate for the Environment

The university has established environmental literacy and stewardship as an institutional priority.

1.8 Partnership with Industry and Peers

State-supported schools everywhere are being called upon to improve their efficiency and accountability - to make the most of their budgets. One of the best ways to accomplish this is through cooperative agreements with other University System institutions and with private industry.

1.9 Contributions to Georgia's Development

In fulfilling its mission of instruction, research, and public service, the university is actively involved in the economic, social, and cultural development of the state.

1.10 Cultural Diversity

University initiatives promoting cultural diversity serve to enrich the academic environment and build respect for cultural differences.

1.11 A Global View

Through technological innovation and economic interdependence, the university is compelled to extend its mission to international programs and development projects.

2. STRATEGIC PLAN

The development of a strategic plan requires selecting areas of emphasis for near-term planning rather than recounting institutional strengths. The following are the plans stated themes and objectives:

2.1 Theme 1

The university will strengthen its land-grant and sea-grant commitment to scholarly inquiry and its application by providing support where it will be most valuable and by seeking new external funding opportunities.

2.2 Theme 2

The university will provide curricula, degree requirements, and instructional methods that respond to student's educational objectives and reflect its land-grant and sea-grant mission.

2.3 Theme 3

The university will foster cultural diversity in its student body, faculty, and staff as well as sensitivity to cultural diversity in its programs, policies, and procedures.

2.4 Theme 4

The university will broaden the international perspective of its teaching, research, service, and co-curricular programs.

The university will expand its commitment to environmental programs and stewardship.

2.6 Theme 6

The university will take advantage of new technologies to improve the quality and research of its academic, research, and service programs.

Date	January 16,1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Principles for the Physical Plan (Section II.B)
From	Ayers/Saint/Gross
То	University of Georgia
Architects and Campus Dianners	These principles are the result of over 200 meetings with 2300 people in an attempt to encapsulate the collective vision that the UGA Community has for their physical plan.

Architects and Campus Planners
Ayers/Saint/Gross

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

1 CREATE THE OPTIMAL STUDENT ENVIRONMENT

The physical plan should support the mission of the university by creating the optimal student learning environment. This plan should support an increase in the quality of the undergraduate experience while encouraging a traditional living/learning environment on campus.

2 EXTEND THE CHARACTERISTICS OF NORTH CAMPUS

The University of Georgia should hold North Campus sacred - both the physical place and its inherent planning principles or characteristics. Those principles should inform the enhancement of South and East Campus as well as the future development of any areas beyond by connecting and linking the campus together.

3 DEVELOP A CONNECTED CAMPUS

The campus open space network should create a broad sense of collegiality, increased safety, and a strong walking environment. This open space system should be memorable and easy to navigate with an ordered pattern of landmarks placed within a straightforward network of routes. The plan should strengthen existing open spaces and provide for new spaces through the placement of future facilities.

4 DEFINE AND PROVIDE FOR THE CURRENT AND FUTURE FACILITY NEEDS

The physical needs of university programs should be assessed against their current size as well as projected needs to allow for anticipated future growth. The facilities assigned to each program should have the best possible fit of both campus location and building/space requirements.

5 PROVIDE FOR ACADEMIC AND STUDENT NEEDS ON CONTIGUOUS LAND

A rich blend of elements create both a traditional undergraduate college and a modern research university – campus buildings, open space, paths, roads, service access, transportation, parking, as well as the surrounding community. The blending and overall balance of these elements is a critical determinant of the physical excellence of a campus. A policy of renovation, addition, and appropriately placed infill projects within the existing main campus land holdings will further enrich campus life.

6 DEVELOP COMPREHENSIVE SOLUTIONS TO TRAFFIC, PARKING, AND INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUES

Parking, transportation, and infrastructure must be integrally related to every other issue associated with this plan. A circulation and utilities network should be created that provides for safe and efficient campus transit and services in coordination with regional systems.

7 PARTICIPATE IN REGIONAL COORDINATION

The campus plan will be strengthened if efforts are made to ensure that it is complimentary to the Athens/Clarke County comprehensive plan. A policy of long term regional coordination should be implemented.

8 PREPARE FOR SUSTAINED IMPLEMENTATION

One true measure of the success of a comprehensive plan is the extent to which it is skillfully implemented over time. Policies should be created and reinforced to ensure the effective implementation or policing of the plan.

Date	February 18, 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Administrative Confirmation by the Cross Team of the Board of Regents (Section II C)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia
	This technical memorandum is to serve as a cover for the meeting minutes to follow.

Architects and Campus Planners

Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture

Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The objective of this meeting was for the staff of the University System of Georgia Board of Regents to confirm their understanding of the University's goals for the physical master plan in relation to the Institutional Mission Statement and Strategic Plan. In addition, the staff of the University System of Georgia Board of Regents was given this opportunity to relate issues of physical planning to issues of academic planning.



Architects and Planners 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 Phone 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519 Email Info@ASG-Architects.com

Meeting Report

PROJECT NAME:	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan				
PROJECT NUMBER:	Ayers/Saint/Gross No. 9740				
MEETING DATE:	February 18, 1998				
SUBJECT:	Regents Cross Team Meeting #1				
ATTENDEES:	Mark Demyanek, J. Hollis Dorsey, Jr., John Wolfe, Jr., Jean Bronaugh Wright, John Orr, John Stockbridge, Tom Bowen, Bob Bugbee, Ryan Nesbit, Danny Sniff, Adam Gross, Luanne Greene.	Board of Regents Director of Environmental Affairs Board of Regents Program Manager Board of Regents Assoc. Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs Board of Regents Program Manager Athens Clarke County Planning Department Athens Clarke County Planning Department UGA Assist. Vice President, Academic Affairs UGA Assoc. Vice President, Budget Division UGA Assistant Director of University Architects UGA Director of University Architects Ayers/Saint/Gross Avers/Saint/Gross			
	Suzanne Holden,	Ayers/Saint/Gross			

DISCUSSION:

- 1. The Space Planning Analysis component of the Master Plan should be heavily noted to explain specific deviations from the national space standards. It is anticipated that some modifications will be made to reflect the age, inefficiency, and poor conditions of many UGA buildings.
- 2. The Master Plan will have building sites indicated but not necessarily assigned to a particular use or program.
- 3. Very large buildings will have a greater magnitude of maintenance and programming issues as they age. When a huge building becomes obsolete for its original use, there is a huge problem of renovation and reuse. Smaller buildings are more conducive to the traditional university cycle of renovation and change to a lower intensity use.
- 4. The Regents do not want the building of dorms by UGA to be viewed as a limitation to private development by the local community. There are now precedents for privatizing the development of dorms; however there is then a loss of the academic leadership and social nurturing that the university's Student Services can provide.



MEETING REPORT 2/18/98 PAGE 2

5. The Planning Principles need to more strongly address environmental stewardship. There are likely to be more restrictive changes to the current storm water regulations that the University follows that will have an impact on future infrastructure and building projects.

Respectfully submitted,

AYERS/SAINT/GROSS, INC.

Luanne Goodson Greene, AIA Senior Associate

Copies to: All Attendees



Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Campus Conditions Introduction (Section III)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia
	The objective of this section is to record the conditions and characteristics of the existing
Architecte and Compus Planners	Main Campus.

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The University of Georgia as a mature institution has distinct characteristics that form its identity. This unique identity that separates this University from other institutions is comprised of not only the academic but also the physical characteristics of the campus.

The academic climate of a University can be supported and complemented by the physical condition of its campus. Because of the uniqueness of the University of Georgia, there are certain needs that the physical master plan will have to identify in order to address. For the planning team to develop a clear understanding of the needs of the University, it is necessary for a complete inventory of existing conditions to be taken and recorded. This section of the Template records the observations of the Existing Campus Conditions Inventory of Main Campus. This section includes information that falls into three categories: the campus grounds, campus infrastructure and community setting.



Not to Scale August 18, 1997



UGA Property



The contiguous property area northwest of SR10 that is outlined in red is considered in this document as Main Campus UGA Master Periphery Property Map (area contained within Athens/Clarke County)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Elevations (figure III A 1.1a)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia
	The purpose of this technical memorandum is to discuss the existing topographical

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan

1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The purpose of this technical memorandum is to discuss the existing topographical elevations on the University of Georgia campus.

Analysis of topographic conditions, specifically relative elevations, demonstrates the general character of the land and provides useful information for planning efforts. Elevations and slopes directly impact how and where development occurs.

1. TOPOGRAPHIC HIGH POINTS AND LOW POINTS

1.1 Elevations above 750'

The main campus of University of Georgia has only a small portion of land at an elevation of greater than 750', this high point is confined to the quadrangle portion of the North Campus. This part of the campus is near the same elevation as the highest portions of the city of Athens.

1.2 Elevations between 750' and 600'

The majority of the main campus of University of Georgia lies between the elevations of 750' and 600'. Over fifty percent of Central Campus lies at elevations between 600' and 650'. There is a ridge, with elevations between 700' and 750', that runs between the athletic complex on the east side of Lumpkin Street (including the Butts-Mehre building) and the Chemistry building near Connor Hall. This ridge elevation and elevations between 650' and 700' make up the majority of South and West Campus.

1.3 Elevations below 600'

The only portions of the main campus of University of Georgia that are below 600' are adjacent to the North Oconee River in a valley within the East Campus. This lowest area remains undeveloped and in fact separates the existing developed portions of East Campus into two distinct regions.





Existing Elevations

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III A1.1a

Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Landforms, Views and Landmarks (figure III A 1.1b)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The purpose of this technical memorandum is to describe the general character of the terrain on the University of Georgia campus and to discuss the significant views and landmarks that are part of the campus landscape.

Analysis of landforms demonstrates the general character of the land and provides useful information for planning efforts pertaining to viewpoints, major view corridors and the overall structure of campus development.

1. LANDFORMS

1.1. Landforms - landbays, ridges and high points

The defining landform of the University of Georgia can be best described as rolling terrain. The terrain is a characteristic of the piedmont landscape in northeast Georgia and adds to the region's and the campus' aesthetic appeal and identity. For those walking the campus, the varied terrain is most noticeable.

Both North and South Campus are situated at an elevation of approximately 725'. Separating the two main bodies of the campus is Central Campus, which lies in the valley created by Tanyard Creek, at an elevation of approximately 625'. The physical landform separation defined by Tanyard Creek has significantly impacted the historical development of the campus and the north – south circulation opportunities. The primary circulation link between North and South Campus is Sanford Drive Bridge which crosses over Tanyard Creek.

The new East Campus development area has a significant elevation change between the two primary areas of growth. An undeveloped natural ravine separates the two East Campus components.

Two significant ridges define the high points of the campus. The highest of these two ridges is centered on the North Campus quadrangle. This ridge includes the oldest, most historic portions of the campus and the core of downtown Athens. The second highest ridge extends from a high point off campus, through the athletic complex on the east side of Lumpkin Street (including the Butts-Mehre building) and past the Chemistry building near Conner Hall.

1. VIEWS AND VISTAS

The most significant views on the University of Georgia campus range in size and content. Some memorable views are of individual buildings, such as Sanford Stadium or small groups of buildings and the space around them, such as the Myers quadrangle. Medium distance, on-campus views exist generally between North and South Campus and specifically from the hill near Park Hall towards the Sanford Drive bridge. Medium distance views also exist from the Arts Center complex on East Campus looking towards the natural ravine that divides East Campus. The most notable long distance view from the University of Georgia campus is the view looking southeast from a spot between the Main Library and Peabody Hall towards the distant piedmont ridges.

2. LANDMARKS

Landmarks are used as navigational tools and therefore tend to be large and or unique and easily described or recognized. Landmarks exist in two forms on the University of Georgia campus. The first type, large, unique buildings, includes Sanford Stadium, the high-rise dormitories on Baxter Street, The Stegeman Coliseum, The Ramsey Center, and the Butts-Mehre Building. The best example of the second type of landmark is The Arch at the entrance to North Campus from Broad Street. Though not large, this symbol of the University is unique and, because of its location, easily described and identified.



Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Drainage (figure III A 1.1c)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE

Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

The purpose of this memorandum is to describe the limits of watersheds associated with the University of Georgia campus and to briefly discuss the surface waters present on the campus. Watershed management plays a key role in the quality of storm water runoff, especially in areas like the University with high concentrations of impervious surfaces.

1. WATERSHED BOUNDARIES

The main campus of University of Georgia is situated adjacent to the west side of the north fork of the Oconee River. Consequently, the campus lies at the lower edge of the watersheds that drain a large portion of the city of Athens. Because of the University's location relative to the city, storm water quality issues are a serious concern.

Observations about watersheds are based on general topographic maps. There is no verified, accurate mapping on this topic. The main campus appears to be, at this time, divided between four watersheds. The ridge of the easternmost watershed runs through the North Campus quadrangle to the quadrangle between Milledge Hall and Payne Hall and drains directly into the north fork of the Oconee River.

The western half of North Campus and the majority of Central Campus are part of the Tanyard Creek drainage basin. This watershed also collects water from the city from as far West as Milledge Avenue.

South Campus and the most recently developed portions of East Campus drain into an unnamed creek which flows between the Ramsey Student Physical Activities Center and the electrical substation. This watershed also collects water from the city from as far west as the Five Points intersection of Milledge Avenue, Lumpkin Street and Milledge Circle.

The remaining portions of South Campus, including the intramural fields and the Family Housing development, drain into the southern most watershed on the University of Georgia Campus. This watershed drains to Lake Herrick and its associated creeks. The basin, which extends west to a ridge near Milledge Terrace, also drains some residential areas of the city.

There is little or no detention of storm water from the city of Athens or the University itself. Therefore, storm water flowing into the campus streams, lakes, and the Oconee River carries with it typical non-point source pollutants.

2. RIVERS AND STREAMS

The North fork of the Oconee river forms a natural edge for the east side of the campus. There is very little University development fronting the river. However, proposed greenway trails will help bring the University community closer to the river.

There are four major streams that flow through the University of Georgia campus. With the exception of Tanyard Creek, the streams are unnamed. One stream has been dammed to create Lake Herrick and the others are piped for large portions of their overall length. Because the streams are often not visible, the polluted condition of the water is not noticed by many members of the University community. The high density of impervious surfaces on and surrounding the campus increase the frequency and amount of erosion and degradation of the campus rivers and streams. A project is under construction at this time to clean and stabilize the banks of Tanyard Creek within the campus boundaries.

3. LAKES AND PONDS

Lake Herrick, which is located near the intramural fields on South Campus, is a man made lake formed by a dam located near the Athens Perimeter (GA 10 Loop). This ± 18 acre lake and a nearby ± 1.5 acre pond are the only still surface waters on the main campus, and are used primarily for recreational purposes.





November 1997

Legend





Rivers and Streams





Existing Drainage

University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III A 1.1c



Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Vegetation (figure III A 1.1e)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia
	The purpose of this technical memorandum is to describe the overall patterns of existing

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates

899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The purpose of this technical memorandum is to describe the overall patterns of existing vegetation on the University of Georgia campus.

Vegetation helps to create an overall image of the campus. Some of the most memorable spaces on the campus, such as quadrangles, are heavily influenced by the mature trees in them that provide a sense of scale for the buildings and grounds.

1. DEVELOPED LANDSCAPES

Most of the area of the campus is comprised of developed landscapes. It includes both native and introduced species in formal and informal arrangements. The predominant look, especially in the older and more formal areas, is large shade trees and turf. The University of Georgia is graced with a variety of ornamental plantings that reflect the long history of skilled designers and plantsmen that have been associated with the University.

The majority of developed landscape areas consist of informal drifts of small groups of trees, shrubs and groundcovers linked by a network of turf grass. With a few exceptions, such as portions of the Founder's Garden and some of the older quadrangles, the campus lacks regimented, formal plantings.

The campus has a number of landscape designs that reflect a trend in landscape architecture towards the use of native plants and plant communities as a basis for design. These landscapes include: the recent development on East Campus, the landscape near the Life Sciences building, the water garden at the Ecology building, and several wildflower plantings along East Campus Road.

Due to it's history as an agricultural school and the inclusion of Landscape Architecture, Forestry, and Plant Sciences in the curriculum, the University of Georgia has a great variety of plant species on its campus.

2. UNDEVELOPED LANDSCAPES

2.1 Forests

2.1.1 Oconee Forest

The Oconee Forest, located between Lake Herrick and the Athens Perimeter, is the only large forest area within the main campus of the University of Georgia. This forest, which is over forty acres in size, is a mixed successional forest with some large trees. The canopy layer contains: oaks, hickory, tulip poplar, beech and pine; the understory is a mix of dogwood, shrubs and an herbaceous layer, typically on a leaf litter floor.

The Oconee Forest is used regularly for recreational purposes such as hiking and mountain biking as well as being a recreational area for dogs and their owners. Because of the heavy use, the trails in the forest are subject to erosion.

2.1.2 Whitehall Forest

Information on this section is forthcoming and will be updated accordingly.

2.1.3 Horseshoe Bend

Information on this section is forthcoming and will be updated accordingly.

2.2 Remnant Woodlands

Remnant woodland patches are an important part of the character of the developed portions of the campus. While the remnant woodlands do not provide a physical link to larger tracts of forestland, they serve as a reminder of the larger forests that once existed in the Athens area. Although they are relatively small, the remnant woodlands make an important contribution to the look and feel of the campus.

2.2.1 Driftmier

The small woodland located south of the Driftmier Engineering Center contains some large specimen trees and is frequently used by the Ecology and Horticulture departments for instructive purposes. There is student interest in forming a group to maintain the edges, monitor the encroachment of invasive plants, develop a signage program and maintain the trails in the woodland.

2.2.2 Lumpkin Woods

Lumpkin Woods is located between Sanford Drive and Lumpkin Street near the intersection of Cedar Street. It is a shady grove that provides a respite from the highly developed area that surrounds it. The woodland is transected by a number of paths and is used primarily as a pedestrian transportation route.

2.1.3 People's park

People's park is located between the parking area for the large dormitories on Baxter Street and Cloverhurst Drive. Passive recreation is the primary use in this small woodland.

2.3 Fields

A small portion of the main campus is held in fields. The fields are, for the most part, unmaintained (not kept as turf). The fields are on South Campus and exist primarily adjacent to the Athens Perimeter and in utility easements.





Legend

Continutous Forest Canopy

Isolated or Remnant Woodlands





Unmaintained Fields

Developed & Maintained Landscapes

Existing Vegetation

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III A1.1e

Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Edges and Entry Points (figure III A 1.2)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia
	The purpose of this memorandum is to describe the various types of edges and entry points

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

The purpose of this memorandum is to describe the various types of edges and entry points that influence the physical and social character of the University of Georgia.

Well defined and attractive boundaries help to create a cohesive campus community. The University of Georgia's boundaries consist of built, natural, and perceived edges. The political or property boundary is often not noticed at all.

The gateways and thresholds by which one enters onto the main campus are varied and often unclear.

1. EDGES

1.1 Built Edges

The Athens Perimeter on the southeast side of the main campus creates a strong, but not necessarily attractive edge to the campus. The majority of this noisy edge is adjacent to the Lake Herrick recreation area and does not greatly impede academic activities.

Other built edges include portions of Agriculture Drive and Baxter Street where well defined examples of on-campus housing sit opposite other residential quarters.

1.2 Natural Edge

The North Oconee River defines the eastern edge of the campus. The river edge provides a clear boundary and a green buffer between the campus and adjacent land.

1.3 Perceived Edges

Lumpkin Street between Broad Street and Pinecrest Drive is perceived as an edge to the campus although it is actually within the boundaries of the main campus. This perception is due to a contrast in the character and uses of the buildings on each side of the street. On the east side of Lumpkin there are a number of academic buildings and buildings used on a University-wide scale. On the west side of the street many of the buildings are related to Greek organizations or religious affiliations implying more of a private use.

The Norfolk Southern rail line that runs the entire length of the campus is a second perceived edge. There are several well-used crossings both over and under the line, and this coupled with recent development of the East campus has helped to dissolve the perception of the railroad as a barrier. There are safety concerns at the remaining "at grade" crossings.

1.3 Property Boundary

The actual property boundary of the main campus does little to help define the edges of the campus. The property boundary is often overlapped by the edge conditions mentioned above and in areas where no other edge condition exists, it is difficult to distinguish between the campus property and surrounding properties.

2. ENTRY POINTS

2.1 Major Gateway

The most significant gateway to the main campus is the Arch located opposite College Avenue at Broad Street. This historic symbol marks the entry point into the original portion of the campus from the heart of the city of Athens.

2.2 Minor Gateway

Recent development of the East campus has created a more modern, and somewhat less well defined gateway to the campus. On College Station Road, just east of the intersection at East Campus Road, a minor gateway exists near the new Visitors' Center.

2.3 Thresholds

Thresholds exist at numerous crossings where a visitor feels as if they have entered the university setting, though not necessarily via an official gateway. These thresholds can be street intersections or railroad crossings that bring one into any recognizable portion of the main campus.



Existing Edges & Entry Points



Date	December 7, 1997				
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan				
Subject	University of Georgia Land Holdings, Section III.A.2.4				
From	Ayers/Saint/Gross				
То	University of Georgia The following is a summary of the land holdings of the University of Georgia. A more detailed account of this information can be found in the 1997 University of Georgia Fact Book. Contact the Office of the University Architects for detailed documentation of property locations. *This calculation includes all the property within Athens/Clarke County. What is referred to as "Main Campus" in the remainder of this document includes the 633 contiguous acres Northwest of SR 10(Loop).				
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519					
Architecture and Engineering					
Heery International	Land Holdings	Acres	<u>Map Codes</u>		
999 Peachtree Street, NE	University of Georgia Main Campus*	1,289	1		
Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283	Botanical Garden	312	1, 4		
Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309	College Station	3,350	1, 2, 3, 4		
	Georgia Branch Stations	5,659	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16		
404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858	Georgia Station	1,291	5, 27		
Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering	Coastal Plain Station	5,868	11, 12, 13, 29		
1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797	Cooperative Extension Service	1,594	17, 18, 28, 30		
	School of Forest Resources	22,686	1, 4, 9, 10, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26		
Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508	Institute of Ecology	137	18		
Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272	Marine Resource Facility	694	22, 23		
Fax 303/832-3380	College of Veterinary Medicine	567	1, 2, 4, 11		
	TOTAL	43,447			

Source: 1996 University of Georgia Fact Book



Not to Scale 9/2/98

Numbered locations correspond to Land Holdings Listing in preceding Technical Memorandum

UGA Land Holdings Map (State)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan



Figure III A 2.4

Date	11/15/98				
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan				
Subject	Land Use Section III A 2 (UGA Facility Leases)				
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross				
To Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross	University of Georgia The following is a list that documents and describes the current lease agreements for the University of Georgia. This list was provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. Any questions about this information should be directed to that office.				
222 Saint Paul Place	Bldg No	. Building Name	Area	Lessor	Description
Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519	0004	Kress Building	6987	David H. Poer Co.	Legal Aid & Defender Society
Architecture and Engineering	0005	Franklin House	2280	Franklin House	Temporary office space for the History Dept & Center for Global Policies
999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta GA 30367	0009	College Square Building	820	Pease / Myers	Office Space for Rutland Center
404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283	0013	Saye Building	750	McClure & Griffin Enterprises, LLC	Family Violence Clinic for the School of Law
Landscape Architecture	0019	B&L Warehouse	5900	Troy Porterfield Sr.	Housing Department warehousing space
Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309	0019	B&L Warehouse	5000	Troy Porterfield Sr.	Storage of instructional equipment, awaiting renovations of AAVIM warehouse
Fax 404/876-6858	0019	B&L Warehouse	6600	Troy Porterfield Sr.	Art Department Storage
Traffic Engineering	0113	382 East Broad Street	10658	Robert Pease, III	Office of the University Architect
LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220	0140	Akers Learning Center	4000	Lynn R. Akers	Educational Opportunity Center
Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797	2017	Fairfax Hall	15392	Lois Felder, Richard Marbut James Bernstein	College of Education Test Score and Reporting Services Program
Academic Programming	2022	UGA Foundation Building	13200	UGA Foundation	Office space for Development Staff
Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380	2027	NEGAPA	10000	John H. Barrett Construction Co.	Space for the NE Georgia Policy Academy
	2028	AG Edwards Building	1630	South Millege Holdings	Developmental Staff Offices
	2031	Oakbrook B-100	9422	Galis-Vandiver Development Corporation, Inc.	University Press
	2032	Oglesby Megdal	3000	Oglesby & Oglesby	Storage for University Press

	Warehouse			
2034	Oconee Timber Lgm	1271	Oconee Timber, Inc	College of Family and
				Consumer Sciences
2035	UGA Federal Credit	1000	University	University Employee's
	Union		Employee's Federal	Federal Credit Union
			Credit Union	
2036	Family Support Center	1000	Craig Stansberry,	School of Social Work
	GRN		dba Athens-Clarke	
			County Affordable	
20.40		2500	Housing	
2848	Oso Coop Extri Scsp	2500	City of Lithonia, c/o	Cooperative Extension
			Marcia Glenn	Service Car Seat Program
7002	Pog EO Prunguviak	075	Mid America	Business Outreach Services
7002	BOS FO Bruilswick	623	Apartment	Business Outreach Services
			Communities	
7005	Bos FO Gainesville	3576	Church Street	Business Outreach Services
1005	Dos i o Guinesvine	5570	Properties, Richard	Dusiness Guilduch Bervices
			Hunt. President	
7007	Bos FO Macon	1700	Land South	Business Outreach Services
			Investments	
7011	SBDC FO Warner Robins	500	The Warner Robins	Business Outreach Services
			Development	
			Authority	
7051	Bos FO Albany	1950	City of Albany	Office of the Small Business
			Business and	Development Center
			Technology Center	
7053	Bos FO Norcross	1497	Economic	Business Outreach Services
			Development	
			Institute of the	
			Georgia Institute of	
			Technology	
7054	Bos FO Augusta	1704	Pakmerica, LLC	Business Outreach Services
7057	Marine Extension	220	Constantin	Marine Extension Service
	Peachtree		Soulakos	
7058	Bos FO Columbus	2882	George Jeter	Business Outreach Services
7059	Bos FO Savannah	939	Small Business	Business Outreach Services
0020	Delter State Cellere	420	Assistance Corp.	Descinante October els Compiones
8028	Dalton State College	432	Economic	Business Outreach Services
			Institute of the	
			Georgia Institute of	
			Technology	
80/10	Gwinnett Ctr-I wrnc	*	Gwinnett	School of Social Work
00-10	Swinnett Cu Dwine		Industries. Inc	Sentor of Boelar WOIK
8070	Medical College of	6889	Medical College of	Office space for the College
0070	Georgia	0007	Georgia	of Pharmacy to house
				faculty and staff who are
				involved in professional and
				research programs at the
				Medical College of Georgia
8165	Cortona, Italy	210	Cassa Di Risparmio	Studies Abroad Program
	-	square	Di Firenze SpA	-

		meters		
8500	Oakbrook Corporate Campus	1600	Charles Armentrout & David Roebuck	School of Social Work
	Parking Lot	2 acres	Belt Line Bulge Corporation	Auxiliary Services Parking Lot
	Parking Lot	0.7 acres	Troy Porterfield Sr.	Auxiliary Services Parking Lot
	Land	72 acres	Janie E. Harris, Sarah E. Almond and John W Etheredge	College of Agriculture crop research
	Land	35 acres	Carter Farms, Inc.	College of Agriculture fertility and insecticide trials
	Land	75 acres	Mrs. Grady Smith	College of Agriculture crop research
	Land	24 acres	Clyde C. & Helen S. Dowler	College of Agriculture crop research
	Camp	6.4 acres	Jekyll Island State Park Authority	Cooperative Extension Service 4-H Camp
	Land	25 acres	Roy A. Bottoms Sr.	College of Agriculture & Environmental Sciences
	Parking Lot	1.9 acres	Lumpkin Square, Ltd	Auxiliary Services parking lot

* Area is not shown because it is controlled by GA Perimeter College.



Not to Scale August 18, 1997



UGA Property



The contiguous property area northwest of SR10 that is outlined in red is considered in this document as Main Campus UGA Master Periphery Property Map (area contained within Athens/Clarke County)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Date	9/11/98			
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan			
Subject	Existing Building Use and Condition (Section III A)			
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross			
То	University of Georgia			
	Full documentation of existing campus building conditions is recorded in the University of			

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 Full documentation of existing campus building conditions is recorded in the University of Georgia's FY 1997 Building Condition Evaluation that is included in the appendix. The total building areas and assignable square feet for each building is represented in the report submitted by Paulien Associates in Section IV.

1. BUILDING USE

In the beginnings of the University, one building provided the library, classroom space, dining, and housing. UGA has grown into a campus of over 200 buildings. Now entire buildings are constructed to house one specialized discipline. Figure III A 2 is a diagram of the existing building uses. This diagram shows how the natural adjacencies of compatible programs and buildings have occurred in different areas, but this network has remained loose without the development of formally defined districts.

As facility needs of the University change, the natural cycle of obsolescence of buildings does not. Disciplines change so that buildings no longer suit the activities that go on in them. Countless factors are involved in the obsolescence of campus facilities including technological, economical and sociological changes. This cycle has proved to be very costly for most universities and colleges, and it should be expected to continue. There will not only be a constant need for new facilities, but also for the restoration and substantial renovation of older buildings. For mature institutions like UGA, the restoration and renovation of older buildings is a major concern. While the University's replacement value of buildings is about 26% of Georgia's University System total, UGA maintains 64% of the System's buildings which are over 50 years or older (see Figures III A 3.6 - 3.6.1). With age factored into the formula, UGA's needs represent 33% of the system total as calculated by the Regent's formula.

Included in the appendix are the University of Georgia's FY 1997 Building Condition Evaluation and a summary of the estimated building correction costs. This deficiency has been translated into a concept of usable space (see Figure III A 4). Of the existing 3,600,088 assigned academic and administrative square feet of space on the main campus, the average building deficiency has been calculated as 23.5%. The application of that deficiency factor results in only 2,753,491 assigned square feet of space that is in acceptable condition and 846,597 assignable square feet of space that is in need of substantial renovation.

Over time, the continued patchwork and retrofitting of an old building for a new use may prove more costly than the construction of a new facility. The price tag for neglecting the renewal of campus infrastructure increases every year. Current policies associated with MRR (Major Repair and Renovation) funding do not allow for the process of renovating older buildings to work as efficiently as possible.

2. ADAPTIVE REUSE

The University of Georgia has a valuable resource of historic structures and landscape features. These attractive structures reflect the history of the University and should be treated in a respectful and sensitive manner. There have been some excellent examples of successful adaptive reuse in Four Towers, Reed Hall, Terrell Hall and Demosthenian Hall.

Over the years there have also been some unfortunate interior and exterior renovations and additions that have destroyed many of the endearing and beautiful original characteristics of these structures. Examples of this can be seen in the Conner Hall and Memorial Hall renovations, and the loss of the South Campus amphitheater. The tragic placement of Boyd Graduate Studies destroyed the amphitheater – the strongest site element on South Campus.

These unfortunate events stress the importance of the utmost care being given to all building renovations, planning and building placement. Important historic structures and landscape features have been identified in the Section III C 2.3 Existing Conditions portion of the Template. Before future renovations occur, care should be taken to thoroughly research the architectural character to ensure the original design intent and integrity of the structure is maintained.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA – ATHENS BUILDING CONDITION ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE TOTALS

BASE YEAR 1996

	Existing			Sq.Ft.
	Assigned		Acceptable	In Need of
	Square	Building	Assigned	Renovation or
SPACE TYPE	Feet	Deficiency	Square Ft.	Replacement
ACADEMIC UNITS				
College of Agriculture	585,745	26.5%	430,366	155,379
College of Arts and Sciences	1,074,827	25.3%	802,706	272,121
College of Business	75,421	15.7%	63,547	11,874
Developmental Studies	13,093	0.0%	13,093	0
College of Education	196,600	16.2%	164,710	31,890
School of Environmental Design	34,443	30.0%	24,117	10,326
College of Family and Cons. Sciences	83,959	27.2%	61,131	22,828
School of Forest Resources	64,883	15.9%	54,577	10,306
College of Journalism and Mass. Comm.	39,612	21.0%	31,287	8,325
School of Law	96,634	5.8%	91,031	5,603
Military Science	16,659	52.3%	7,954	8,705
College of Pharmacy	65,087	34.9%	42,404	22,683
School of Social Work	22,058	50.3%	10,972	11,086
College of Veterinary Medicine	313,305	24.9%	235,348	77,957
Vice Pres. for Academic Affairs	176,220	25.8%	130,820	45,400
Vice Pres. for Research	127,732	19.3%	103,095	24,637
Academic Space Subtotal	2,986,278	24.1%	2,267,158	719,120
Administrative Units				
President	50 779	12.2%	44 587	6 192
Vice Pres for Business and Finance	203 111	23.9%	154 477	48 634
Vice Pres, for Development and Univ. Rel.	14.352	29.2%	10.167	4,185
Vice Pres for Legal Affairs	1 490	53.0%	701	789
Vice Pres. for Service	155.687	16.7%	129.695	25,992
Vice Pres, for Student Affairs	188,391	22.1%	146.706	41.685
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	613 810	20.8%	486 333	127 477
	015,010	20.070	100,000	127,777
TOTAL ACAD. AND ADMIN. SPACE	3,600,088	23.5%	2,753,491	846,597



Not To Scale 8/18/98

Legend

- Administration
- Instruction
- Research / Outreach
- Housing / Student Services
- Service / Operations Support
- Transportation / Parking
- Recreation / Leisure / Performance
- Natural

Existing Campus Conditions Land Use (Main Campus)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III A 2 1





Existing Building Use

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III A 2


Chicopee 000 00 0.0000 90 -05 Door 17 000 Lucy Cobb Institute 1 2 --10 Family Housing



Not to Scale 8/25/98



Built Before 1949



Built Between1949 and1973

Built After 1973

Building Age Study (Main Campus)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III A 3.6



Not to Scale 8/26/98

Legend



Less Than 35% Deficiency

Building Deficiency Study Main Campus

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

More Than 35% Deficiency

Figure III A 3.6.1

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Open Space (figure III A 4.1)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia
	The purpose of this technical memorandum is to describe the various types of open space

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The purpose of this technical memorandum is to describe the various types of open space that exist on the University of Georgia campus.

The character and size of open space on the main campus varies greatly with its use. To some extent the quality of space, especially formal space, varies with regard to its similarity to the North Campus quadrangle.

1. OPEN SPACE

1.1 Natural Space

The only large tract of natural, undeveloped space is the Oconee Forest south of Lake Herrick. The tract includes a wooded area with ponds, a stream and an open field that is maintained only at a minimum level. The area provides habitat for plants and animals, especially those adapted to edge conditions. The natural area affords recreation space for a variety of individual activities.

Other natural spaces include a very thin strip of land adjacent to the North Oconee River and several small remnant woodlands within the interior of the campus.

1.2 Recreational Space

The primary location for organized recreation on the main campus is the intramural fields situated north and west of Lake Herrick. The fields are heavily used for a wide variety of active and passive sports. Other recreational opportunities are provided at basketball, tennis and volleyball courts scattered throughout the campus. Legion Pool and Legion Field are located adjacent to Lumpkin Street and provide seasonal recreation opportunities and a venue for special functions such as concerts.

The remaining recreation areas are primarily related to highly organized intercollegiate sports such as football, basketball, baseball, tennis and track.

1.3 Formal Space

Formal space, defined as structured spaces planned for and created primarily by the construction of buildings, exists in its best form on the North Campus. The oldest spaces, the quadrangles in front of the Main Library and between Old College and Broad Street,

are high quality spaces. Quality is achieved through their basic organization that forms green pedestrian areas enclosed by relatively small-scale buildings with similar character. Circulation is well defined by a network of sidewalks with direct paths of travel taken into consideration. The proportion of the buildings to green space is crucial to the success of a formal space and the North campus demonstrates the notion fully.

Additional formal spaces, though none as successful as the North quadrangles, are located throughout the main campus. These spaces include the area between Moore College and Broad street, the quadrangle behind Memorial Hall, the Child Development Complex on South Campus, the Myers quadrangle, and the area between the Physics and Geography buildings.

The Founders' Garden is also a formal open space. The general character is of a very passive, reflective nature. Vegetation rather than buildings provides the primary spatial structure.

1.4 Informal Space

Informal space within the main campus is more difficult to discern than formal open space. Numerous informal gathering spaces, or spaces viewed as left over space after the construction of streets and buildings, exist throughout the campus. Some examples of this type of space are: Herty Mall near the Law School, the area north of Baldwin Street between Park Hall and the Main Library, the space adjacent to Baxter Street between Brumby and Russell Residence Halls, the gathering area in front of the Creamery on South Campus, the plaza adjacent to the Ramsey Center, and the Performing and Visual Arts Center plaza.

1.5 Memorable Space

Memorable spaces are those which reflect the tradition of the institution and create lasting impressions of the University. Like many campuses, the University of Georgia's historic spaces tend to be the most memorable. The North Campus quadrangle, with the icon of The Arch, scale of space and historic structures, epitomizes the image of a memorable space. The Founders Garden on North Campus that is traditionally used by the Garden Club of Georgia, is also a memorable space.

Sanford Stadium is a uniquely memorable visual open space in what could be defined as the perceived center of campus. Sanford Bridge, with its strategic elevation, allows for unimpeded views into the stadium, the football field and the famed 'Hedges'.

Though more recently developed, the Ecology Garden on South Campus defines a memorable space and reflects elements of scale, texture and form compatible to the traditional spaces.



Not to Scale November 1997

Legend







Informal Space



Memorable Space

Cemetery

Existing Open Space

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III A4.1

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Pedestrian Circulation (figure III A 4.2)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
To Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place	University of Georgia The purpose of this technical memorandum is to describe the patterns of pedestrian circulation that exist on the University of Georgia campus. Walking is one of the most desirable defining characteristics of the collegiate experience.
Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519	connections that are clearly structured, richly textured, and pedestrian oriented.
Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880	Compact campus plans allow for walking distances that relate to class change duration. Clear structure is provided by a strong hierarchy of pathways and an appropriate relationship to landmarks that allows a pedestrian to understand how to navigate the landscape.
Fax 404/875-1283 Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309	Rich texture is provided by the presence of multiple routes and intermediate goals. Intermediate goals relate to the idea that any trip is made up of a series of shorter destinations punctuated by large and small landmarks. Multiple routes are based on the idea that one measure of the richness of an environment is the number of routes one has available to reach a destination.
404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858 <i>Traffic Engineering</i> LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797	The University of Georgia campus has developed in a very linear fashion, north to south. Dimensionally the north - south boundaries are approximately 1.5 miles in length and the east - west boundaries are approximately .33 miles in length. Because of the length of the campus and other clear geographic divisions, the University is commonly divided into three districts: North, South, and East Campus. For the purposes of this discussion, five more detailed districts will be used: North, Central, South, East, and West. Pedestrian circulation is best discussed in the context of these discreet units and then related to the total campus system.
Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272	1. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION - CAMPUS DISTRICTS 1.1 North Campus
I an jujioj2-jjou	North Campus is compact and well connected. A richly textured experience provides

North Campus is compact and well connected. A richly textured experience provides access to many academic and administrative buildings and to the heart of the downtown Athens retail/restaurant district, located near Broad Street and College Avenue. The scale

and character of buildings, style of site furnishings, and the mature, well maintained landscape all enhance the pedestrian experience on North campus.

1.2 Central Campus

From a pedestrian perspective, Central Campus functions primarily as a link between North and South Campus. Once a pedestrian leaves the main streets, Central Campus has a somewhat confusing network of sidewalks and an undisciplined arrangement of buildings.

1.3 South Campus

South Campus is compact, but not well connected. Many of the science oriented disciplines are located in close proximity to each other, but pedestrian texture is limited by the relatively few choices of routes offered to a visitor and the somewhat disorienting layout of streets and buildings, and the general lack of landmarks. The scale and character of some of the buildings on South Campus do not lend themselves to a rich pedestrian experience.

1.4 East Campus

East Campus in neither compact nor well connected. The buildings' relationships to each other and the pathways around them are disorienting. The proximity of the development to large commuter parking areas with major vehicular circulation routes, the scale of the buildings, and the sparse landscape detract from the pedestrian experience.

1.5 West Campus

West Campus, which is primarily a residential area, has very direct links to the other portions of the campus but lacks a rich texture. The scale of buildings and open space do not provide a memorable pedestrian experience.

In general, the North, South and East campuses act as the discrete units within the Main campus of the University of Georgia. Some flow occurs between North and South Campus, via Central Campus, during the class change duration, but the East Campus is isolated from the rest of the University pedestrian experience.



gia	Т	е	С	h	n	i	С	а		Μ	е	m	0	r	а	n	d	u	m	
-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

Date	December 10, 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	III.A.5 Vehicular Circulation and Parking
From	LRE Engineering, Inc.
То	University of Georgia
	The purpose of this memorandum is to describe

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202

410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering

1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The purpose of this memorandum is to describe existing vehicular circulation routes onand off-campus, classify existing campus roadways, describe public transit services and to provide an inventory of existing on- and off-campus parking facilities. The information contained in this memorandum is based on discussions with staff from the University of Georgia and Athens/Clark County, as well as a review of various documents provided by the University which include the University's 1996-1997 Riders Guide for the Campus Transit System, the 1993 Parking and Transit Study and 1994 Parking Study Update prepared for the University of Georgia by Walker Parking Consultants / Engineers Inc., and the 1997-98 Campus Parking Map and Regulations.

1. CIRCULATION

1.1 Circulation Routes Off-Campus

The University of Georgia and the City of Athens are served by several major roadway facilities. As shown in Figure III.A.5.1, the City of Athens is encircled by the South Athens Perimeter Highway also know as US 78 and SR 10 Loop. This road is a four lane limited access highway and carries an average daily traffic (ADT) volume of 31,101 vehicles per day as recorded by the Georgia Department of Transportation in 1996. Other major regional roadways that serve the City of Athens and the University of Georgia campus include US 78 business, (also known as SR 10) which is a major east/west arterial road ; SR 15 which is a major north/south arterial that borders the western edge of the campus and US 441 which is a north/south arterial. For the most part, Business 78 is a four lane divided highway with recorded ADT's in the range of 28,000 vehicles per day. These major roadway facilities provide good regional access for the University of Georgia campus.

1.2 On-Campus Route

Major gateways to the University of Georgia campus include the interchange of SR 10 Loop and College Station Road, Lumpkin Street as it enters the campus from Broad Street and Thomas Street / East Campus Road which is a north/south roadway bordering the east side of the Campus. As shown in Figure III.A.5.2, many of the internal roadways on the Campus are owned by the University. Also shown in this figure is a functional classification of existing roadways as either urban principal arterial, urban minor arterial, urban collector, or urban local. In some cases, such as the East Campus Road, roadways will have dual functionality operating as both an arterial and as a collector. In those situations, the roadways have been classified in Figure III.A.5.2 as the highest classification.

1.3 Bike Trails

With the exception of the bike route shown in figure III.A.5.1 there are no bike lanes on the UGA street system.

2. PUBLIC TRANSIT

2.1 Campus Transit System

The University of Georgia's campus transit system is second only to Atlanta's Marta system in the number of passengers carried per year in the state of Georgia. The campus transit system operates eight daily routes which are:

- Russell Hall Route
- East / West Route
- North / South Route
- Milledge Avenue Route
- Orbit Route
- South Campus Loop Route
- Family Housing Route
- East Campus Express

In addition to the these eight daily routes, three night routes are run by the bus system. They are:

- Family Housing Route
- South Campus Loop Night Route
- Russell Night Route

The campus transit system operates 35 buses on its eight daytime routes and 5 buses on its three nighttime routes and travels on average 2,600 daily route miles. The capacity of the system is 19 riders per route mile with an average daily ridership of 42,623 passengers. The hours of operation of the campus transit system are between 7:00 a.m. and 1:00 a.m. with peak hours of service being between 8:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m.

Listed in Table 1 below is the frequency with which buses depart for each route. During peak ridership times of the day, headways are less between buses. These routes are depicted graphically in figures III.A.5.2a through III.A.5.2.h.

Route	Bus Departures	Frequency
Russell Hall	7:00 a.m 8:30 a.m.	10 min.
	8:30 a.m 4:00 p.m.	5 min.
	4:00 p.m 6:00 p.m.	10 min.
	6:00 p.m 12:40 p.m.	20 min.
East / West	7:05 a.m 8:25 p.m.	10 min.
	8:25 p.m 4:05 p.m.	5 min.
	4:05 p.m 6:05 p.m.	10 min.
North / South	7.00 a m - 4.00 p m	4 min
	4:00 p.m 6:12 p.m.	8 min
	4.00 p.m. 0.12 p.m.	0 11111
Milledge Avenue	7:00 a.m 8:12 a.m.	12 min.
	8:30 a.m 4:36 p.m.	6 min.
	4:36 p.m 6:20 p.m.	12 min.
Orbit	7.00 a m - 8.30 a m	10 min
C.S.C	8:30 a m - 4:00 n m	5 min
	4:00 p m - 6:00 p m	10 min
	4.00 p.m 0.00 p.m.	ro min.
South Campus Loop	7:15 a.m 6:05 p.m.	10 min
	6:12 p.m 11:36 p.m.	20 min.
Family Housing	7:10 a m - 12:25 p m	12 min
ranny nousing	7.10 a.m. 12.20 p.m.	12 11111.
East Campus Express	8:39 a.m 3:45 p.m.	6 min.

Table 1: Route Descriptions

The University of Georgia has an agreement with Athens/Clarke County government which allows students to ride Athens Transit buses fare-free.





Street Classifications

University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III.A.5.2





Drawing Not to Scale

Legend

December 1997

Bus Stop Commuter Parking Lot East/West Route

University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III.A.5.2.b

















3.0 PARKING

3.1 Existing Parking Supply

Shown in Figure III.A.5.3 is the assignment of the existing parking, based on classification, for the main campus. Currently the University provides a total of 17,303 parking spaces in the various parking areas as shown in Figure III.A.5.3. Also shown are the four parking regions - north, central, south and east which are used by the University to describe each of the various parking areas on the main campus. Shown in Table 2 below is the parking on Campus by region. The North Campus Parking Deck was not included in the existing parking counts. It is however, estimated to provide 1200 parking spaces to the North Campus region.

Table 2: Parking By Region

Region North	Total Spaces 3054
Central	4622
South and East	<u>9657</u>
Total	17,333

3.2 Existing Parking Demand

In 1993, Walker Parking Consultants/Engineers, Inc. performed a parking and transit study for the University of Georgia. In September of 1994, an update to that study was performed to project the future parking demand for the University in 1996 based on assumptions of faculty, staff and student enrollment. In that study the projected future parking demand for 1996 was 18,865 spaces. The projected supply of parking in that study was 16,277 spaces and the projected effective supply was 15,464 spaces resulting in a parking deficit of 3,401 spaces. The difference between parking supply and effective supply is that the parking supply is the total number of actual spaces while the effective supply is the total number of vehicles those spaces can actually park when consideration is given for the need for empty spaces to allow cars to come and go.

Based on information provided by the University, the current breakdown of faculty and staff as of October of 1996 is as follows:

•	Commuter Students	22,130
---	-------------------	--------

- Resident Students 7,274
- Faculty / Staff 4,844
- Employees 4,275

Using these latest numbers and the parking ratio developed in the 1994 study, the existing parking demand was recalculated to be 17,981 spaces, which is 884 spaces less than the projected demand from the 1994 study. This reduced demand can be attributed to fewer employees and resident students than were assumed in the 1994 study. As previously stated, the total parking supply on campus is 17,333 spaces. This results in an effective parking supply of 16,466 spaces because the effective parking supply is 95% of the total parking available. By comparing the effective parking supply to demand, it can be seen that there is an existing total parking deficit of 1,515 spaces.

4. PARKING FACILITIES CONDITIONS

4.1 Inventory

An inventory of the conditions of the Universities parking facilities was performed. The condition of each parking facility was ranked using a graduated scale from 1 to 5 with 5 being very good condition, 4 being good condition, 3 being average condition, 2 being poor condition and 1 being very poor condition. Some of the factors that were evaluated for each parking facility include the asphalt condition, striping condition, and circulation. Listed in Table 3 is a summary of the condition rankings for each of the parking facilities. For any facility that received a ranking of three or less, a comment is provided describing the reason for this average or below average ranking. The number identifying each parking facility in Table 3 corresponds to the number shown on the parking areas in figure III.A.5.3.



Not to Scale November 1997

Regional Circulation Main Campus Area

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III A.5.1



Table 3: Parking Inventory

NUMBER	PARKING LOT LOCATION	CONDITION	COMMENTS
1	Four Towers Visitor's Center	4	
2	University Health Center	5	
3	Ramsey Center	3	minor uneven pavement
4	East Campus Parking Deck	3	striping faded badly - hard to see in low deck light
5	Driftmier Engineering Center	2	cracking, faded striping, general old paving
6	River's Crossing	4	front lot currently under construction - dirt only
7	Driftmier Engineering Center	3	minor pavement cracking
8	East Campus Parking Deck	4	
9	Power Station	3	some pot holes
10	Georgia Museum of Art	1	bad alligator cracking - stripes faded badly
11	Georgia Museum of Art	2	confusing parking area - badly faded stripes
12	Georgia Museum of Art	3	beginning to crack - yellow on white hard to read
13	Parking Services	3	main "road" stripes fading - spaces too small - asphalt curb cracking
14	Parking Services	4	
15	Parking Services	4	
16	Performing Arts	4	
17	Performing Arts	4	
18	Printing	3	cracks running throughout
19	Printing	2	needs new striping - cannot tell what space designations are
20	Veterinary Medicine	3	some new parking under construction - some cracking & pot holes - faded stripes
21	Veterinary Medicine	1	very old paving - cannot turn for one-way parking design
22	Veterinary Medicine	3	general old pavement
23	Veterinary Medicine	2	faded stripes, much cracking
24	Tennis	3	general cracking
25	Tennis	3	
26	Tennis	3	some tree damage - grass in cracks - wheel stop decay
27	Tennis	3	hard to tell which lot is which - general cracking
28	Tennis	3	
29	Butts-Mehre	3	some stripes need re-painting
30	Baseball Field	3	
31	Alumni House	2	old paving, faded stripes, cracking all over
32	Alumni House	3	
33	Stegeman Coliseum	3	one-way and openings are confusing
34	McWhorter	2	old paving with some pot holes
35	McWhorter	2	old paving with some pot holes
36	Aderhold	3	traffic pattern confusing - may need sign at bend - overlapping colors, and one-way to dead end
37	lucker	2	construction zone - impossible to turn around - materials in spaces
38	Statistics/computer	3	by tucker, some cracking and fading, transitions from lots confusing, truck areas all look very bad
39	Forest Resources	3	some cracks and raded paint

Table 3: Parking Inventory

NUMBER	PARKING LOT LOCATION	CONDITION	COMMENTS
40	Forest Resources	3	some cracks and faded paint
41	Environmental Services	3	general cracks and old paving - drainage structure in deep
42	Hardman	3	
43	Hardman	3	entrance is in blue zone's exit
44	Barrow	1	spaces and turns too tight - pavement old and cracked
45	Connor	3	strange layout at entrance
46	Connor	3	needs new striping
47	Brooks Drive	3	some cracking
48	Dawson	2	deteriorating pavement and stripes
49	Science Library	3	some spaces show wear
50	P.E.	3	gold on white hard to read
51	Pharmacy	3	old paving, faded striping
52	Snelling Cafeteria	1	faded paint, tight spaces, have to cross truck zones, some pot holes
53	Wilson Pharmacy	3	old pavement, faded striping
54	Miller Plant Services	1	stripes faded, very bad alligator cracking in several areas
55	Greenhouses	3	combination of old & new paving
56	Child Development	2	stripes (new vs. old) very confusing
57	Cooperative Extension	4	asphalt seams are rough
58	Hoke Smith Annex	3	
59	Parking Deck	4	
60	Parking Deck	4	
61	Rutherford	3	
62	Rutherford	2	old lot, cracking, faded paint, some pot holes
63	Cedar Street Parking	3	needs new paint
64	Cloverhurst Avenue	4	wear near drainage structure
65	Oglethorpe	4	small area of wear
66	Oglethorpe Dining Hall	3	asphalt & striping worn
67	Boggs	4	slight cracking, arrow fading
68	Visitor's Center (College Stn.)	2	a big "V" on the side of the road, no stripes
68	West Campus Parking Deck	3	half lot good, half lot fair, cracking, worn stripes, uneven wear
69	West Campus Parking Deck	3	asphalt worn, cracking, not level
70	West Campus Parking Deck	5	
71	Church Street	4	one section cracked
72	Brumby	2	paving scratched & cracked, stripes worn, cannot read labels
73	Church Street	4	some cracking
74	Russell	3	
75	Creswell	4	
76	Creswell	3	some cracking and worn stripes
77	Baxter Street	2	asphalt & stripes very worn, fire lane? median confusing
78	Bolton Dining Hall	2	asphalt and stripes worn
79	Church	4	end spaces worn

Table 3: Parking Inventory

NUMBER	PARKING LOT LOCATION	CONDITION	COMMENTS
80	Hill	2	asphalt & paving worn
81	Clark Howell	3	some asphalt cracking
82	Lipscomb	3	some asphalt cracking
83	Public Safety	3	
84	Geology Lab	4	some cracks and wear
86	Geography Geology	3	concrete worn, asphalt cracked, striping is worn
87	Field Street	4	
88	Chemistry	2	asphalt cracked, stripes faded
89	Tate Student Center	4	patch needs restriping
89	Field Street	5	
9 0	Food Science	4	striping labels are worn
91	Bookstore	4	old stripes not eradicated
92	Bookstore	4	
93	Fine Arts	4	bad asphalt/stripe in cut stripe
94	Baptist Student Union	3	worn striping
96	Baptist Student Union	2	extreme cracking, old stripes not eradicated, new stripes look good
97	Recording for Blind	1	tree in middle of parking lot
98	Recording for Blind	1	trees in middle of parking lot
99	Recording for Blind	3	space labels worn
99	Baptist Student Union	2	worn & cracking, faded stripes
100	Recording for Blind	2	metal structures in lot, steep grade on west drive
101	Recording for Blind	1	old striping not eradicated
102	Morris	4	poor turn around, steep grades, sections of faded striping, shown on
			map but not existing
103	Brooks	1	asphalt does not exist, stripes extremely worn
104	Gilbert Hall	4	average cracking & wear, striping on parallel spaces worn
105	New College	5	slight cracking, poor drainage, narrow clearance
106	Business Services Annex	4	average spot problems, good stripe track marks in asphalt
107	Thomas Street	3	
108	Thomas Street Art Complex	3	
10 9	Thomas Street	2	R.R. track in lot, poor asphalt patch work, striping is worn
110	Baldwin	2	rough asphalt, worn stripes, narrow access
111	Baldwin	3	
112	Main Library	3	space labels hard to read, minor cracking
113	Peabody	3	spot problems, striping labels worn west edge of lot, roots in pavement
114	Ramsey Center	3	H/C ramp is in a space - unusable if car were there

The *Existing Parking Zones* diagram is currently only available in the Master Plan hard copy; however, the generating CAD drawing is available in the *CAD Files* folder.

5. UGA PARKING POLICIES

5.1 Vehicle Registration

It is the University's policy to require all persons, with the exception of visitors, that will be parking a vehicle on campus Monday through Friday between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. to register that vehicle with Parking Services. Failure to register a vehicle may result in fines for each violation escalating up to the possibility of impoundment of a vehicle if multiple violations are cited. The University allows faculty, staff and employees to register as many four wheel vehicles and one motorcycle. While students may register only four wheel vehicle and one motorcycle. All students, regarded of year, are allowed to register vehicles.

5.2 Parking Permit

The parking facilities on campus are divided into two categories - Peripheral lots and Premium lots. Typically, the Perimeter lots are less convenient than the Premium lots and therefore are less restrictive and have the lower permit fees. Lots are further defined by a letter such as (F) for faculty / staff or (E) for employee which defines the level of permit you must have to park in a particular lot. The term "level" is used because some permits allow the user to park not only in the lots designated with their type of permit but also in lots designated for other types of permits as well. This is illustrated in Table 4 below which shows the type of permit and the lots that permit allows access to.

-	
Permit Type	Access Allowed to:
Faculty / Staff (F)	F, E, G, P, C
Employee (E)	E, P, C
Perimeter (P)	P,C
Undergraduate, Students, Graduate Students,	
Housing Students (C)	С
Graduate Students Only (G)	C, G
Housing Students (H)	H, C
Motorcycle (M)	Areas specially designated by
	signs for motorcycles only
Vendor (V)	Any non-restricted parking space
	Pick-up or deliver supplies or
Courier Decals	materials on campus

Table 4 : Permit Hierarchy

In addition to the primary permits listed above, there also secondary permits. These include handicap permits (which the University does not issue), graduate/resident permits and temporary permits.

5.3 Parking Fees

The parking fees charged vary depending on the permit which is issued. For "F" and "E" type permits fees also vary depending upon whether or not the permit allows you access to both Perimeter and Premium parking locations. Table 5 below lists the range of current parking permit fees.

Table 5: Parking Permit Fees

Permit Type	Fee
F	\$36.00 - \$190.00
E	\$36.00 - \$170.00
С	\$35.00
G	\$55.00
Н	\$55.00
М	\$25.00
V	\$190.00

In addition to these general permit fees, specific fees are identified for locations such as the south campus parking deck, west campus parking deck, and east campus parking deck. Each of these parking facilities has designated users that may be allowed reserved spaces in those facilities.

5.4 Penalties and Appeals

Fines are issued for a number of parking violations and range from \$5.00 up to \$40.00 per violation. Fines that have not been paid or appealed within 10 calendar days are considered to be delinquent. If a fine becomes delinquent for faculty, staff or employees, the citation amount is sent to the payroll department and deducted from that individuals pay. If fines become delinquent for students, their records are flagged and delay of future registration or the issuance of transcripts may occur if outstanding fines are not paid. An appeal process is available to appeal parking violations. The appeals must be made within seven calendar days after receiving the violation. After this time period, the right to appeal is forfeited. Appeals are made in writing and submitted to the faculty / staff appeals committee. Faculty, staff or employees that submit an appeal will be notified of the Board's decision by Parking Services. Students that submit an appeal have the option of being informed of the Board's decision by e-mail or U.S. mail.

The parking policies and regulations of the University are made available through the parking guide published by Parking Services and via the Internet.

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Recreational Space (figure III A 6.1)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia
	The purpose of this technical memorandum is to describe the various types of outdoor

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The purpose of this technical memorandum is to describe the various types of outdoor recreational spaces that are present on the University of Georgia campus.

For many people, athletics are an important part of the college experience, and the University of Georgia has a wide variety of athletic facilities and outdoor spaces.

1. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Intercollegiate athletics, particularly football, basketball and baseball, are a high-profile element of the culture of the University. Intercollegiate Athletic facilities such as Sanford Stadium, the Coliseum, and Foley Field are important visual icons in the campus landscape. These large structures and the spaces around them are landmarks as well as recreational facilities. Other intercollegiate athletic facilities include the track and tennis center adjacent to Lumpkin Street and a soon to be constructed soccer facility.

2. INTRAMURAL ATHLETICS

Intramural field sports take place near Lake Herrick on South Campus. Soccer, softball, baseball, rugby, Ultimate Frisbee, and flag football and tennis are all played at the Lake Herrick facility.

3. NATURAL RECREATION SPACE

3.1 Lake Herrick Area

The Oconee Forest, located south of Lake Herrick, and Lake Herrick itself are natural areas that are heavily used for recreational purposes. Walking and mountain biking are popular activities on the trails in the forest. A small pond on the southern end of the site is a favorite recreation spot for dogs and their owners. The trail system and it's amenities provide opportunities for exercise, study of plants, and passive recreation such as picnicking. The popularity of the trails has led to erosion and degradation due to overuse. The shore of Lake Herrick includes a beach that is used seasonally by the University community on a pay per use basis.

3.2 People's Park

People's Park is a remnant woodland within the West campus that has developed into a passive recreation area.

4. INFORMAL RECREATION SPACE

"Informal recreation space" describes spaces that were not constructed for recreational purposes, but are used as recreation areas for activities such as Frisbee, hacky-sack, and sunbathing. Some examples of this type of space are: the North Campus quadrangle, the lawn adjacent to Cedar Street near the Chemistry building, the Myers quadrangle, and the lawn between the Brumby and Russell residence halls known as "Brumby Beach".

5. DESIGNATED RECREATION SPACE

Designated recreation spaces are places such as tennis, basketball, and volleyball courts, swimming pools and picnic areas. This type of facility exists in many locations scattered throughout the campus.



Existing Recreational Space



c Facility

University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure III A 6.1



The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	December 12, 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Utilities, Section III.B.1
From	Heery
То	Ayers/Saint/Gross
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place	The following is the description of the existing utility conditions at the University of Georgia.1 UTILITIES
Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519	1.1. Existing Steam Utilities Most of the main campus is served by the existing steam plant. The only exception is the new East Campus River Road development, across the railroad track, which is heated with individual gas boilers and a small hot water distribution system in the Performing and Visual Arts Campar. The central steam plant is primerily fueled by interruptible gas and
Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283	 visual Arts Center. The central steam plant is primarily fueled by interruptible gas and coal, with fuel oil as standby fuel. Some summer load is provided by steam absorption chillers (see chilled water discussion). This plant is situated in the center of campus which is now desirable real estate for future growth and development. The use of coal, although economical, is unsightly and is a source of heavy delivery traffic at the center of campus. Currently, there is no EPA air quality problem with the coal burning plant and no regulating difficulty foreseen in the very near future with continuing to burn coal.
Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858	The steam supply piping is said to be in good shape and is expected to have considerable life remaining. Condensate return piping, however is in poor condition. Nearly 80% of existing condensate piping needs replacement. The North Campus condensate system is in worse condition than the South Campus. Highest priority is for replacement of 6" condensate from the steam plant to Lumpkin Street. Near that point at Lumpkin Street is a major condensate lift station (5,000 gallon receiver) that is over 55 years old, is beyond the end of its expected life, and needs to be replaced.
<i>Traffic Engineering</i> LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797	The central steam plant has firm capacity of approximately 190,000 to 220,000 lbs/hr of 100 psi steam, depending on which of four boilers are operating. Typically, three boilers operate, with one spare boiler. Three of these boilers are gas with fuel oil standby. One of these boilers is normally rotated as a standby. The fourth boiler is coal fired and operates continuously at 45,000 lbs/hr, except for one month of summer maintenance. The coal-fired boiler is equipped with a bag house and meets current emission criteria. All four boilers are external water tube type.
Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508	Standby fuel oil is stored in one of three 600,000 gallon concrete vaults. To prevent overflow and spillage, this vault is never filled over 300,000 gallons and has high level alarms. Fuel oil for emergency generators in the steam plant is kept in a separate, new 4,000 gallon double-walled fiberglass fuel oil storage tank.

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

Currently, only the central steam plant is metered for interruptible gas, which has a relatively low rate. All other users of gas on campus are metered at a higher rate.

Older pneumatic controls on the gas/oil boilers are approaching obsolescence and will need replacement in the very near future. Two of the steam plant's gas/oil boilers are approaching the end of their life and will need replacement or major work within the next

10 years. The other two boilers are expected to last up to 30 years with periodic repairs and proper upkeep.

The steam plant and distribution system meets current load requirements which have peaked at about 220,000 lbs/hr. Typical winter peaks are lower, at about 190,000 lbs/hr, which leaves a very small margin of spare capacity. The fourth, spare boiler is considered an emergency backup and should not be considered as firm capacity. Significantly large building additions may trigger the need for additional boilers and distribution capacity.

1.2 Existing Chilled Water Utilities

Most, but not all, campus buildings are interconnected to several mini chilled water distribution systems. Six separate chilled water loop systems interconnect from two to 12 separate buildings each.

Although these mini loop systems can be difficult to coordinate during design, and to control, their use has the advantage of avoiding the greater first cost of building a separate central chiller plant. Since loops are kept small, pumping energy is kept to a minimum. Also, this design allows existing buildings, built with individual chillers, to be interconnected and form small central plant loops without purchasing new chillers

Two of the larger systems, North Campus Loop and Science Loop (central south campus) use an unusual "three-pipe" chilled water distribution. The third pipe allows the loop to perform as a "distributed chiller plant." This allows the efficiencies of multiple buildings being cooled by only a few chillers as with a conventional central chiller plant, but with the chillers located in separate buildings.

These and the remaining two pipe chilled water mini loops are listed below with approximate total chiller capacity in each loop:

North Campus Loop	2,000?	Tons	
Science Loop (central campus)	2,050+	Tons	
South Campus Loop	6,100+	- Tons	
Vet School Loop	1,200	Tons	
East Campus (River Road)	2,550	Tons	
West Campus (Brumby & Russell Hall	ls)	770	Tons

The North Campus Loop area has the greatest opportunity for improvement. A number of older buildings in this area are not connected to the loop and have aging chillers. An approximate additional load of 3,000 tons could be added to the North Campus Loop from surrounding buildings not now connected. A large chiller is planned for this area when replacement of existing chillers is warranted.

An additional 2,000 to 3,000 tons is estimated to exist in remaining areas with the potential to create additional loops.

Depending on the individual loop, spare capacity of 0 to 25% is available. Individual building loads are not metered and precise numbers are not available.

Approximately 25 to 30% of chillers are steam absorption including a large 1,300 ton absorption chiller in the South Campus Loop located in the Central Steam Plant. As they reach the end of their life, absorption chillers are being replaced with more efficient, electric centrifugal chillers. Generally most other chillers on campus are new and are in good condition.Existing generators are not being used for peak shaving electric chillers.

Chilled water distribution piping is in very good condition. All underground distribution piping is steel or ductile iron, with only one small PVC pipe at the Vet School.

1.3 Potable and Fire Protection Water Distribution Grid

The water distribution system for the main campus of the University of Georgia supplies both potable and fire protection water. The majority of the system is owned and maintained by Athens/Clarke County. The university maintains a small portion, which they are in the process of turning over to Athens/Clarke County. The system was originally constructed using cast iron pipe and fittings with lead and oakum joints. Since the late 1960's, system expansions and repairs have been constructed using cement lined ductile iron pipe and fittings. The general condition of the piping in the system is good.

Water supplied to the campus is produced at the Athens/Clarke County Water Treatment Facility. The plant has a permitted capacity of 28 MGD. The plant is generating on a daily basis between 23 and 24 million gallons. By 2001, the plant will be expanded to generate 32 MGD.

The campus annually consumes 1,785 million gallons of water.

1.3.1 Fire Protection Considerations

Gage-Babcock is in the process of evaluating each building relative to fire protection. Its study will be referenced in the master plan documents when completed.

In addition to the buildings' evaluation documentation, Gage-Babcock presently has a proposal to evaluate the site distribution systems based on the required fire protection water flow rates.

1.4 Sanitary Sewer

The main sanitary sewer collection system for the University of Georgia is owned and maintained by Athens/Clarke County. The university owns and maintains the sanitary sewers serving North Campus quadrangle and the recently developed areas of East Campus, including the river crossing.

The North Oconee Plant receives the waste water from the campus. This plant is owned and operated by Athens/Clarke County. Its permitted capacity is 10 MGD. This plant also serves other clients from the Athens area. The county is planning to upgrade the plant by the year 2006. These include eliminating odor and filtration problems.

A pre-treatment system is presently under construction by UGA for the Animal Science Complex. The waste water from this facility exceeds Athens/Clarke County's acceptable limits for BOD and suspended solids.

The campus produces 1.2 MGD of waste water.

The system consists of terra cotta (vitrified clay) and ductile iron pipe on the older sections. Newer sections and repairs made to the older lines used concrete truss pipe for sizes up to 12 inches in diameter. The larger mains are constructed with ductile iron pipe.

There are several issues concerning the sanitary sewer system that will affect future growth. They include the lack of grease traps in the system and future load projections.

Suspended grease in the sanitary effluent from the University is creating problems for the collection/treatment process at the treatment plant.

With the county planning to upgrade the North Oconee Plant, it is very important that the University provide realistic sanitary load projections.

1.5 Gas

The natural gas service for the Main Campus of the University of Georgia is divided into two service areas - North and South Campus. The physical boundary line between the two areas is Sanford Stadium.

Originally the North Campus natural gas distribution was owned, operated, and maintained by the University. The mains were constructed of cast iron pipe, which over time began to leak and were difficult to repair. Approximately two years ago, the system was turned
over to Atlanta Gas Light Company. They undertook a program to replace the cast iron mains with polyethylene pipe. The distribution pressure is approximately 100 psi in some areas and 60 psi in other areas. Meters and regulators are provided at the service entrance to each building.

The South Campus is served by a natural gas system owned by the University. This system is fed from the 100 psi Atlanta Gas Light main through a master meter. At the meter station the pressure is reduced to 12 psi. The site mains and building branch lines operate at this reduced pressure. Regulators are provided at each building to reduce the 12 psi distribution pressure down to 7"-14" water column pressure within the buildings.

Piping materials used in both systems are either black steel or polyethylene. The polyethylene piping is provided with a 14 - 16 gauge tracer wire for utility location purposes. The black steel piping is protected by two types of cathodic protection at various locations throughout the system. The first type is an impressed current system, which induces a low voltage current in the pipe. The other system utilizes sacrificial anodes located adjacent to the pipe.

The boiler plant is provided with an interruptible gas supply. It is provided with a separate meter and regulator located at the boiler plant.

1.6 Existing Electrical Utilities

The University of Georgia electrical distribution system obtains its power supply from Georgia Power Co. through its substation along East Campus Road. Campus electrical demand has been growing almost on a yearly basis, however, not as steadily as had been projected in 1993 during the River Road expansion master plan study.

Following are the overall projected electrical demands for 1993-98 based on a 2% annual growth rate, which were projected with the addition of the River Road campus expansion buildings in 1993. They are shown here as compared to the actual demand: (Numbers in **MW**, Megawatts)

Fiscal Year	Actual Projecte	ed in 1993
1994	30.5	35.5
1995	32.7	37.02
1996	34.5	39.54
1997	33.9	40.86
1998	32.9(est.)	45.01

Attached please find Exhibit 1 provided by the UGA Operations group, showing a graph of the fiscal year $\underline{\mathbf{Kw}}$ demand loads since 1985.

There are several factors that account for this "turnaround" in electrical demand growth. The UGA plant operations and engineering groups have performed an excellent job in identifying energy saving opportunities such as:

- 1. Adopting the EPA Green Lights program which emphasizes the retrofit of existing facilities with energy efficient light fixtures. Lighting demand loads on any given building could be as much as 30-35% of total load, therefore a savings in this area represents a significant savings overall.
- 2. Utilization of night setbacks when buildings are unoccupied.
- 3. Another significant factor has been the institution of effective chilled water loop controls which have optimized the production and distribution of chilled water throughout the facility.
- 4. Some of the newer buildings such as Performing Arts, are more active after hours, therefore their impact on the overall demand is less noticeable.

Most of the above factors account for the sharp decline in the projected rate of growth until 1996, and they did represent a significant savings. During late 1996 and 1997 a reduction of load was experienced. This reduction is accounted for by the disconnection of the River Road circuit feeder number 10, carrying approximately 2 Megawatts or 2.3 MVA. This circuit has been powered directly from the Georgia Power system since the latter part of 1996, diverting it from passing through the UGA campus power substation. It is therefore, separately metered and is not included within the UGA substation load. The University negotiated a contract with Georgia Power under the MLM (Multiple Load Management Center) concept which allows UGA to separately power this load and at the same time maintain the current RTP (Real Time Pricing) rates being enjoyed by the rest of the facility, now applicable to this load as well.

To meet current and future distribution line expansion, the University has added five additional 12.47 KV underground distribution circuits since 1993, and is currently in the process of adding five (5) more circuits as follows 2 for the South campus, 2 for the North campus and 1 redundant circuit.

Georgia Power will need to expand this substation by the addition of a third 22.5 MVA transformer in the near future. This expansion is expected to serve the load growth needs of the campus throughout the next 10-15 years.

There are currently several buildings under construction, or recently completed, such as Sanford Hall Business School, South Law School, and the North Campus Parking Deck, slated for completion in 1998. Stegeman Hall was demolished, and in its place, a large classroom building is being planned. There are various other buildings in the planning, design and construction stages.

Longer-range demand growth will likely require the addition of a second campus substation.

The following diagrams are currently only available in the Master Plan hard copy:

Existing Steam UtilitiesExisting Chilled Water UtilitiesExisting Potable Water UtilitiesExisting Natural Gas UtilitiesExisting Sanitary UtilitiesExisting Electrical Utilities

However, the generating CAD files are available in the *CAD Files* folder.

Project Subject From To Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Ballimore, MD, 21202	December 12, 1997
Subject From To Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore MD 21202	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
From To Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD, 21202	Stormwater, Section III.B.2
To Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore MD 21202	Heery
Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283 Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858 Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797 Academic Programming Paulien & Associates	Heery Ayers/Saint/Gross The following is a description of the existing stormwater conditions at the University of Georgia. 1. Stormwater The stormwater from the main campus of the University of Georgia is collected in four major drainage basins. The easternmost basin contains the North Campus quadrangle and the Milledge Hall / Payne Hall quadrangle. This basin discharges stormwater directly into the north fork of the Oconee River. The Tanyard Creek drainage basin covers the eastern half of the North Campus and a large part of the Central Campus. Tanyard Creek also drains a portion of the City of Athens from Milledge Avenue east to the Main Campus. The southeastern basin encompasses the South Campus and the recently developed East Campus. The stormwater flows into an unnamed creek. This basin includes portions of the City of Athens as far west as the intersection of Lumpkin Street, Milledge Avenue, and Circle. The southernmost basin includes the remaining areas of the South Campus. Stormwater in this basin flows into Lake Herrick. Lake Herrick provides minimal stormwater detention. The stormwater collection system consists of underground piped sewer system in highly developed areas, and drainage swales and pipe culverts in lightly developed areas of the campus. The system within the campus is maintained by the University. The condition and capacity of the system varies with the location and age. The Main Campus storm sewers are old, and in certain sections, are at or above design capacity. Where new buildings have been added, the sewers in the immediate area have been upgraded or replaced. Recently developed portions of East Campus have a complet
899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380	water in a stormwater management facility.

The *Existing Stormwater* Utilities diagram is currently only available in the Master Plan hard copy; however, the generating CAD drawing is available in the *CAD Files* folder.

Date	December 12, 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Communications Utilities, Section III.B.3
From	Heery
То	Ayers/Saint/Gross
	The following is a description of the existing communications utilities at the University of Georgia
Architects and Campus Planners	our generation of the second s

Ayers/Saint/Gross

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

1. EXISTING COMMUNICATIONS UTILITIES

1.1 Voice:

The existing campus-wide voice communications system consists of shared communications ductbanks intended for voice, data, and video distribution. For voice services, there are five campus communications hubs with AT&T Definity Generic 2, PBX switches. The major hubs are at the Boyd Graduate Studies Building and at Peabody Hall- Jackson Street. There are additional switch hubs at Chicopee, East Campus, and at Rivers Crossing Bldg.-College Station Road. Following are tabulations of the switch hubs and the campus areas they serve:

Hub/SW. Location	Areas Served
Boyd Graduate Studies Bldg.	South Campus buildings
Peabody Hall	North Campus buildings
Chicopee Bldg.	Physical Plant building
Ramsey Center	East Campus buildings
Rivers Crossing Bldg.	College Station Road Area

BellSouth serves UGA through two major Trunk line facilities. One serves the Boyd Hub, its major Trunk line is copper based; however, recently BellSouth added a fiber optics link at that same location. This fiber optics line is currently dedicated to modem services for UNCS, the computer center. The second major Trunk line currently serves the Peabody Hall Hub. This line is entirely fiber optics based. Off these hubs, distribution is via copper cabling to all buildings in the associated areas as described in the above table.

All hubs are interconnected to each other via fiber optics through the campus communications ductbank system.

Currently, buildings are provided with a main communications room where voice, data, and video cabling enters and is then distributed to dedicated service shelves and throughout the facility.

1.2 Data Distribution:

The main center and origination point of the UGA data network is at the Boyd Graduate Studies Building at the UGA Computer Center. Distribution is via broadband coaxial copper cabling in underground ductbanks, where space is shared with voice and video cabling. Internal distribution throughout the various buildings is via Ethernet or Token Ring Networks. The current mix consists of about 95% Ethernet and 5% Token Ring.

1.3 Video Distribution: The main distribution and origination point of the UGA video services is located at the Physics and Journalism Complex. There are three main source inputs into the system-satellite, regular broadcast, and locally generated programming. The cabling distribution is via coaxial broadband sharing underground ductbank space with voice and data systems. The system is distributed to end users via traditional, tree-structure connected cabling.

The *Existing Communications* Utilities diagram is currently only available in the Master Plan hard copy; however, the generating CAD drawing is available in the *CAD Files* folder.

Date	7/24/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Regulatory Issues (Section III C 1)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia
	The purpose of this memo is to address the regulatory issues applicable to UGA property

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

1. Zoning / Land Use Requirements

and to identify the authorities involved.

The Campus of the University of Georgia is state owned property and is under the sole jurisdiction and regulation of the State of Georgia. Any questions regarding regulatory issues, zoning or land-use requirements should be directed to the Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance.

2. Adjacent Properties

The campus is surrounded by many different land uses. The commercial district of downtown Athens creates the northern edge of campus. The properties adjacent to campus on the western edge are mostly single or multi-family residential. The land use adjacent to the southern boundary of main campus is primarily industrial. To the east is a mix of commercial, residential, and parks / open space.

3. ADA Compliance

All University buildings and site improvements are to be compliant with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

4. Stormwater Regulation

Stormwater regulation is delegated to the County by the State.

Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Natural Resources (figure III.C.2.1)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The purpose of this memorandum is to describe the natural resources present on the University of Georgia campus. The understanding of natural resources is essential to responsible planning efforts and the development of sustainable landscapes.

1. NATURAL RESOURCES

1.1 Lakes, Rivers and Streams

As described in detail in figure III.A.1.1.c, the rivers and streams on the University of Georgia campus are currently in a poor environmental condition and the University community does not interact with them on a regular basis. The few lakes on the Main Campus are small and are used for minor recreational purposes.

1.2 100 Year Floodplain

The 100 year floodplain, as documented from Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Maps, lies primarily along the Oconee River. Some tributary creeks to the Oconee are within the floodplain, but with the exception of some parking lots, these areas are undeveloped.

1.3 Springs

There is a spring on the west side of the Thorton Brothers Paper Company on Spring Street. This spring is the original water source for the city of Athens.

1.4 Unique Geological Features

The University has a great deal of rock near the ground's surface. The rock shows itself in the form of gneiss rock outcrops located near the entrance to the Butts-Mehre building and at the northwest corner of East Campus Road and Carlton Street.

1.5 Animal Habitat

Animal habitat on the main campus of the University of Georgia consists of small patches of woodland. These areas are suitable for habitation by animals such as squirrels, opossums, raccoons, blue jays, chickadees, sparrows, some migratory birds, and other small mammals and birds adapted to edge conditions.

There are no known populations of endangered plants or animals on the main campus.

1.6 Potential Wetlands

The main campus of the University contains only a small area of wetlands, as documented from the United States Department of the Interior National Wetlands Inventory. The potential wetlands are confined to an area on East campus adjacent to the Oconee River.



Floodplain & Bottom Lands

Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Existing Hazardous Environmental Conditions (figure III C2.2)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519	The purpose of this technical memorandum is to describe the hazardous environmental conditions that exist on or near the main campus of the University of Georgia. The term "hazardous environmental conditions", as discussed in this section, does not imply that there is an immediate threat from the conditions described. Rather, the sites described are an inventory of conditions that should be considered carefully if future development is called for in the locations indicated.
Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283	Information for this section was provided to the master planning team by the University of Georgia Department of Public Safety. 1. SITE DESCRIPTIONS (see maps for locations indicated by letters)
Landscape Architecture	1.1 Will Hunter Road Property
Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858	1.1.1 'A' Hazardous Waste Storage and Treatment Facility Hazardous materials are collected and consolidated in this area and some treatment is done on site. Some low level radioactive animal carcasses are buried on this site.
<i>Traffic Engineering</i> LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309	1.1.2 'B' Capped Municipal Landfill This landfill, located across the road from UGA's Will Hunter Road property, is capped and is not UGA property.
404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797	1.2 Near State Botanical Garden
Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380	 1.2.1 'C' Hazardous Waste Burial site This site consists of approximately two acres. One acre contains chemical waste and one acre contains radioactive waste. The edge of the plume of contamination from this site is near a creek and may require a remediation plan in the future. 1.2.2 'D' Cemeteries
	There are several cemeteries located near the UGA campus. A study to determine whether or not these cemeteries contain hazardous materials should be done if

development is proposed near them.

F:\1\3 Exist Conditions\Hazardous Environmental Conditions (3c22).doc

1.3 Agricultural Areas

Agricultural areas often contain storage sites for pesticides and fertilizer. These materials may pose an environmental risk if not handled properly, they also pose a security risk because of the possibility that these chemicals could be turned into explosives.

1.3.1 'E' (typical) Farm Pond Runoff

Farm ponds associated with livestock must be monitored for hazardous conditions. The swine farm located east of the State Botanical Garden is the only UGA site mentioned that may be a cause for concern.

1.3.2 'F' Inert Landfills

By definition, these landfills contain materials whose leachate does not pose an environmental threat. However, their locations are noted because of the possibility that the materials would have to be relocated if development were to occur on these sites.

1.4 Chicopee Complex

1.4.1 Paint Shed and Air Conditioning Shop

The existing paint shed '**G**' has been designated by the state Environmental Protection Division as a Solid Waste Management Unit and is managed as such by the University. Although there is not an environmental hazard present, the old paint shed '**H**' (which is now a parking lot) is also designated as a Solid Waste Management Unit by the EPD and the University manages it as such.

The Air Conditioning Shop at the Chicopee Complex manages chlorofluorocarbons (cfc) which may pose an environmental hazard if handled improperly.

1.5 Old Physical Plant Site - Cedar Street 'l'

1.5.1 Dump Truck Wash Site, Heating Plant, Fuel Oil Bunker, Fertilizer and Pesticide Storage

Dump Truck Wash Site - Water from this area has to be diverted to the sanitary sewer rather than being allowed to run into the storm water system.

Heating Plant - coal piles pose a fire hazard as well as a potential environmental risk from storm water runoff.

Fuel Oil Bunker - Located behind Hardeman Hall

Fertilizer and Pesticide Storage - Storage area is open during the day and secured at night

1.6 Riverbend Road - Vehicle and Bus Maintenance Areas

This area contains underground fuel storage tanks that must comply with EPD rules and regulations.

1.7 On Campus Chemical Storage

Various chemicals are stored on the University campus at the following locations: Central Research Storage at Whitehall and the Central Distributing area at the Chemistry Building loading dock. Pre-built chemical storage units are located at: Chemistry, Food Service, Veterinary Medicine, Pharmacy School, and Biological Sciences.

1.8 Off Campus Hazardous Sites

The Old Chevron Station, located at the northeast corner of Baxter Street and Church Street, has a corrective action plan in place to remediate leaking underground storage tanks. The plume is currently moving away from the campus and does not pose a threat to the environmental safety of the University. The Existing Hazardous Environmental Conditions Diagram is currently only available in the Master Plan hard copy.

Date	November 1997
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Protection and Restoration of Historic and Natural Sites (figure III C2.3)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202

410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 As described in Section IA of this document, the University of Campus has a rich history as one of the nation's oldest centers of higher education. Because of the history of the place and its location adjacent to the Oconee River, reason exists to protect existing historic and natural resources and where needed restore these sites.

1. HISTORIC SITES

There are a number of historic sites related to the landscape and grounds of the University of Georgia. The most obvious historic landscape is the North Campus quadrangle. This area represents the original character of the University and is a modern icon of the campus. Continuous efforts should be made to protect and restore the landscape of the quadrangle. The protection and restoration should include a long term plan for planting shade trees to replace to existing trees as they mature and die and a plan to maintain and repair the iron fence and arch that are the campus' northern boundary.

The Founders' Garden, the grounds adjacent to Bishop House, the landscape designed by Thomas Church for the Georgia Center, and the Myers quadrangle are other examples of landscapes worthy of careful preservation.

Restoration of demolished historic landscapes is more difficult than preservation of existing landscapes. Careful research into the original design intent and the evolution of the use of a site is required to determine weather or not a landscape is worthy of restoration. The same care should be taken to develop an accurate plan for restoration. Examples of landscape features that may be worthy of restoration are the amphitheater that was located on South Campus and Civil War era cannon bunkers/berms that were once in place on the campus. Another historic site is "Herty Field" which was located on the site that is currently a parking lot west of the North Campus quadrangle. Herty Field was an open space that was the original football field. This site provides an excellent opportunity to restore a historic landscape.

2. NATURAL RESOURCES

Waterways are the natural resource in greatest need of protection. Like all places, the University of Georgia campus is part of a larger region that is dependent on local water supplies. Prevention of siltation and other forms of water pollution should be priority for the University. Restoration and protection of enough stream bank habitat to create successful corridors for wildlife should also be a primary focus of future development.

As described in Sections III A 1.1e and III C 2.1, the woodlands on the campus are places that serve as research and recreation areas as well as wildlife habitat. These few remaining areas should be protected at all costs and restored whenever possible.



Date	October 5, 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Space Needs Analysis to Target Year (Section IV)
From	Paulien & Associates
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture

Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 This technical memorandum is to serve as a cover for the Future Requirements Section to follow. The objective of this work element was to provide the planning team with the overall impact of the future academic program upon campus development.

With this extensive analyses of program needs as a foundation for our physical planning, we have been able to develop a plan for UGA's main campus that will accommodate an increase in UGA's student body from its current size of 29,400 students to 35,000 students.

University of Georgia FUTURE CAMPUS REQUIREMENTS TABLE OF CONTENTS

Template Section IV

Page

1.0	DES	CRIP	FION OF FUTURE ACADEMIC PROGRAM	1
	1.1	Progra	am Summary	1
	1.2	Contir	nuing Education	7
	1.3	Resea	rch and Service	7
2.0	SPA	CE NI	EEDS ANALYSIS TO TARGET YEARS	8
	2.1	Studer	nt Enrollment Assumptions	8
	2.1	Facult	v and Staff Projections	10
	2.2	Acade	amic Space Projections	1/
	2.5	2 3 1	Pase Vegr 1006	14
		2.3.1	Target Vegr 2002	14
		2.3.2	Target Year - 2007	18
	2.4	Findir	has by Major Academic and Administrative Units	20
	2.7	241	Academic Units Base Year and Target Year 2002	20
		2.4.1	Administrative Units Base Year and Target Year 2002	41
		2.4.3	Academic Units Target Year 2007	49
		2.4.4	Administrative Units Target Year 2007	68
	2.5	Guide	line Assumptions	76
		2.5.1	Classroom Space	76
		2.5.2	Teaching Laboratories	77
		2.5.3	Open Laboratories	80
		2.5.4	Research Laboratories	80
		2.5.5	Office Space	82
		2.5.6	Library Space	83
		2.5.7	Physical Education/Recreation	83
		2.5.8	Athletics	84
		2.5.9	Assembly/Exhibit	84
		2.5.10	Student Union Space	84
		2.5.11	Physical Plant	84
		2.5.12	Central Computer Space	84

Technical Memorandum

July 16, 1998

UGA Master Plan

Future Campus Requirements (Template Section IV)

Paulien & Associates, Inc.

University of Georgia

Chapter four will outline the future campus requirements for the University of Georgia. It will include a description of future academic programs, space needs analysis, parking space requirements, athletic and recreational space requirements, and utility infrastructure requirements. The space needs analysis section will provide projections at the target year periods and will include student enrollment assumptions, faculty and staffing projections, space requirements by academic division, and academic support facility requirements.

The background information used in the chapter four analysis was provided by the University of Georgia and the office of the Georgia Board of Regents. Course information from the Fall 1996 quarter was used, in addition to facilities inventory and staffing information from the Spring of 1997. In conducting the space needs analysis, meetings were held with individual academic and administrative groups across campus. In addition, visits were made to various spaces throughout the campus.

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF FUTURE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

1.1 Program Summary

This section will summarize the proposed future academic programs. It will also provide student enrollment projections to the year 2002, define the role of continuing education in the future academic programs, and discuss research and service at the University of Georgia.

The University of Georgia is made up of thirteen major academic units. Each of these units reports directly to the Provost. These colleges and schools are:

- College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences
- College of Arts and Sciences
- College of Business
- College of Education
- School of Environmental Design
- College of Family and Consumer Sciences
- School of Forest Resources
- Graduate School
- College of Journalism and Mass Communication
- School of Law

- College of Pharmacy
- School of Social Work
- College of Veterinary Medicine

The following is a brief discussion of future trends for these programs.

College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences

The College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences was founded in 1859. Until a year ago, the College showed 23 consecutive quarters of growth in student enrollments. In the last year it has had one quarter with constant enrollment and two quarters of decline. Growth in Agriculture and Environmental Sciences is in the environmental programs. There has been no growth in the traditional agricultural areas, such as dairy or poultry sciences. Planning for the future revolves around the need for more laboratory, computer, and classroom space for Food, Environmental, and Engineering majors, rather than an increase in space for crops. Changes in Agriculture and Environmental Sciences will result in redistribution of space utilization and in interdisciplinary collaborations with Forest Resources, Family and Consumer Sciences, and Veterinary Medicine.

College of Arts and Sciences

The College of Arts and Sciences is the oldest and largest college within the University of Georgia. Founded in 1801, it includes more than 14,000 students from all across the campus in some 50 different majors. Because essentially all lower division undergraduate students are taught by Arts and Sciences faculty, the College of Arts and Sciences will be strongly affected by anticipated enrollment growth.

In addition to enrollment growth, the conversion to semesters will dramatically affect the space needs for the College. As a general rule, the College of Arts and Sciences will need to put half again as many students in classes after the conversion to semesters. This will increase space utilization and will extend the day. It is worth noting that a few years ago, as a separate event, some of the College's classes were scheduled in the evening periods to utilize space more efficiently.

College of Business

The College of Business recently survived a huge fire and renovation in Brooks Hall and occupied its new classroom building, Sanford Hall. In Caldwell Hall, classrooms were remodeled with computer network connections added to 450 classroom seats, following the technology standard set when Sanford Hall opened. The College, founded in 1912, has historically taught classes all over the campus. Since a large portion of credit hours for undergraduate Business majors are taken outside the College's three buildings, Business students take classes in all parts of the campus. Alternately, students in the College of Arts and Sciences majoring in Economics take classes in the College of Business. There is a joint MBA/JD program whose students use the Law Library, as do Business students majoring in Accounting and Risk Management/Insurance.

To move to a higher level of service, the College of Business anticipates enlarging the MBA program, adding an executive MBA program, and increasing distance learning opportunities.

College of Education

The College of Education, founded in 1908, is one of the largest and most comprehensive in the nation. There are approximately 225 full-time faculty, 400 graduate assistants, and 153 staff serving a student body of 2,500 undergraduates and 2,000 graduate students. The College is organized into four schools: the School of Health and Human Performance, the School of Leadership and Lifelong Learning, the School of Professional Studies, and the School of Teacher Education. The College is located in five buildings on South and East Campus: Aderhold Hall, the Ramsey Center, the River's Crossing building and its annex, and a part of the Physical Education building.

The College provides undergraduate and graduate classes across the state, but primarily in central and north Georgia. The University will soon acquire a satellite teaching campus in Gwinnett County. The College expects to play a primary teaching role at the new Gwinnett Center.

Consistent with the strategic plan of the University and the mission of the College, it has been proposed that a new building, consisting of 150,000 square feet, be built adjacent to Aderhold Hall. The primary purpose of this building will be to bring together in one highly visible place all of the College's departments, programs, and projects that provide service and outreach to the community and citizens of the state of Georgia.

Aderhold Hall was built almost thirty years ago and the design of the building was not very progressive. It is a brick rectangular-shaped building with seven floors and approximately 200,000 square feet of usable space. It is proposed that the appearance of Aderhold Hall be changed by enclosing the lower three or four floors of the building with more architecturally pleasing addition. This would provide the additional classroom and office space needed by the College to accommodate the increased enrollment growth planned for the University and for the College.

School of Environmental Design

The School of Environmental Design, founded in 1969, is the newest of the schools at the University of Georgia. It is the largest landscape architecture school in the country. The School offers a five-year Bachelor degree in Landscape Architecture and Masters degrees in Landscape Architecture and in Historical Preservation. There is currently discussion of adding a four-year Bachelor of Environmental Design degree. This four-year option will increase the number of students in the School of Environmental Design.

The existing student body in the School of Environmental Design is not all able to be assigned individual studio desks which is critical for the Design Laboratory Experience. The expected increase in the number of students will exacerbate the student desk shortage. The School of Environmental Design is looking toward having students bring prescribed computers for AutoCAD use. This would require desks and tables to be wired for computer ports and would require an ability to secure the computers and studios.

The School is looking at creating a Center for Community Design and Preservation which will function as both the School's service outreach arm and as a research function for the faculty.

College of Family and Consumer Sciences

The College of Family and Consumer Sciences, established in 1933, is comprised of four departments: Child and Family Development; Foods and Nutrition; Housing and Consumer Economics; and Textiles, Merchandising, and Interiors. The main building is Dawson Hall, but faculty and staff are housed over ten campus buildings, including McPhaul Center, Boyd Graduate Studies, River's Crossing Building, Hoke Smith, Barrow Hall and a cluster of four houses now converted to offices.

As a result of over 20% increase in undergraduate enrollment in recent years, and signific ant growth in research and outreach programs, the need for lecture halls, classrooms, seminar rooms, laboratories, and offices is very pressing. An expansion of Dawson Hall to centralize departmental activities and increase student interaction with faculty would enhance the program.

Advances in technology both in teaching and research have dramatically changed the discipline. The College's ability to perform research to benefit Georgia's economy (e.g., textiles and environmental studies) and to enhance the well-being of individuals, families, and communities (e.g., nutrition, housing, and parenting studies) requires greatly expanded facilities. The College extends the knowledge it generates to the State through its Extension and other outreach programs. The outreach program would be strengthened if all faculty were located in close proximity within departments with necessary support systems.

School of Forest Resources

The School of Forest Resources was founded in 1906 and has over 500 students enrolled. The School occupies four buildings. It moved into its most recent building in 1992. The School also has over 22,600 acres of land off-campus including 700 acres at Whitehall Forest and 11,000 acres at Bishop F. Grant Memorial Forest.

The School of Forest Resources is one of the top three Forestry programs in the country and delivers programs both over the Internet and through distance learning services. These are in response to a commitment from the School to provide life-long learning opportunities. Presently the School does not have its own Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System (GSAMS) site, which it sees as necessary in the future to continue to provide classes at distant and corporate locations. Future growth in the School is predicted to be largely in graduate and continuing education.

The field of Forest Resources is evolving toward more bio-research in laboratories, necessitating an increase in laboratory space. There is a trend toward lecture classes in Forest Resources having more of a quantitative aspect requiring more use of computers and connectivity of classrooms.

Graduate School

The Graduate School is located on the fifth floor of Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center. The Graduate School, founded in 1910, is comprised of office space. Graduate students take classes and do research within their various departments. For this reason the Graduate School has relationships with colleges and departments in all the areas of the campus. The Graduate School reports to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and has close interactions with the Office of the Vice President for Research. The latter is located near the Graduate School in Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center. Communication with the colleges and departments around campus is primarily electronic.

The Graduate School funds around 325 students through competitive university-wide assistantships. The Graduate School also funds the travel of senior graduate students who present their findings at national professional conferences. Graduate assistantships at the University of Georgia range from one-third to one-half time.

College of Journalism and Mass Communication

The College of Journalism and Mass Communication was founded in 1915 and moved into the current building in 1969. It is the only accredited Journalism program in the state. Students in the College of Journalism and Mass Communication are required to have a minor or cognate. This reflects the need to learn Journalism technique, but also the need to learn content. The College needs to be near the College of Business and the College of Arts and Sciences so students in Journalism can take classes in Business, Speech Communications, English, Political Science, and History.

Space allocated to the Journalism program in the Journalism Building is both inadequate and in many cases outdated for current programs. The College needs more space for classrooms, seminar rooms, computer laboratories, offices, and storage. Newer laboratories are set up more like news rooms and offices than classrooms. Media is switching more to digital formats. As industry technology equipment has become more compact and portable, instruction in some areas of Journalism is more mobile and less restricted to particular laboratories or studios. However, this does little to diminish the significant need for substantial renovation of a number of facilities for instruction in editing, design and graphics, and layout which must be done inhouse.

School of Law

The School of Law, founded in 1859, includes the Law School Building, Law Library Annex, and Dean Rusk Hall. Continuing Legal Education is located off-campus in an antebellum house which belonged to the first Georgia Chief Justice. Courses for Continuing Legal Education are held at the Georgia Center and elsewhere around the state of Georgia.

The Law School has 650 to 675 students and is one of four law schools in the state. There is a declining demand for legal education nationwide. There is no predicted expansion of the enrollment in the Law School. Predicted growth in the Law School will be in the Law Library. It is anticipated that the Library will gain 6,000 volumes per year for the next three years and after three years will gain 10,000 volumes per year. While the Law Library uses and will continue to increase use of electronic formats, the Library can not use the electronic formats to replace law books. Even with technology and electronic formats, book publishing has increased, and law students will still need to learn how to use law books.

College of Pharmacy

The College of Pharmacy was founded in 1903 and currently has between 400 and 440 professional students and 70 to 80 graduate students in its programs. The College offers a Doctor of Pharmacy degree which involves two years of pre-pharmacy followed by four years of study in the College of Pharmacy. It offers both the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees. It is likely the College will also offer a four-year Bachelor of Science in Pharmaceutical Sciences degree requiring two years of study in the College of Pharmacy. This new degree would be a pre-health

sciences/health professions degree.

The College of Pharmacy has an innovative curriculum which includes problem-based learning and distance learning. The College is one of the greatest distance education users on campus. Classes are linked between the campus and the Medical College of Georgia. A distance learning program to deliver a Doctor of Pharmacy degree program to practicing pharmacists throughout the state has been initiated.

The College of Pharmacy needs its security considered as part of the campus master planning process. Security is needed for drugs and pharmaceuticals in the buildings.

School of Social Work

The School of Social Work was founded in 1964 and enrollment is strong. Growth in this unit is limited by admissions levels. There are 700 applicants for the 90 students who are admitted to the graduate program. The School of Social Work could grow if space permitted. Increased growth would allow the School to better respond to the state's needs. There is a large demand for Social Work education in the state. Until two years ago the only Social Work program in Georgia was at the University of Georgia. Now there are two other programs in the state and third one scheduled to open in 1998. Demand is expected to exceed supply for Social Work jobs into the next century.

The School of Social Work is located in Tucker Hall on East Campus Drive. The College of Education vacated the space it was using in Tucker Hall and renovations have begun to enable the School of Social Work to use all of the building. Renovations will provide two large classrooms, two seminar rooms, and office space for adjunct faculty, new faculty, and doctoral teaching assistants. Even with use of the entire building, the School will still not have communal spaces or space for collaborative work with community agencies. Tucker Hall provides a good location, but will not accommodate growth.

College of Veterinary Medicine

Growth in the College of Veterinary Medicine is related more to growth of research and expansion of the profession than to increased enrollment. Slight increase in enrollment may occur within the limits of current resources. The College would like to increase interactivity between the College, other scientists and programs on campus.

The College of Veterinary Medicine, founded in 1946, is a source of new veterinary technology in the state. The Teaching Hospital serves as the ultimate referral center for animal health care in the region, reaching beyond state lines. Public traffic to and from the Teaching Hospital must be readily accessible from main highways into Athens. The physical facilities utilized by the Teaching Hospital are inadequate, and a new building of considerably larger size is needed. Expansion of research facilities must be planned. The new Animal Health Research Center, scheduled to open in 1998, will be for research in highly infectious and hazardous materials. The new facility is predicted to increase the growth of the College by attracting more talented research scientists. The trend toward corporate practice in the field of veterinary medicine is predicted to increase the number of second referrals and the number of veterinarians practicing specialties. The College of Veterinary Medicine needs its security considered as part of the campus master planning process. Veterinary Medicine schools have been the targets of extremists. Security is needed for animal laboratories as well as for students and faculty.

For the fall quarter 1996, total enrollment at the University of Georgia was 29,400. This figure is projected to increase, by the year 2002, to a total of 32,500 ("Institutional Enrollment Targets and Ranges - Fall 1998 through Fall 2002"). This calculates to an overall increase of around 10.5 percent from Fall 1996.

Year	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
University of Georgia	30,388	30,838	31,288	31,838	32,500
Total					

Projected Student Enrollments - Fall 1998 to 2002

1.2 Continuing Education

Continuing Education will continue to play a large and crucial role at the University of Georgia since the reputation of the University is affected by the long-term success of its graduates. The University's commitment to continuing education is reflected in the success of the Georgia Center for Continuing Education. The Georgia Center for Continuing Education is the focal point for the University's continuing education efforts. The Georgia Center serves more than 200,000 people annually through its workshops, training sessions, and seminars offered on campus and throughout the state via distance education.

There has been an increase in the growth of life-long learning and continuing education programs due to improved distance learning delivery methods. The increase in distance and electronic delivery will affect continuing education programs for practicing professionals such as those provided by the Colleges of Veterinary Medicine, Pharmacy, and Business. It is predicted that all University units will become more involved in continuing education.

The use of distance learning has allowed continuing education to become increasingly more individualized and flexible. Continuing education programs have become larger and more successful as they have used distance learning as a delivery method. These programs have created a need for more technology equipment, electronic communication methods, connectivity, and infrastructure. This will continue to be the case in the future as continuing education provides a combination of services using Internet, distance learning, corporate locations. If the University doesn't respond to the need for distance and life-long learning, private industry will. Regardless of direction or system of delivery continuing education programs will need to be supported with adequate equipment and faculty. They will need to become more collaborative and interdisciplinary and include public-private collaborations and programs.

1.3 Research and Service

The University of Georgia mission includes a commitment to three areas – teaching, research, service. Each college and school at the University has a service and outreach program. As a

research university all the colleges and schools and many faculty are actively involved in research. Service and research enable the University to use its resources to improve the quality of life in the state. Both public service and research have been and are expected to remain a high priority.

2.0 SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS TO TARGET YEARS

This section will cover student enrollment assumptions, faculty and staffing projections, academic space needs and academic support facility requirements for the University of Georgia.

2.1 Student Enrollment Assumptions

Projected enrollments were made to the target year 2002 assuming most colleges and schools would reflect the same 10.5% overall growth as the University as a whole. The exceptions were to the College of Arts and Sciences which is predicted to grow at a slightly greater percentage (11.5%) than the University as a whole and the School of Law which is predicted to remain at the current enrollment level. The enrollment growth projections for the year 2002 were applied to the fall 1996 enrollment figure of 29,404. This calculation produced a 2002 target year enrollment of 32,500. The 32,500 enrollment is the enrollment from "Institutional Enrollment Targets and Ranges - Fall 1998 through Fall 2002" approved by the University System of Georgia Board of Regents.

Projections were then made to the year 2007 using a 19% overall increase, a 20% increase in the College of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Law remaining at the current level. This produced a 2007 target year enrollment of 35,000. The following table illustrates current and expected enrollments by school or college. The table includes undergraduate, professional, and graduate enrollments.

University of Georgia Enrollment															
College		Fall 1996 Projected 2002						Projected 2007							
_	Undgrad	1st Prof	Grad	Total	% Univ Tot	Undgrad	1st Prof	Grad	Total	% Univ Tot	Undgrad	1st Prof	Grad	Total	% Univ Tot
Ag & Env. Studies	1,340		305	1,645	6%	1,481		337	1,818	6%	1,595		363	1,958	6%
Arts & Sciences	12,208		1,906	14,114	48%	13,558		2,117	15,674	48%	14,650		2,282	16,932	48%
Business	3,906		354	4,260	14%	4,316		391	4,707	14%	4,648		421	5,069	14%
Education	2,625		1,958	4,583	16%	2,901		2,164	5,064	16%	3,124		2,330	5,454	16%
Env. Design	346		101	447	2%	382		112	494	2%	412		120	532	2%
Fam. & Cns. Sciences	801		113	914	3%	885		125	1,010	3%	953		134	1,088	3%
Forest Resources	174	223	122	519	2%	192	246	135	573	2%	207	265	145	618	2%
Journalism		674	119	793	3%		745	131	876	3%		802	142	944	3%
Law		640	28	668	2%		640	28	668	2%		640	28	668	2%
Pharmacy		361	65	426	1%		399	72	471	1%		430	77	507	1%
Social Work	46	150	273	469	2%	51	166	302	518	2%	55	179	325	558	2%
Vet. Medicine		316	74	390	1%		349	82	431	1%		376	88	464	1%
Cont. Education		176		176	1%		194		194	1%		209		209	1%
Total Univ. Enrollment	21,446	2,540	5,418	29,404	100%	23,766	2,739	5,994	32,500	100%	25,643	2,901	6,456	35,000	100%

2.2 Faculty and Staff Projections

Academic faculty and staff positions at the University of Georgia totaled 8,049 as of spring of 1997. Staffing projections were made using the same percentage increase in academic faculty and staff as were used for student enrollment projections to the target years 2002 and 2007. These projections produced a total increase in academic faculty and staff to 8,796 in the year 2002 and to 9,428 in the year 2007. Distance learning needs are not projected to have an impact on the number of faculty or staff.

The total number of students, faculty and staff are represented in the table below. Detailed tables of faculty and staff projections as well as a faculty to student ratio table follow.

Projected Student and Staff Populations - 1997 to 2007									
Year	1997	2002	2007						
Students	29 404	32 500	35 000						
Faculty/Staff	8,049	8,796	9,428						
Total	37,453	41,296	44,428						

Section 2: Existing Faculty and Staff Populations

Base Year 1996*	Staffing Type														TOTAL
		Assoc.	Admin			Asst.		Lecturer/			Graduate			Student	
School	Dean (VP)	Dean		Chair	Director	Dir.	Faculty	Adjunct	Professional	Technical	Assistant	Clerical	Worker	Worker	
Ag & Env Std	1	5		8	2		209	4	62	188	212	108	51	188	1,038
Art & Sci	1	5	2	27	17	2	645	109	125	189	1,048	108	5	225	2,508
Business	1	1		5	3	1	94	10	39	15	185	25	2	39	420
Devl Studies			1		3	1	13	3	46	2	9	5	2	24	109
Educ	1	1	4	19	9	2	205	14	191	48	279	58	2	38	871
Env Design	1				1		22	3	3	3	20	5		1	59
Fam & Cns Sci	1	2		4	2		52	2	84	31	85	45	7	38	353
Forest Res	1	1	1				41	2	24	61	81	9	10	21	252
Journalism	1	1		3	3	1	28	6	18	4	30	12		5	112
Law	1	2	5		7	4	35	1	46	13	5	34	4	39	196
Military Sci							2		11	6		2			21
Pharmacy	1	2	2	4			38	1	16	15	52	17	2	8	158
Social Work	1	1	1		1		21	2	15	3	59	6		4	114
Vet Med	1	2	1	8	5		92	5	63	178	40	27	25	119	566
VP Acad Aff	2	2	6		15	17	9	3	117	98	322	54	10	163	818
VP Research	1		6		13	1	7		64	135	88	39	29	71	454
TOTAL	15	25	29	78	81	228	1,513	165	924	989	2,515	554	149	983	8,049

*Staffing data snapshot as of Spring 1997

Section 2: Future Faculty and Staff Populations 2002

Target Year 2002	Staffing Type														TOTAL
		Assoc.	Exec./					Lecturer/			Graduate			Student	
School	Dean (VP)	Dean	Admin.	Chair	Director	Asst. Dir.	Faculty	Adjunct	Professional	Technical	Assistant	Clerical	Worker	Worker	
Ag & Env Std	1	5		8	2		221	4	65	202	233	109	55	205	1,110
Art & Sci	1	6	2	27	17	2	716	116	136	208	1,169	116	5	250	2,771
Business	1	1		5	3	1	104	10	43	16	205	27	2	42	460
Devl Studies			1		3	1	14	3	51	2	10	6	2	27	120
Educ	1	1	4	22	9	2	228	15	211	53	308	64	2	43	963
Env Design	1				1		24	3	3	3	22	6		1	64
Fam & Cns Sci	1	2		4	2		57	2	91	34	94	48	8	42	385
Forest Res	1	1	1				45	2	27	67	90	9	11	23	277
Journalism	1	1		3	3	1	31	7	20	4	33	13		6	123
Law	1	2	5		7	4	35	1	46	13	5	34	4	39	196
Military Sci							2		11	6		2			21
Pharmacy	1	2	2	4			43	1	17	16	57	18	2	9	172
Social Work	1	1	1		1		23	2	17	3	65	7		4	125
Vet Med	1	2	1	8	5		101	5	69	197	43	28	29	129	618
VP Acad Aff	2	2	6		15	17	10	3	129	108	312	58	11	223	896
VP Research	1		6		13	1	8		71	148	96	41	31	79	495
TOTAL	15	26	29	81	81	232	1,662	174	1,007	1,080	2,742	586	162	1,122	8,796

Section 2: Future Faculty and Staff Populations 2007

Target Year 2007	Staffing Type														TOTAL
		Assoc.	Exec./					Lecturer/			Graduate			Student	
School	Dean (VP)	Dean	Admin.	Chair	Director	Asst. Dir.	Faculty	Adjunct	Professional	Technical	Assistant	Clerical	Worker	Worker	
Ag & Env Std	1	5		8	2		233	4	71	215	250	116	57	219	1,181
Art & Sci	1	6	2	27	18	2	766	126	147	223	1,247	125	5	276	2,971
Business	1	1		5	4	1	111	10	45	17	221	29	2	47	494
Devl Studies			1		3	1	15	3	55	2	11	6	2	29	128
Educ	1	1	4	23	11	2	244	17	227	57	332	70	2	45	1,036
Env Design	1				1		26	4	4	4	24	6		1	71
Fam & Cns Sci	1	2		5	2		62	2	96	37	101	51	8	45	412
Forest Res	1	1	1				48	2	29	73	97	11	12	25	300
Journalism	1	1		4	4	1	33	7	21	5	36	14		6	133
Law	1	2	5		7	4	35	1	46	13	5	34	4	39	196
Military Sci							2		11	6		2			21
Pharmacy	1	2	2	4			45	1	19	17	61	19	2	9	182
Social Work	1	1	1		1		25	2	18	4	70	7		5	135
Vet Med	1	2	1	8	5		111	5	75	211	46	33	29	140	667
VP Acad Aff	2	2	7		16	20	10	4	140	115	338	62	12	236	964
VP Research	1		6		15	1	8		75	162	104	47	34	84	537
TOTAL	15	26	30	84	89	244	1,774	188	1,079	1,161	2,943	632	169	1,206	9,428

Faculty to student ratios averaged 1:17.1 for the fall of 1996 and increased to 1:17.3 when projected at the target year 2002. At the target year 2007 the projected faculty to student ratios show a 1:17.5 average.

	Faculty/Student	Ratio	Summary
--	-----------------	-------	---------

Year	Faculty*	Enrollment	# of Students per Faculty
1997	1,719	29,404	17.1
2002	1,877	32,500	17.3
2007	2,004	35,000	17.5

*Includes chair and lecturer/adjunct positions

2.3 Academic Space Projections

This section will summarize the current and projected academic space need by academic and academic support function. Fall 1996 course files, along with spring 1997 facility inventory files and staffing data, were assembled by the consultant for use in projecting base and target year space needs. The enrollment and staffing assumptions presented earlier in this document for the target years 2002 and 2007 were used to project target year space needs by space type and are contained in the base and target years space needs analysis summary tables that follow. The following is a brief summary of the findings for the base and target years for each individual space type. A more detailed explanation of guideline applications and results is contained further in this section.

2.3.1 Base Year - 1996

At fall 1996 enrollment levels (21,446 undergraduate, 7,958 graduate students) and spring 1997 staffing figures, the University of Georgia shows a need for an additional 2,402,592 assignable square feet (ASF) of space. This is a 32% increase to existing space. Assignable square footage is defined as the usable space inside classrooms, laboratories, offices, etc. It does not include circulation and building service space or the thickness of walls. The all-inclusive space category, gross square feet (GSF), is used in campus master plan project lists. For most types of space, gross square footage is 25% to 40% more than assignable square footage.

- The guideline assumption for Classroom space indicates an existing deficit of 15,490 assignable square feet. This is a 6% deficit.
- Teaching Laboratory analysis shows a 53% deficit, or 103,929 ASF in the base year.
- The Open Laboratories category shows a slight deficit of 5,880 ASF, or 3%.
- In the base year the Research Laboratories category shows a deficit of 14%, or 107,563 ASF.
- Academic Office space shows a base year deficit of 69,169 ASF or 7% of existing space.
- Administrative Office space shows a base year deficit of 108,719 ASF or 33% of existing space.
- Library space at the University of Georgia shows a base year need for 162,908 ASF or a 38% increase over total existing library space of 425,050 ASF.
- Indoor Recreation and Physical Education space calculations result in a need of 42,494 ASF or 17% of existing space in the base year.
- Athletic space does not lend itself to guideline analysis. For this category it was assumed that all existing space is needed and therefore carried forward as the base year guideline space.
- The Assembly and Exhibit space category shows a deficit of 8,921 ASF or 5%.
- Student Union space shows a need of 137,512 ASF or a 108% increase to existing student center space.
- Central Computer space indicates a surplus of 2,498 ASF or 8% of existing space.
- Physical Plant category shows a surplus of 16% or 55,838 ASF at the base year.
- The Vehicle Storage and Parking category does not lend itself to guideline analysis. For this category it was assumed that all existing space is needed and therefore carried forward as the base year guideline space. Separate analysis is being done to determine needs for additional parking structures.
- The other Academic Department space category shows a deficit of 16,526 ASF or 3% of existing space.
- Other Administrative Department space indicates a need of 31,817 ASF or 12% of existing space.
- Residence Life space shows a deficit of 1,650,000 ASF or 103% of existing space at the base year. The University of Georgia set a target of housing capacity to equal the total number of freshman and sophomore students on campus. This recent policy has driven the guideline calculation and the existing deficit.

2.3.2 Target Year - 2002

At target year 2002 enrollment levels (total enrollment of 32,500) and projected staffing increases, the University of Georgia shows a campus-wide need for an additional 3,248,071 assignable square feet (ASF) of space or 43%. While guideline application produces space deficits in all categories of space at the target year 2002, categories with major (over 50%) additional guideline space needs include Teaching Laboratories, Library, Student Union, and Residence Life.

- The Classroom space category shows a target year deficit of 15% or 41,841 ASF of space.
- Analysis of Teaching Laboratory space indicates a need of 127,225 ASF or 65% at target year enrollments.
- The Open Laboratory space category has a need of 25,709 ASF of space or a 14% increase.

- The Research Laboratories category shows a projected need of 191,643 ASF or 25% at the target year 2002.
- For the Academic Office category, target year guideline application produces a deficit of 156,809 ASF or 17%.
- At the target year the Administrative Office category shows a deficit of 40% or 132,029 ASF.
- Library space at the University of Georgia shows a target year need of 240,727 ASF or a 57% increase over projected library and service space.
- Indoor Recreation and Physical Education space shows a projected need of 73,177 ASF at the target year level. This is a 30% increase from projected space.
- Athletics space does not lend itself to guideline analysis. For this category it was assumed that all existing space is needed and therefore carried forward as the target year guideline space.
- The Assembly and Exhibit space guideline application projects a deficit of 27,497 ASF or 17% at the target year 2002.
- Student Union space shows a target year space need of 165,376 ASF or a 130% increase over projected student union space.
- Central Computer space indicates a need of 598 ASF or only 2% so appears to be in relative balance at the target year 2002.
- Physical Plant shows a surplus of 11% or 38,568 ASF at the target year.
- The Vehicle Storage and Parking category does not lend itself to guideline analysis. For this category it was assumed that all existing space is needed and therefore carried forward as the target year guideline space. Separate analysis is being done to determine needs for additional parking structures.
- Other Academic Department space shows a need for an increase of 13% or 78,037 ASF at the target year 2002.
- Other Administrative Department space category projects a deficit of 17% or 45,972 ASF at the target year.
- At the target year Residence Life guideline analysis indicates a deficit of 1,980,000 ASF or 124%. The target housing capacity, set to equal to the total number of freshman and sophomore students on campus, has driven the guideline calculation and the target year deficit.

The summary tables by space type follow for the base year and the target year 2002.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE TOTALS

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent	Guideline
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/	Gross
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)	Square Ft
TOTAL SPACE					
Classroom & Service	280,037	295,527	(15,490)	(6%)	443,291
Teaching Labs & Service	195,914	299,843	(103,929)	(53%)	479,749
Open Labs & Service	190,307	196,187	(5,880)	(3%)	313,899
Research Labs & Service	761,427	868,990	(107,563)	(14%)	1,477,283
Academic Offices & Service	944,264	1,013,433	(69,169)	(7%)	1,520,149
Administrative Offices & Service	331,680	440,399	(108,719)	(33%)	660,599
Library	425,050	587,958	(162,908)	(38%)	823,141
Physical Education & Recreation	243,944	286,438	(42,494)	(17%)	343,726
Athletics	258,082	258,082	0	0%	309,698
Assembly & Exhibit	164,953	173,874	(8,921)	(5%)	243,424
Student Union	127,124	264,636	(137,512)	(108%)	370,490
Central Computer	31,402	28,904	2,498	8%	43,356
Physical Plant	344,517	288,679	55,838	16%	346,414
Vehicle Storage/Parking*	740,024	740,024	0	0%	888,029
Other Academic Department Space	592,498	609,024	(16,526)	(3%)	913,536
Other Admn Department Space	267,082	298,899	(31,817)	(12%)	448,349
Residence Life**	1,603,233	3,253,233	(1,650,000)	(103%)	4,879,850
TOTAL SPACE SUBTOTAL	7,501,538	9,904,130	(2,402,592)	(32%)	14,504,983

*Separate analysis is being done to determine needs for additional parking structures.

**Space includes residential facilities for President's House (12,048 ASF) and Cont Ed Ctr (47,757).

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent	Guideline
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/	Proj Gross
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)	Square Ft
TOTAL SPACE					
Classroom & Service	278,612	320,453	(41,841)	(15%)	480,679
Teaching Labs & Service	195,914	323,139	(127,225)	(65%)	517,022
Open Labs & Service	190,307	216,016	(25,709)	(14%)	345,625
Research Labs & Service	761,427	953,070	(191,643)	(25%)	1,620,219
Academic Offices & Service	944,264	1,101,073	(156,809)	(17%)	1,651,609
Administrative Offices & Service	331,680	463,709	(132,029)	(40%)	695,564
Library	425,050	665,777	(240,727)	(57%)	932,088
Physical Education & Recreation	243,944	317,121	(73,177)	(30%)	380,545
Athletics	258,082	258,082	0	0%	309,698
Assembly & Exhibit	164,953	192,450	(27,497)	(17%)	269,430
Student Union	127,124	292,500	(165,376)	(130%)	409,500
Central Computer	31,402	32,000	(598)	(2%)	48,000
Physical Plant	344,517	305,949	38,568	11%	367,139
Vehicle Storage/Parking*	740,024	740,024	0	0%	888,029
Other Academic Department Space	592,498	670,535	(78,037)	(13%)	1,005,803
Other Admn Department Space	267,082	313,054	(45,972)	(17%)	469,582
Residence Life**	1,603,233	3,583,233	(1,980,000)	(124%)	5,374,850
TOTAL SPACE SUBTOTAL	7,500,113	10,748,184	(3,248,071)	(43%)	15,765,380

*Separate analysis is being done to determine needs for additional parking structures.

**Space includes residential facilities for President's House (12,048 ASF) and Cont Ed Ctr (47,757).

2.3.3 Target Year - 2007

At target year 2007 enrollment levels (total enrollment of 35,000) and projected staffing increases, the University of Georgia shows a campus-wide need for an additional 3,829,817 ASF or 51%. While guideline application produces space deficits in all categories of space at the target year, categories with major (over 50%) additional guideline space needs include Teaching Laboratories, Library, Student Union, and Residence Life.

- The Classroom space category indicates a target year deficit of 65,017 ASF or 23%.
- Teaching Laboratory analysis shows a need of 152,186 ASF of space or 78% at target year 2007 enrollments.
- The Open Laboratory space category has a need of 25,709 ASF or a 14% increase.

- The Research Laboratories category shows a projected need of 257,303 ASF or 34% at the target year 2007.
- The Academic Office target year 2007 guideline application produces a deficit of 233,689 ASF of space or 25%.
- The Administrative Office target year guideline indicates a deficit of 150,839 ASF or 45%.
- Library space at the University of Georgia shows a target year 2007 need of 310,940 ASF or a 73% increase.
- Indoor Recreation and Physical Education space shows a projected need of 97,996 ASF at the target year level. This is a 40% increase from projected space.
- Athletics space does not lend itself to guideline analysis. For this category it was assumed that all existing space is needed and therefore carried forward as the target year guideline space.
- The Assembly and Exhibit space guideline application indicates a deficit of 42,497 ASF or 26% at the target year 2007.
- Student Union space shows a target year space need of 187,876 ASF or a 148% increase over projected student union space.
- Central Computer space indicates a need of 3,098 ASF or 10% at the target year.
- Physical Plant shows a surplus of 6% or 21,342 ASF at the target year.
- The Vehicle Storage and Parking category does not lend itself to guideline analysis. For this category it was assumed that all existing space is needed and therefore carried forward as the target year guideline space. Separate analysis is being done to determine needs for additional parking structures.
- Other Academic Department space shows a need for an increase of 13% or 78,037 ASF at the target year.
- The Other Administrative Department space category indicates a deficit of 45,972 ASF or 17% at the target year.
- Residence Life guideline analysis shows a deficit of 137% or 2,200,000 ASF. The target housing capacity, set to equal to the total number of freshman and sophomore students on campus, has driven the guideline calculation and the target year deficit.

The summary table by space type follows for the target year 2007.

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent	Guideline
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/	Proj Gross
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)	Square Ft
TOTAL SPACE					
Classroom & Service	278,612	343,629	(65,017)	(23%)	515,444
Teaching Labs & Service	195,914	348,100	(152,186)	(78%)	556,960
Open Labs & Service	190,307	216,016	(25,709)	(14%)	345,625
Research Labs & Service	761,427	1,018,730	(257,303)	(34%)	1,731,841
Academic Offices & Service	944,264	1,177,953	(233,689)	(25%)	1,766,929
Administrative Offices & Service	331,680	482,519	(150,839)	(45%)	723,779
Library	425,050	735,990	(310,940)	(73%)	1,030,386
Physical Education & Recreation	243,944	341,940	(97,996)	(40%)	410,329
Athletics	258,082	258,082	0	0%	309,698
Assembly & Exhibit	164,953	207,450	(42,497)	(26%)	290,430
Student Union	127,124	315,000	(187,876)	(148%)	441,000
Central Computer	31,402	34,500	(3,098)	(10%)	51,750
Physical Plant	344,517	323,175	21,342	6%	387,810
Vehicle Storage/Parking*	740,024	740,024	0	0%	888,029
Other Academic Department Space	592,498	670,535	(78,037)	(13%)	1,005,803
Other Admn Department Space	267,082	313,054	(45,972)	(17%)	469,582
Residence Life**	1,603,233	3,803,233	(2,200,000)	(137%)	5,704,850
TOTAL SPACE SUBTOTAL	7,500,113	11,329,930	(3,829,817)	(51%)	16,630,242

*Separate analysis is being done to determine needs for additional parking structures.

**Space includes residential facilities for President's House (12,048 ASF) and Cont Ed Ctr (47,757).

2.4 Findings by Major Academic and Administrative Units

The following section of this report provides summaries of key findings by major unit. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Research have been grouped with academic units since these units have significant amounts of research space that report directly to them.

Classrooms which are centrally scheduled are shown with the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Some classrooms are scheduled by the various units and are shown with the space for the particular unit. Due to the bulk of classroom space being centrally scheduled rather than assigned through the various units, the Space Needs Analysis Summary Table for the Vice President for Academic Affairs indicates a large classroom surplus and many academic units show deficits for classroom space. Totals without classroom space have been included at the bottom of the unit tables so the needs for laboratory, office, and other space can be seen without distortion from the classroom "deficits." The classroom "deficits" are helpful when doing space planning for individual units, since they show each unit's need for access to classroom space. In some instances courses may have been taught in rooms, such as meeting rooms or conference rooms, not designated as classrooms. As a result some units may indicate a greater classroom space deficit than is actually needed.

2.4.1 Academic Units Base Year and Target Year 2002

The guideline application for academic units shows a deficit of 313,791 ASF or 11% at the existing enrollment. At the target year 2002 enrollment a 21% need for additional space is shown; this is 621,692 ASF. The difference in the amount of existing space for classrooms and service from the base year to the target year is due to renovations of space which were occurring in the base year in the College of Business and School of Social Work. The Academic Space Needs Summary Tables include the Law Library as it reports directly to an academic unit. Following the academic space needs summaries below are Academic Space Needs Analysis Summary Tables for each major Academic unit.

College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences

Guideline application without classrooms shows this unit having a deficit at the base year of 14,859 ASF or 3%. At the target year the total without classrooms indicates a deficit of 63,130 ASF or 11%.

College of Arts and Sciences

At the base year guideline application without classrooms shows this unit having a surplus of 3% or 31,554 ASF. At the target year 2002 the total without classrooms projects a deficit of 63,161 ASF or 7%. The category of space having the largest deficit in the College of Arts and Sciences at the target year is Teaching Laboratory space.

College of Business

The College of Business guideline application without classrooms shows a deficit at the base year of 2,087 ASF or 3%. At the target year the total without classrooms shows a deficit of 13% or 7,842 ASF.

Developmental Studies

Guideline application at the base year without classrooms indicates Developmental Studies has a deficit of 9,503 ASF or 75%. The total without classrooms at the target year projects a deficit of 11,721 ASF or 92%.

College of Education

Guideline application without classrooms for the College of Education calculates a deficit at the base year of 16% or 27,041 ASF. The total without classrooms at the target year shows a deficit of 47,500 ASF or 28%. The category of space having the largest deficit in the College of Education at the target year is Research Laboratory space.

School of Environmental Design

At the base year guideline application without classrooms shows this unit having a deficit of 14% or 4,894 ASF. At the target year the total without classrooms indicates a deficit of 8,194 ASF or 24%.

College of Family and Consumer Sciences

At the base year guideline application without classrooms for the College of Family and Consumer Sciences indicates a deficit of 23,423 ASF or 31%. At the target year the total without classrooms projects a deficit of 43% or 32,584 ASF.

School of Forest Resources

The School of Forest Resources guideline application without classrooms shows a deficit at the base year of 36,845 ASF or 60%. The total without classrooms at the target year projects a deficit of 45,796 ASF or 74%. At the target year Research Laboratory space is the category which shows the largest deficit in the School of Forest Resources.

College of Journalism and Mass Communication

Guideline application without classrooms shows this unit having a deficit at the base year of 20% or 7,830 ASF. At the target year the total without classrooms shows a deficit of 11,971 ASF or 31%.

School of Law

At the base year guideline application without classrooms shows this unit having a deficit of 18% or 15,850 ASF. The total without classrooms at the target year indicates a deficit of 24,085 ASF or 27%. The Academic Space Needs Summary Tables for the School of Law include the Law Library, as it reports directly to the School. Guideline space for the Law Library was calculated as a proportion of the total campus library space needs.

Military Science

Guideline application without classrooms shows this unit having a surplus at the base year of 4,679 ASF or 34%. At the target year the total without classrooms projects a surplus of 30% or 4,108 ASF.

College of Pharmacy

The College of Pharmacy guideline application without classrooms shows a deficit at the base year of 25,000 ASF or 40%. The total without classrooms at the target year indicates a deficit of 53% or 33,088 ASF. The category of space having the largest deficit in the College of Pharmacy at the target year is Teaching Laboratory space.

School of Social Work

At the base year guideline application without classrooms for this unit indicates a deficit of 3% or 571 ASF. The total without classrooms at the target year shows a deficit of 2,483 ASF or 13%.

College of Veterinary Medicine

Guideline application without classrooms indicates this unit having a deficit at the base year of 104,572 ASF or 34%. At the target year the total without classrooms projects a deficit of

144,163 ASF or 47%. The category of space having the largest deficit in the College of Veterinary Medicine at the target year is Research Laboratory space.

Vice President for Academic Affairs

At the base year guideline application without classrooms shows this unit having a deficit of 17% or 17,509 ASF. At the target year the total without classrooms indicates a deficit of 27,679 ASF or 27%. The centrally scheduled classrooms are shown with this unit while almost all classroom need guidelines are generated within the schools and colleges resulting in a "surplus" finding for this unit when classrooms are included.

Vice President for Research

Guideline application without classrooms for this unit indicates a deficit at the base year of 44,550 ASF or 35%. The total without classrooms at the target year shows a deficit of 47% or 60,562 ASF.

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	280,037	295,527	(15,490)	(6%)
Teaching Labs & Service	195,914	299,843	(103,929)	(53%)
Open Labs & Service	187,351	193,231	(5,880)	(3%)
Research Labs & Service	749,335	837,997	(88,662)	(12%)
Academic Offices & Service	944,264	1,013,433	(69,169)	(7%)
Other Academic Department Space	592,498	609,024	(16,526)	(3%)
Law Library	36,879	51,014	(14,135)	(38%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	2,986,278	3,300,069	(313,791)	(11%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS ACADEMIC SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	278,612	320,453	(41,841)	(15%)
Teaching Labs & Service	195,914	323,139	(127,225)	(65%)
Open Labs & Service	187,351	212,903	(25,552)	(14%)
Research Labs & Service	749,335	920,677	(171,342)	(23%)
Academic Offices & Service	944,264	1,101,073	(156,809)	(17%)
Other Academic Department Space	592,498	670,535	(78,037)	(13%)
Law Library	36,879	57,765	(20,886)	(57%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	2,984,853	3,606,545	(621,692)	(21%)

Note: The difference in classrooms and service space between base and target years is due to renovations.

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	18,123	8,197	9,926	55%
Teaching Labs & Service	17,674	29,597	(11,923)	(67%)
Open Labs & Service	19,463	19,463	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	210,504	183,169	27,335	13%
Academic Offices & Service	115,507	135,090	(19,583)	(17%)
Other Academic Dept Space	204,474	215,162	(10,688)	(5%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	585,745	590,677	(4,932)	(1%)
Total Without Classrooms	567,622	582,481	(14,859)	(3%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	18,123	8,894	9,229	51%
Teaching Labs & Service	17,674	31,600	(13,926)	(79%)
Open Labs & Service	19,463	21,507	(2,044)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	210,504	197,644	12,860	6%
Academic Offices & Service	115,507	143,370	(27,863)	(24%)
Other Academic Dept Space	204,474	236,632	(32,158)	(16%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	585,745	639,646	(53,901)	(9%)
Total Without Classrooms	567,622	630,752	(63,130)	(11%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	115,960	167,155	(51,195)	(44%)
Teaching Labs & Service	102,661	160,704	(58,043)	(57%)
Open Labs & Service	86,079	91,959	(5,880)	(7%)
Research Labs & Service	338,415	302,280	36,135	11%
Academic Offices & Service	353,439	294,097	59,342	17%
Other Academic Dept Space	78,273	78,273	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	1,074,827	1,094,468	(19,641)	(2%)
Total Without Classrooms	958,867	927,313	31,554	3%

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	115,960	183,453	(67,493)	(58%)
Teaching Labs & Service	102,661	174,542	(71,881)	(70%)
Open Labs & Service	86,079	100,997	(14,918)	(17%)
Research Labs & Service	338,415	336,290	2,125	1%
Academic Offices & Service	353,439	323,707	29,732	8%
Other Academic Dept Space	78,273	86,492	(8,219)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	1,074,827	1,205,481	<u>(130,654)</u>	(12%)
Total Without Classrooms	958,867	1,022,028	(63,161)	(7%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	15,679	38,077	(22,398)	(143%)
Teaching Labs & Service	3,436	6,273	(2,837)	(83%)
Open Labs & Service	858	858	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	2,638	4,280	(1,642)	(62%)
Academic Offices & Service	47,272	44,880	2,392	5%
Other Academic Dept Space	5,538	5,538	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	75,421	99,906	(24,485)	(32%)
Total Without Classrooms	59,742	61,829	(2,087)	(3%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	13,607	41,659	(28,052)	(206%)
Teaching Labs & Service	3,436	6,847	(3,411)	(99%)
Open Labs & Service	858	948	(90)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	2,638	4,760	(2,122)	(80%)
Academic Offices & Service	47,272	48,910	(1,638)	(3%)
Other Academic Dept Space	5,538	6,119	(581)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	73,349	109,243	(35,894)	(49%)
Total Without Classrooms	59,742	67,584	(7,842)	(13%)

	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
DASE TEAN 1990		Assistant	O	
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	376	2,227	(1,851)	(492%)
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	4,975	4,975	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	0	420	(420)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	7,407	16,490	(9,083)	(123%)
Other Academic Dept Space	335	335	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	13,093	24,447	(11,354)	(87%)
Total Without Classrooms	12,717	22,220	(9,503)	(75%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	376	2,397	(2,021)	(537%)
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	4,975	5,497	(522)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	0	460	(460)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	7,407	18,110	(10,703)	(144%)
Other Academic Dept Space	335	370	(35)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	13,093	26,834	(13,741)	(105%)
Total Without Classrooms	12,717	24,438	(11,721)	(92%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	24,160	24,353	(193)	(1%)
Teaching Labs & Service	13,083	22,006	(8,923)	(68%)
Open Labs & Service	19,212	19,212	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	14,897	29,880	(14,983)	(101%)
Academic Offices & Service	113,656	116,791	(3,135)	(3%)
Other Academic Dept Space	11,592	11,592	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	196,600	223,833	(27,233)	(14%)
Total Without Classrooms	172,440	199,481	(27,041)	(16%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	24,160	26,209	(2,049)	(8%)
Teaching Labs & Service	13,083	23,641	(10,558)	(81%)
Open Labs & Service	19,212	21,229	(2,017)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	14,897	33,120	(18,223)	(122%)
Academic Offices & Service	113,656	129,141	(15,485)	(14%)
Other Academic Dept Space	11,592	12,809	(1,217)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	196,600	246,149	(49,549)	(25%)
Total Without Classrooms	172,440	219,940	(47,500)	(28%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	463	1,606	(1,143)	(247%)
Teaching Labs & Service	18,014	17,265	749	4%
Open Labs & Service	4,706	4,706	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	0	4,200	(4,200)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	8,449	9,892	(1,443)	(17%)
Other Academic Dept Space	2,811	2,811	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	34,443	40,480	(6,037)	(18%)
Total Without Classrooms	33,980	38,874	(4,894)	(14%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	463	1,738	(1,275)	(275%)
Teaching Labs & Service	18,014	18,656	(642)	(4%)
Open Labs & Service	4,706	5,200	(494)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	0	4,560	(4,560)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	8,449	10,652	(2,203)	(26%)
Other Academic Dept Space	2,811	3,106	(295)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	34,443	43,913	(9,470)	(27%)
Total Without Classrooms	33,980	42,174	(8,194)	(24%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	7,342	7,567	(225)	(3%)
Teaching Labs & Service	5,278	3,440	1,838	35%
Open Labs & Service	13,218	13,218	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	16,951	24,400	(7,449)	(44%)
Academic Offices & Service	29,901	47,713	(17,812)	(60%)
Other Academic Dept Space	11,269	11,269	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	83,959	107,607	(23,648)	(28%)
Total Without Classrooms	76,617	100,040	(23,423)	(31%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF FAMILY & CONSUMER SCIENCE

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	7,342	8,223	(881)	(12%)
Teaching Labs & Service	5,278	3,700	1,578	30%
Open Labs & Service	13,218	14,606	(1,388)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	16,951	26,800	(9,849)	(58%)
Academic Offices & Service	29,901	51,643	(21,742)	(73%)
Other Academic Dept Space	11,269	12,452	(1,183)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	83,959	117,424	(33,465)	(40%)
Total Without Classrooms	76,617	109,201	(32,584)	(43%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	3,134	2,111	1,023	33%
Teaching Labs & Service	1,622	10,739	(9,117)	(562%)
Open Labs & Service	2,221	2,221	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	20,791	46,500	(25,709)	(124%)
Academic Offices & Service	30,311	32,330	(2,019)	(7%)
Other Academic Dept Space	6,804	6,804	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	64,883	100,705	(35,822)	(55%)
Total Without Classrooms	61,749	98,594	(36,845)	(60%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	3,134	2,289	845	27%
Teaching Labs & Service	1,622	11,583	(9,961)	(614%)
Open Labs & Service	2,221	2,454	(233)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	20,791	51,300	(30,509)	(147%)
Academic Offices & Service	30,311	35,390	(5,079)	(17%)
Other Academic Dept Space	6,804	6,817	(13)	(0%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	64,883	109,834	(44,951)	(69%)
Total Without Classrooms	61,749	107,545	(45,796)	(74%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	736	4,999	(4,263)	(579%)
Teaching Labs & Service	7,135	8,389	(1,254)	(18%)
Open Labs & Service	11,823	11,823	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	774	4,500	(3,726)	(481%)
Academic Offices & Service	13,390	16,240	(2,850)	(21%)
Other Academic Dept Space	5,754	5,754	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	39,612	51,705	(12,093)	(31%)
Total Without Classrooms	38,876	46,706	(7,830)	(20%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	736	5,433	(4,697)	(638%)
Teaching Labs & Service	7,135	8,954	(1,819)	(26%)
Open Labs & Service	11,823	13,064	(1,241)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	774	4,900	(4,126)	(533%)
Academic Offices & Service	13,390	17,570	(4,180)	(31%)
Other Academic Dept Space	5,754	6,358	(604)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	39,612	56,280	(16,668)	(42%)
Total Without Classrooms	38,876	50,847	(11,971)	(31%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	8,839	6,226	2,613	30%
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,505	2,505	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	0	4,080	(4,080)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	36,796	34,432	2,364	6%
Other Academic Dept Space	11,615	11,615	0	0%
Law Library	36,879	51,014	(14,135)	(38%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	96,634	109,871	(13,237)	(14%)
Total Without Classrooms	87,795	103,645	(15,850)	(18%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS SCHOOL OF LAW

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	8,839	6,226	2,613	30%
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,505	2,768	(263)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	0	4,080	(4,080)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	36,796	34,432	2,364	6%
Other Academic Dept Space	11,615	12,835	(1,220)	(11%)
Law Library	36,879	57,765	(20,886)	(57%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	96,634	118,105	(21,471)	(22%)
Total Without Classrooms	87,795	111,880	(24,085)	(27%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	2,892	632	2,260	78%
Teaching Labs & Service	1,218	0	1,218	100%
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	7,110	3,649	3,461	49%
Other Academic Dept Space	5,439	5,439	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	16,659	9,719	6,940	42%
Total Without Classrooms	13,767	9,088	4,679	34%

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS MILITARY SCIENCE

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	2,892	663	2,229	77%
Teaching Labs & Service	1,218	0	1,218	100%
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	7,110	3,649	3,461	49%
Other Academic Dept Space	5,439	6,010	(571)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	16,659	10,322	6,337	38%
Total Without Classrooms	13,767	9,659	4,108	30%

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	2,431	6,543	(4,112)	(169%)
Teaching Labs & Service	1,874	22,260	(20,386)	(1088%)
Open Labs & Service	8,696	8,696	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	23,648	25,500	(1,852)	(8%)
Academic Offices & Service	17,874	20,636	(2,762)	(15%)
Other Academic Dept Space	10,564	10,564	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	65,087	94,199	(29,112)	(45%)
Total Without Classrooms	62,656	87,656	(25,000)	(40%)

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	2,431	7,166	(4,735)	(195%)
Teaching Labs & Service	1,874	24,446	(22,572)	(1204%)
Open Labs & Service	8,696	9,609	(913)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	23,648	27,750	(4,102)	(17%)
Academic Offices & Service	17,874	22,266	(4,392)	(25%)
Other Academic Dept Space	10,564	11,673	(1,109)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	65,087	102,910	(37,823)	(58%)
Total Without Classrooms	62,656	95,744	(33,088)	(53%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	2,464	2,485	(21)	(1%)
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	1,197	1,197	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	0	5,200	(5,200)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	17,005	12,376	4,629	27%
Other Academic Dept Space	1,392	1,392	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	22,058	22,650	(592)	(3%)
Total Without Classrooms	19,594	20,165	(571)	(3%)

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	3,111	2,688	423	14%
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	1,197	1,323	(126)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	0	5,700	(5,700)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	17,005	13,516	3,489	21%
Other Academic Dept Space	1,392	1,538	(146)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	22,705	24,765	(2,060)	(9%)
Total Without Classrooms	19,594	22,077	(2,483)	(13%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	3,913	22,428	(18,515)	(473%)
Teaching Labs & Service	19,794	19,170	624	3%
Open Labs & Service	9,357	9,357	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	55,123	117,750	(62,627)	(114%)
Academic Offices & Service	40,319	82,888	(42,569)	(106%)
Other Academic Dept Space	184,799	184,799	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	313,305	436,392	(123,087)	(39%)
Total Without Classrooms	309,392	413,964	(104,572)	(34%)

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	3,913	22,428	(18,515)	(473%)
Teaching Labs & Service	19,794	19,170	624	3%
Open Labs & Service	9,357	10,339	(982)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	55,123	129,375	(74,252)	(135%)
Academic Offices & Service	40,319	90,468	(50,149)	(124%)
Other Academic Dept Space	184,799	204,203	(19,404)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	313,305	475,984	(162,679)	(52%)
Total Without Classrooms	309,392	453,555	(144,163)	(47%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	73,525	922	72,603	99%
Teaching Labs & Service	4,125	0	4,125	100%
Open Labs & Service	2,179	2,179	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	963	963	0	0%
Administrative Offices & Service	65,890	82,340	(16,450)	(25%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	29,538	34,722	(5,184)	(18%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	176,220	121,126	55,094	31%
Total Without Classrooms	102,695	120,204	(17,509)	(17%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	73,525	987	72,538	99%
Teaching Labs & Service	4,125	0	4,125	100%
Open Labs & Service	2,179	2,408	(229)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	963	963	0	0%
Administrative Offices & Service	65,890	89,180	(23,290)	(35%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	29,538	37,823	(8,285)	(28%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	176,220	131,362	44,858	25%
Total Without Classrooms	102,695	130,374	(27,679)	(27%)

Note: All centrally scheduled classrooms are shown with this unit. The guideline space is primarily generated within Colleges and Schools and is shown with those units.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS
VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	862	862	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	64,631	84,875	(20,244)	(31%)
Academic Offices & Service	39,938	63,590	(23,652)	(59%)
Other Academic Dept Space	22,301	22,955	(654)	(3%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	127,732	172,282	(44,550)	(35%)
Total Without Classrooms	127,732	172,282	(44,550)	(35%)

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	862	953	(91)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	64,631	92,975	(28,344)	(44%)
Academic Offices & Service	39,938	69,070	(29,132)	(73%)
Other Academic Dept Space	22,301	25,297	(2,996)	(13%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	127,732	188,294	(60,562)	(47%)
Total Without Classrooms	127,732	188,294	(60,562)	(47%)

2.4.2 Administrative Units Base Year and Target Year 2002

Administrative units show a deficit of 159,437 or 26% at the base year. At the target year need for additional 198,459 ASF or 32% is shown. Following the summaries are Administrative Space Needs Analysis Summary Tables for each major Administrative unit.

President

At the base year guideline application indicates the unit with the President has a deficit of 2,235 ASF or 4%. The deficit at the target year 2002 is 5,017 ASF or 10%.

Vice President for Business and Finance

Guideline application at the base year shows this unit has a deficit of 11% or 22,367 ASF. At the target year there is a deficit of 35,028 ASF or 17%.

Vice President for Development and University Relations

Guideline application for the Vice President for Development and University Relations indicates a deficit at the base year of 13,821 ASF or 96%. At the target year the deficit increases to 15,225 ASF or 106%.

Vice President for Legal Affairs

At the base year guideline application indicates the unit has a deficit of 1,570 ASF or 105%. The deficit at the target year is 138% or 2,060 ASF. (This unit existed and was included in the campus organization at the time the analysis was conducted.)

Vice President for Service

Guideline application shows a deficit at the base year of 33% or 50,969 ASF. At the target year there is a deficit of 60,960 ASF or 39%.

Vice President for Student Affairs

Guideline application at the base year shows this unit has a deficit of 68,475 ASF or 36%. At the target year 2002 the deficit increases to 80,170 ASF or 43%.

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,956	2,956	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	12,092	30,993	(18,901)	(156%)
Administrative Offices & Service	331,680	440,399	(108,719)	(33%)
Other Administrative Department Space	267,082	298,899	(31,817)	(12%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	613,810	773,247	(159,437)	(26%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,956	3,113	(157)	(5%)
Research Labs & Service	12,092	32,393	(20,301)	(168%)
Administrative Offices & Service	331,680	463,709	(132,029)	(40%)
Other Administrative Department Space	267,082	313,054	(45,972)	(17%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	613,810	812,269	(198,459)	(32%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	38,295	40,530	(2,235)	(6%)
Other Adminstrative Dept Space	12,484	12,484	0	0%
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	50,779	53,014	(2,235)	(4%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS PRESIDENT

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	38,295	42,650	(4,355)	(11%)
Other Adminstrative Dept Space	12,484	13,146	(662)	(5%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	50,779	55,796	(5,017)	(10%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	156	156	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	467	467	0	0%
Administrative Offices & Service	103,383	125,750	(22,367)	(22%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	99,105	99,105	0	0%
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	203,111	225,478	(22,367)	(11%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR BUSINESS AND FINANCE

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	156	164	(8)	(5%)
Research Labs & Service	467	467	0	0%
Administrative Offices & Service	103,383	133,150	(29,767)	(29%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	99,105	104,358	(5,253)	(5%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	203,111	238,139	(35,028)	(17%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS	
VICE PRESIDENT FOR DEVELOPMENT AND UNIV RELATIONS	

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	11,253	24,950	(13,697)	(122%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	3,099	3,223	(124)	(4%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	14,352	28,173	(13,821)	(96%)

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	11,253	26,190	(14,937)	(133%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	3,099	3,387	(288)	(9%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	14,352	29,577	(15,225)	(106%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	1,490	3,060	(1,570)	(105%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	0	0	0	N/A
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	1,490	3,060	(1,570)	(105%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR LEGAL AFFAIRS

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	1,490	3,550	(2,060)	(138%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	0	0	0	N/A
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	1,490	3,550	(2,060)	(138%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR SERVICES

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	279	279	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	7,834	27,650	(19,816)	(253%)
Administrative Offices & Service	84,446	115,599	(31,153)	(37%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	63,128	63,128	0	0%
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	155,687	206,656	(50,969)	(33%)

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	279	294	(15)	(5%)
Research Labs & Service	7,834	29,050	(21,216)	(271%)
Administrative Offices & Service	84,446	120,829	(36,383)	(43%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	63,128	66,474	(3,346)	(5%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	155,687	216,647	(60,960)	(39%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,521	2,521	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	3,791	2,876	915	24%
Administrative Offices & Service	92,813	130,510	(37,697)	(41%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	89,266	120,959	(31,693)	(36%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	188,391	256,866	(68,475)	(36%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS

TARGET YEAR 2002	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,521	2,655	(134)	(5%)
Research Labs & Service	3,791	2,876	915	24%
Administrative Offices & Service	92,813	137,340	(44,527)	(48%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	89,266	125,690	(36,424)	(41%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	188,391	268,561	(80,170)	(43%)

2.4.3 Academic Units Target Year 2007

The guideline application for academic units shows a deficit of 817,061 or 27% at the target year 2007 enrollment. The Academic Space Needs Summary Tables include the Law Library as it reports directly to an academic unit. Summaries of space needs below are followed by the Academic Space Needs Analysis Summary Tables for each major Academic unit.

College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences

Guideline application without classrooms for the college of Agriculture and Environmental Studies shows a deficit at the target year of 86,610 ASF or 15%.

College of Arts and Sciences

The College of Arts and Sciences guideline application without classrooms projects a deficit of 121,536 ASF or 13% at the target year. The category of space having the largest deficit in the College of Arts and Sciences at the target year 2007 is Teaching Laboratory space.

College of Business

At the target year 2007, guideline application without classrooms indicates the College of Business has a deficit of 20% or 11,742 ASF.

Developmental Studies

Guideline application without classrooms shows this unit having a deficit at the target year of 13,161 ASF or 103%.

College of Education

At the target year guideline application without classrooms for the College of Education indicates a deficit of 61,679 ASF or 36%.

School of Environmental Design

For the School of Environmental Design the target year totals without classrooms indicate a deficit of 33% or 11,123 ASF.

College of Family and Consumer Sciences

The target year 2007 guideline application without classrooms shows this unit having a deficit of 51% or 38,941 ASF.

School of Forest Resources

The School of forest Resources guideline application without classrooms projects a deficit at the target year of 53,443 ASF or 87%. At the target year Research Laboratory space is the category which shows the largest deficit in the School of Forest Resources.

College of Journalism and Mass Communication

At the target year 2007, guideline application without classrooms shows a deficit of 38% or 14,843 ASF.

School of Law

At the target year the total without classrooms for the School of Law indicates a deficit of 30,177 ASF or 34%. The Academic Space Needs Summary Tables for the School of Law include the Law Library as it reports directly to the School. Guideline space for the Law Library was calculated as a proportion of the total campus library space needs.

Military Science

At the target year the total without classrooms indicates a surplus of 4,108 ASF or 30%.

College of Pharmacy

The target year 2007 guideline application without classrooms projects a deficit of 38,206 ASF or 61%. The category of space having the largest deficit in the College of Pharmacy at the target year is Teaching Laboratory space.

School of Social Work

The School of Social Work guideline application without classrooms shows a surplus at the target year of 20% or 3,963 ASF.

College of Veterinary Medicine

At the target year guideline application without classrooms for the College of Veterinary Medicine indicates a deficit of 161,778 ASF or 52%. The category of space having the largest deficit in the College of Veterinary Medicine at the target year 2007 is Research Laboratory space.

Vice President for Academic Affairs

Guideline application without classrooms shows this unit having a deficit at the target year of 33% or 34,389 ASF.

Vice President for Research

At the target year guideline application without classrooms indicates a deficit of 74,562 ASF or 58%.
BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	280,037	295,527	(15,490)	(6%)
Teaching Labs & Service	195,914	299,843	(103,929)	(53%)
Open Labs & Service	187,351	193,231	(5,880)	(3%)
Research Labs & Service	749,335	837,997	(88,662)	(12%)
Academic Offices & Service	944,264	1,013,433	(69,169)	(7%)
Other Academic Department Space	592,498	609,024	(16,526)	(3%)
Law Library	36,879	51,014	(14,135)	(38%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	2,986,278	3,300,069	(313,791)	(11%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS ACADEMIC SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	278,612	343,629	(65,017)	(23%)
Teaching Labs & Service	195,914	348,100	(152,186)	(78%)
Open Labs & Service	187,351	212,903	(25,552)	(14%)
Research Labs & Service	749,335	984,937	(235,602)	(31%)
Academic Offices & Service	944,264	1,177,953	(233,689)	(25%)
Other Academic Department Space	592,498	670,535	(78,037)	(13%)
Law Library	36,879	63,857	(26,978)	(73%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	2,984,853	3,801,914	(817,061)	(27%)

Note: The difference in classrooms and service space between base and target years is due to renovations.

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	18,123	8,197	9,926	55%
Teaching Labs & Service	17,674	29,597	(11,923)	(67%)
Open Labs & Service	19,463	19,463	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	210,504	183,169	27,335	13%
Academic Offices & Service	115,507	135,090	(19,583)	(17%)
Other Academic Dept Space	204,474	215,162	(10,688)	(5%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	585,745	590,677	(4,932)	(1%)
Total Without Classrooms	567,622	582,481	(14,859)	(3%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	18,123	9,593	8,530	47%
Teaching Labs & Service	17,674	34,265	(16,591)	(94%)
Open Labs & Service	19,463	21,507	(2,044)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	210,504	209,569	935	0%
Academic Offices & Service	115,507	152,260	(36,753)	(32%)
Other Academic Dept Space	204,474	236,632	(32,158)	(16%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	585,745	663,825	(78,080)	(13%)
Total Without Classrooms	567,622	654,232	(86,610)	(15%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	115,960	167,155	(51,195)	(44%)
Teaching Labs & Service	102,661	160,704	(58,043)	(57%)
Open Labs & Service	86,079	91,959	(5,880)	(7%)
Research Labs & Service	338,415	302,280	36,135	11%
Academic Offices & Service	353,439	294,097	59,342	17%
Other Academic Dept Space	78,273	78,273	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	1,074,827	1,094,468	(19,641)	(2%)
Total Without Classrooms	958,867	927,313	31,554	3%

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	115,960	198,261	(82,301)	(71%)
Teaching Labs & Service	102,661	189,012	(86,351)	(84%)
Open Labs & Service	86,079	100,997	(14,918)	(17%)
Research Labs & Service	338,415	357,945	(19,530)	(6%)
Academic Offices & Service	353,439	345,957	7,482	2%
Other Academic Dept Space	78,273	86,492	(8,219)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	1,074,827	1,278,663	(203,836)	(19%)
Total Without Classrooms	958,867	1,080,403	(121,536)	(13%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	15,679	38,077	(22,398)	(143%)
Teaching Labs & Service	3,436	6,273	(2,837)	(83%)
Open Labs & Service	858	858	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	2,638	4,280	(1,642)	(62%)
Academic Offices & Service	47,272	44,880	2,392	5%
Other Academic Dept Space	5,538	5,538	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	75,421	99,906	(24,485)	(32%)
Total Without Classrooms	59,742	61,829	(2,087)	(3%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	13,607	44,879	(31,272)	(230%)
Teaching Labs & Service	3,436	7,387	(3,951)	(115%)
Open Labs & Service	858	948	(90)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	2,638	5,060	(2,422)	(92%)
Academic Offices & Service	47,272	51,970	(4,698)	(10%)
Other Academic Dept Space	5,538	6,119	(581)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	73,349	116,363	(43,014)	(59%)
Total Without Classrooms	59,742	71,484	(11,742)	(20%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	376	2,227	(1,851)	(492%)
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	4,975	4,975	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	0	420	(420)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	7,407	16,490	(9,083)	(123%)
Other Academic Dept Space	335	335	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	13,093	24,447	(11,354)	(87%)
Total Without Classrooms	12,717	22,220	(9,503)	(75%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	376	2,586	(2,210)	(588%)
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	4,975	5,497	(522)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	0	480	(480)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	7,407	19,530	(12,123)	(164%)
Other Academic Dept Space	335	370	(35)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	13,093	28,464	(15,371)	(117%)
Total Without Classrooms	12,717	25,878	(13,161)	(103%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	24,160	24,353	(193)	(1%)
Teaching Labs & Service	13,083	22,006	(8,923)	(68%)
Open Labs & Service	19,212	19,212	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	14,897	29,880	(14,983)	(101%)
Academic Offices & Service	113,656	116,791	(3,135)	(3%)
Other Academic Dept Space	11,592	11,592	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	196,600	223,833	(27,233)	(14%)
Total Without Classrooms	172,440	199,481	(27,041)	(16%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	24,160	28,241	(4,081)	(17%)
Teaching Labs & Service	13,083	25,569	(12,486)	(95%)
Open Labs & Service	19,212	21,229	(2,017)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	14,897	35,550	(20,653)	(139%)
Academic Offices & Service	113,656	138,961	(25,305)	(22%)
Other Academic Dept Space	11,592	12,809	(1,217)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	196,600	262,359	(65,759)	(33%)
Total Without Classrooms	172,440	234,119	(61,679)	(36%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	463	1,606	(1,143)	(247%)
Teaching Labs & Service	18,014	17,265	749	4%
Open Labs & Service	4,706	4,706	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	0	4,200	(4,200)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	8,449	9,892	(1,443)	(17%)
Other Academic Dept Space	2,811	2,811	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	34,443	40,480	(6,037)	(18%)
Total Without Classrooms	33,980	38,874	(4,894)	(14%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	463	1,866	(1,403)	(303%)
Teaching Labs & Service	18,014	20,035	(2,021)	(11%)
Open Labs & Service	4,706	5,200	(494)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	0	5,040	(5,040)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	8,449	11,722	(3,273)	(39%)
Other Academic Dept Space	2,811	3,106	(295)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	34,443	46,970	(12,527)	(36%)
Total Without Classrooms	33,980	45,103	(11,123)	(33%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	7,342	7,567	(225)	(3%)
Teaching Labs & Service	5,278	3,440	1,838	35%
Open Labs & Service	13,218	13,218	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	16,951	24,400	(7,449)	(44%)
Academic Offices & Service	29,901	47,713	(17,812)	(60%)
Other Academic Dept Space	11,269	11,269	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	83,959	107,607	(23,648)	(28%)
Total Without Classrooms	76,617	100,040	(23,423)	(31%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF FAMILY & CONSUMER SCIENCE

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	7,342	8,842	(1,500)	(20%)
Teaching Labs & Service	5,278	3,977	1,301	25%
Open Labs & Service	13,218	14,606	(1,388)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	16,951	29,200	(12,249)	(72%)
Academic Offices & Service	29,901	55,323	(25,422)	(85%)
Other Academic Dept Space	11,269	12,452	(1,183)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	83,959	124,400	(40,441)	(48%)
Total Without Classrooms	76,617	115,558	(38,941)	(51%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS
SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	3,134	2,111	1,023	33%
Teaching Labs & Service	1,622	10,739	(9,117)	(562%)
Open Labs & Service	2,221	2,221	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	20,791	46,500	(25,709)	(124%)
Academic Offices & Service	30,311	32,330	(2,019)	(7%)
Other Academic Dept Space	6,804	6,804	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	64,883	100,705	(35,822)	(55%)
Total Without Classrooms	61,749	98,594	(36,845)	(60%)

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	3,134	2,453	681	22%
Teaching Labs & Service	1,622	12,500	(10,878)	(671%)
Open Labs & Service	2,221	2,454	(233)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	20,791	55,200	(34,409)	(165%)
Academic Offices & Service	30,311	38,220	(7,909)	(26%)
Other Academic Dept Space	6,804	6,817	(13)	(0%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	64,883	117,644	(52,761)	(81%)
Total Without Classrooms	61,749	115,192	(53,443)	(87%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	736	4,999	(4,263)	(579%)
Teaching Labs & Service	7,135	8,389	(1,254)	(18%)
Open Labs & Service	11,823	11,823	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	774	4,500	(3,726)	(481%)
Academic Offices & Service	13,390	16,240	(2,850)	(21%)
Other Academic Dept Space	5,754	5,754	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	39,612	51,705	(12,093)	(31%)
Total Without Classrooms	38,876	46,706	(7,830)	(20%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	736	5,835	(5,099)	(693%)
Teaching Labs & Service	7,135	9,757	(2,622)	(37%)
Open Labs & Service	11,823	13,064	(1,241)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	774	5,400	(4,626)	(598%)
Academic Offices & Service	13,390	19,140	(5,750)	(43%)
Other Academic Dept Space	5,754	6,358	(604)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	39,612	59,554	(19,942)	(50%)
Total Without Classrooms	38,876	53,719	(14,843)	(38%)

BASE VEAR 1006	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
		Guidenne	- · ·	1 ercent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	8,839	6,226	2,613	30%
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,505	2,505	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	0	4,080	(4,080)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	36,796	34,432	2,364	6%
Other Academic Dept Space	11,615	11,615	0	0%
Law Library	36,879	51,014	(14,135)	(38%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	96,634	109,871	(13,237)	(14%)
Total Without Classrooms	87,795	103,645	(15,850)	(18%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS SCHOOL OF LAW

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	8,839	6,226	2,613	30%
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,505	2,768	(263)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	0	4,080	(4,080)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	36,796	34,432	2,364	6%
Other Academic Dept Space	11,615	12,835	(1,220)	(11%)
Law Library	36,879	63,857	(26,978)	(73%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	96,634	124,197	(27,563)	(29%)
Total Without Classrooms	87,795	117,972	(30,177)	(34%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	2,892	632	2,260	78%
Teaching Labs & Service	1,218	0	1,218	100%
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	7,110	3,649	3,461	49%
Other Academic Dept Space	5,439	5,439	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	16,659	9,719	6,940	42%
Total Without Classrooms	13,767	9,088	4,679	34%

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS MILITARY SCIENCE

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	2,892	705	2,187	76%
Teaching Labs & Service	1,218	0	1,218	100%
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	7,110	3,649	3,461	49%
Other Academic Dept Space	5,439	6,010	(571)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	16,659	10,364	6,295	38%
Total Without Classrooms	13,767	9,659	4,108	30%

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	2,431	6,543	(4,112)	(169%)
Teaching Labs & Service	1,874	22,260	(20,386)	(1088%)
Open Labs & Service	8,696	8,696	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	23,648	25,500	(1,852)	(8%)
Academic Offices & Service	17,874	20,636	(2,762)	(15%)
Other Academic Dept Space	10,564	10,564	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	65,087	94,199	(29,112)	(45%)
Total Without Classrooms	62,656	87,656	(25,000)	(40%)

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	2,431	7,750	(5,319)	(219%)
Teaching Labs & Service	1,874	26,429	(24,555)	(1310%)
Open Labs & Service	8,696	9,609	(913)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	23,648	29,625	(5,977)	(25%)
Academic Offices & Service	17,874	23,526	(5,652)	(32%)
Other Academic Dept Space	10,564	11,673	(1,109)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	65,087	108,612	(43,525)	(67%)
Total Without Classrooms	62,656	100,862	(38,206)	(61%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	2,464	2,485	(21)	(1%)
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	1,197	1,197	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	0	5,200	(5,200)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	17,005	12,376	4,629	27%
Other Academic Dept Space	1,392	1,392	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	22,058	22,650	(592)	(3%)
Total Without Classrooms	19,594	20,165	(571)	(3%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	3,111	2,908	203	7%
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	1,197	1,323	(126)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	0	6,200	(6,200)	N/A
Academic Offices & Service	17,005	14,496	2,509	15%
Other Academic Dept Space	1,392	1,538	(146)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	22,705	26,465	(3,760)	(17%)
Total Without Classrooms	19,594	23,557	(3,963)	(20%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	3,913	22,428	(18,515)	(473%)
Teaching Labs & Service	19,794	19,170	624	3%
Open Labs & Service	9,357	9,357	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	55,123	117,750	(62,627)	(114%)
Academic Offices & Service	40,319	82,888	(42,569)	(106%)
Other Academic Dept Space	184,799	184,799	0	0%
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	313,305	436,392	(123,087)	(39%)
Total Without Classrooms	309,392	413,964	(104,572)	(34%)

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	3,913	22,428	(18,515)	(473%)
Teaching Labs & Service	19,794	19,170	624	3%
Open Labs & Service	9,357	10,339	(982)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	55,123	139,500	(84,377)	(153%)
Academic Offices & Service	40,319	97,958	(57,639)	(143%)
Other Academic Dept Space	184,799	204,203	(19,404)	(11%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	313,305	493,599	(180,294)	(58%)
Total Without Classrooms	309,392	471,170	(161,778)	(52%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	73,525	922	72,603	99%
Teaching Labs & Service	4,125	0	4,125	100%
Open Labs & Service	2,179	2,179	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	963	963	0	0%
Administrative Offices & Service	65,890	82,340	(16,450)	(25%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	29,538	34,722	(5,184)	(18%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	176,220	121,126	55,094	31%
Total Without Classrooms	102,695	120,204	(17,509)	(17%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	73,525	1,056	72,469	99%
Teaching Labs & Service	4,125	0	4,125	100%
Open Labs & Service	2,179	2,408	(229)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	963	963	0	0%
Administrative Offices & Service	65,890	95,890	(30,000)	(46%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	29,538	37,823	(8,285)	(28%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	176,220	138,140	38,080	22%
Total Without Classrooms	102,695	137,084	(34,389)	(33%)

Note: All centrally scheduled classrooms are shown with this unit. The guideline space is primarily generated within Colleges and Schools and is shown with those units.

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	862	862	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	64,631	84,875	(20,244)	(31%)
Academic Offices & Service	39,938	63,590	(23,652)	(59%)
Other Academic Dept Space	22,301	22,955	(654)	(3%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	127,732	172,282	(44,550)	(35%)
Total Without Classrooms	127,732	172,282	(44,550)	(35%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ACADEMIC SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	862	953	(91)	(11%)
Research Labs & Service	64,631	101,125	(36,494)	(56%)
Academic Offices & Service	39,938	74,920	(34,982)	(88%)
Other Academic Dept Space	22,301	25,297	(2,996)	(13%)
ACADEMIC SPACE TOTAL	127,732	202,294	(74,562)	(58%)
Total Without Classrooms	127,732	202,294	(74,562)	(58%)

2.4.4 Administrative Units Target Year 2007

Administrative units show a need for additional 218,669 ASF or 36% at the target year 2007. The summaries are followed by the Administrative Space Needs Analysis Summary Tables at the target year 2007 for each major Administrative unit.

President

Guideline application indicates this unit has a deficit at the target year of 6,327 ASF or 12%.

Vice President for Business and Finance

At the target year 2007 there is a deficit of 41,348 ASF or 20%.

Vice President for Development and University Relations

Guideline application shows a deficit at the target year of 111% or 15,915 ASF.

Vice President for Legal Affairs

Guideline application projects this unit to have a deficit at the target year of 2,460 ASF or 165%. (This unit existed and was included in the campus organization at the time the analysis was conducted.)

Vice President for Service

Guideline application indicates this unit has a deficit at the target year of 43% or 67,230 ASF.

Vice President for Student Affairs

Guideline application shows a deficit at the target year of 85,390 ASF or 45%.

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,956	2,956	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	12,092	30,993	(18,901)	(156%)
Administrative Offices & Service	331,680	440,399	(108,719)	(33%)
Other Administrative Department Space	267,082	298,899	(31,817)	(12%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	613,810	773,247	(159,437)	(26%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE NEEDS ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,956	3,113	(157)	(5%)
Research Labs & Service	12,092	33,793	(21,701)	(179%)
Administrative Offices & Service	331,680	482,519	(150,839)	(45%)
Other Administrative Department Space	267,082	313,054	(45,972)	(17%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	613,810	832,479	(218,669)	(36%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	38,295	40,530	(2,235)	(6%)
Other Adminstrative Dept Space	12,484	12,484	0	0%
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	50,779	53,014	(2,235)	(4%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS PRESIDENT

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	38,295	43,960	(5,665)	(15%)
Other Adminstrative Dept Space	12,484	13,146	(662)	(5%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	50,779	57,106	(6,327)	(12%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	156	156	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	467	467	0	0%
Administrative Offices & Service	103,383	125,750	(22,367)	(22%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	99,105	99,105	0	0%
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	203,111	225,478	(22,367)	(11%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR BUSINESS AND FINANCE

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	156	164	(8)	(5%)
Research Labs & Service	467	467	0	0%
Administrative Offices & Service	103,383	139,470	(36,087)	(35%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	99,105	104,358	(5,253)	(5%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	203,111	244,459	(41,348)	(20%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	11,253	24,950	(13,697)	(122%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	3,099	3,223	(124)	(4%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	14,352	28,173	(13,821)	(96%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR DEVELOPMENT AND UNIV RELATIONS

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	11,253	26,880	(15,627)	(139%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	3,099	3,387	(288)	(9%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	14,352	30,267	(15,915)	(111%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	1,490	3,060	(1,570)	(105%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	0	0	0	N/A
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	1,490	3,060	(1,570)	(105%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR LEGAL AFFAIRS

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Research Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Administrative Offices & Service	1,490	3,950	(2,460)	(165%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	0	0	0	N/A
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	1,490	3,950	(2,460)	(165%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	279	279	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	7,834	27,650	(19,816)	(253%)
Administrative Offices & Service	84,446	115,599	(31,153)	(37%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	63,128	63,128	0	0%
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	155,687	206,656	(50,969)	(33%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR SERVICES

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	279	294	(15)	(5%)
Research Labs & Service	7,834	30,450	(22,616)	(289%)
Administrative Offices & Service	84,446	125,699	(41,253)	(49%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	63,128	66,474	(3,346)	(5%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	155,687	222,917	(67,230)	(43%)

BASE YEAR 1996	Permanent	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,521	2,521	0	0%
Research Labs & Service	3,791	2,876	915	24%
Administrative Offices & Service	92,813	130,510	(37,697)	(41%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	89,266	120,959	(31,693)	(36%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	188,391	256,866	(68,475)	(36%)

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA - ATHENS VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS

TARGET YEAR 2007	Projected	Guideline		Percent
	Assigned	Assigned	Surplus/	Surplus/
SPACE TYPE	Square Ft	Square Ft	(Deficit)	(Deficit)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE				
Classroom & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Teaching Labs & Service	0	0	0	N/A
Open Labs & Service	2,521	2,655	(134)	(5%)
Research Labs & Service	3,791	2,876	915	24%
Administrative Offices & Service	92,813	142,560	(49,747)	(54%)
Other Administrative Dept Space	89,266	125,690	(36,424)	(41%)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE SUBTOTAL	188,391	273,781	(85,390)	(45%)

2.5 Guideline Assumptions

Paulien & Associates, Inc., chose to apply to the University of Georgia base year and target year projections, the guidelines of the Council of Educational Facility Planners, International (CEFPI), a professional society for educational facility planners, headquartered in Scottsdale, Arizona. CEFPI has been a leader for most of this century in planning methods and techniques for elementary and secondary schools. They have had a higher education division for many years and in 1985 published higher education guidelines. In addition, the CEFPI standards are recommended in the University System of Georgia Board of Regents Physical Master Planning Template.

CEFPI developed guidelines for classrooms, teaching laboratories by discipline, research laboratories by discipline, library space, office space, and a variety of specialized space categories. Institutional data is utilized to drive the guideline system. This institutional input data can range from a weekly student contact hour in a classroom or a teaching laboratory to the number of employees or graduate students utilizing research laboratories, requiring office space, etc. The specifics of each space category will be discussed briefly in the following sections.

The University of Georgia provided the consultant with background information including a room-by-room facilities inventory and staffing information from 1997, and course information from the fall 1996 quarter.

2.5.1 Classroom Space

CEFPI makes different assumptions about the amount of square footage needed for a student station in each type of space (the range is from 12 ASF for lecture to 20 ASF for seminar). The University of Georgia's actual average calculated to 18 ASF per student station. The consultant chose to use 15 ASF per station for lecture courses and 20 ASF for seminar courses in the analysis. Fall 1996 course data was used as the base information.

CEFPI shows a range of room utilization targets from 27 hours to 35 hours, based on a 45-hour week of 8:00 am to 5:00 p.m. The average CEFPI student station occupancy guideline, when classrooms are in use, ranges from 62.5% to 67%. The University of Georgia classroom utilization is 26 hours per week with 64% student station occupancy during day usage. The consultant applied the CEFPI classroom guideline for doctoral granting institutions: 30 hours per week at 62.5% student station occupancy. The classroom guideline was applied only to courses that met during the defined 45-hour week.

CLASSROOM GUIDELINE

45 Hours per Week

Target Utiization

30 Hours per Week Average Student Occupancy -- 62.5% Space per Student Lecture -- 15 Space per Student Seminar -- 20

University of Georgia Average

26 Hours per Week Average Student Occupancy -- 64% Space per Student -- 18

The formula for determining classroom space needs takes the target utilization of 30 hours per week, multiplies it by the average student occupancy target of 62.5%, and divides the space per student station. This calculation produces a guideline of .800 ASF per weekly student contact hour for lecture courses and 1.067 ASF for seminar courses.

Guideline Application Example

STEP 1 Space per Student Station (15 asf)

Weekly Room Use Target (30 hours) x Average Student Station Occupancy (62.5%) = 18.75 = (.800) Assignable Square Feet per Weekly Student Contact Hour

STEP 2

Enrollment (20) x Weekly Room Hours (3) = Weekly Student Contact Hours (60)

STEP 3

Weekly Student Contact Hours (60) x ASF/WSCH (.800) = Guideline Square Footage (48)

2.5.2 Teaching Laboratories

For this category of space, the space need per student station varies from discipline to discipline. The CEFPI guideline has approximately 50 different subject areas for which it provides teaching laboratory modules. In all cases, these are expressed as a range and in most cases, the high end of the range was utilized for the University of Georgia. The guideline used for each department at the University of Georgia is listed below. A few department units are listed twice because they had courses which best fit two different subject field guidelines.

Teaching Laboratories – Space per Student Station

SCHOOL/UNIT	DEPARTMENT	TEACHING LABS	DISCIPLINE
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	AG & APPLIED ECONOMICS	40	Ag Economics
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	ANIMAL & DAIRY SCIENCE	90	Animal Sciences
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	BIO & AGRIC ENGINEERING	125	Agricultural Engineering
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	BIO & AGRIC ENGINEERING	120	Engineering
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	CROP AND SOIL SCIENCES	70	Agronomy
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	ENTOMOLOGY - AGRIC	65	Biological Sciences
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	FOOD SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	65	Biological Sciences
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	FOOD SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	80	Food Science & Technology
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	HORTICULTURE DEPT	65	Horticulture
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	PLANT PATHOLOGY DEPT	65	Biological Sciences
AGRIC AND ENV SCIENCES	POLILTRY SCIENCE DEPT	65	Poultry Science
ARTS AND SCIENCES	A&S INSTITUTE OF ECOLOGY	65	Biological Sciences
ARTS AND SCIENCES	BIOCHEM & MOL BIOLOGY	65	Biological Sciences
ARTS AND SCIENCES	BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	65	Biological Sciences
ARTS AND SCIENCES	BOTANY	65	Biological Sciences
ARTS AND SCIENCES	CELLULAR BIOLOGY	65	Biological Sciences
ARTS AND SCIENCES	CHEMISTRY	75	Chemistry
ARTS AND SCIENCES	COMPLITER SCIENCE	60	Computer & Information Science
ARTS AND SCIENCES	DRAMA & THEATRE	150	Dance
ARTS AND SCIENCES	GEOGRAPHY	60	Geography
ARTS AND SCIENCES	GEOLOGY	60	Geology
ARTS AND SCIENCES	MICROBIOLOGY	65	Biological Sciences
ARTS AND SCIENCES	MUSIC	60	Music
ARTS AND SCIENCES	PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY	60	Astronomy
ARTS AND SCIENCES	PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY	75	Physics
ARTS AND SCIENCES	PSYCHOLOGY	50	Psychology
ARTS AND SCIENCES	SCHOOL OF ART	80	Art
ARTS AND SCIENCES	SCHOOL OF ART	60	Computer & Information Science
BUSINESS	BANKING AND FINANCE	60	Computer & Information Science
BUSINESS	MANAGEMENT	60	Computer & Information Science
BUSINESS	MARKETING & DISTRIBUTION	60	Computer & Information Science
EDUCATION	AGRIC ED-TEACHER TRAINING	40	Education
EDUCATION	ASSO DEAN FOR ACAD AFFA	40	Education
EDUCATION	COUNSELING & HUMAN DEVEL	40	Education
EDUCATION	DIV COUN.ED PSY.INST TECH	60	Computer & Information Science
EDUCATION	DIV COUN, ED PSY, INST TECH	40	Education
EDUCATION	INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY	80	Art
EDUCATION	INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY	60	Computer & Information Science
EDUCATION	INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY	40	Education
EDUCATION	MATHEMATICS EDUCATION	30	Mathematics
EDUCATION	OCCUPATIONAL STUDIES	60	Computer & Information Science
EDUCATION	SCH HLTH & HUMAN PERFORMA	80	Health Professions (except Medicine)
EDUCATION	SCH LEADSHP & LIFELNG LRN	80	Art
EDUCATION	SCH LEADSHP & LIFFLNG LRN	60	Computer & Information Science
EDUCATION	SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION	60	Computer & Information Science
EDUCATION	SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION	50	Social Sciences
ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN	SCHOOL OF ENVIR DESIGN	125	Agricultural Engineering
ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN	SCHOOL OF ENVIR DESIGN	80	Architecture
ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN	SCHOOL OF ENVIR DESIGN	60	Computer & Information Science
FAMILY & CONSUMER SCIENCES	COLL OF FAMILY & CONS SCI	60	Home Economics
FOREST RESOURCES	SCH OF FOREST RESOURCES	50	Natural Resource Management
JOURNALISM & MASS COMM	COLLEGE OF JRL & MASS COM	80	Art
JOURNALISM & MASS COMM	COLLEGE OF JRL & MASS COM	60	Computer & Information Science
PHARMACY	COLLEGE OF PHARMACY	70	Pharmacy
VETERINARY MEDICINE	AVIAN MEDICINE	90	Veterinary Medicine
VETERINARY MEDICINE	MEDICAL MICROBIOLOGY	90	Veterinary Medicine
VETERINARY MEDICINE	PARASITOLOGY	65	Biological Sciences
VETERINARY MEDICINE	PATHOLOGY	90	Veterinary Medicine
VETERINARY MEDICINE	SMALL ANIMAL MEDICINE	90	Veterinary Medicine
VETERINARY MEDICINE	VET MED-DEANS OFFICE	90	Veterinary Medicine

The CEFPI guideline makes different utilization assumptions for specific disciplines. It identifies agriculture and the health professions as units where lower utilization factors would apply. This is due to the complexity of laboratory types and considerable independent laboratory work. For the University of Georgia, this means that the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, the College of Pharmacy and the College of Veterinary Medicine will have a teaching laboratory utilization factor that is less than that of the other disciplines.

CEFPI expects laboratory utilization of 22.5 hours per week. The guideline (assignable square feet per weekly student contact hour) is derived by taking the expected weekly room hours (22.5 or 11.25 hours per week) and multiplying it by the expected student station occupancy (80%). This product is then divided into the space per student station (ranging from 40 square feet to 150 square feet, depending on the discipline).



The guideline is multiplied by the weekly student contact hours generated by each course. Weekly student contact hours are the number of students enrolled in the course multiplied by the number of hours the course meets per week for laboratory instruction. A section with 20 students enrolled, meeting for a three-hour lab once a week will produce 60 weekly student contact hours. If the guideline figure is 4.44 ASF/WSCH, this will produce 266 assignable square feet of laboratory need for that particular course. These calculations applied to all the laboratory courses in a particular discipline will produce the total guideline square feet.



Fall 1996 course data was used as the base information. Based on a 45-hour week, University of Georgia teaching laboratory utilization was 19 hours per week at 71% student station occupancy and an average square foot per station of 125 ASF. The teaching laboratory guideline was applied only to laboratory courses that met during the defined 45-hour week.

2.5.3 Open Laboratories

The space classified as open laboratories and individual study laboratories are not specifically addressed by the CEFPI guideline. The existing ASF was assumed to be needed, and was, therefore, carried forward as the guideline ASF for the base year. At the target year 2002, the projected 10.5% enrollment increase was applied to the guideline. At the target year 2007, the projected 19% enrollment increase was applied to the guideline.

2.5.4 Research Laboratories

For this category of space, the space needed per department faculty varies from discipline to discipline. Similar to teaching laboratories, CEFPI guideline has approximately 50 different subject areas for which it provides research laboratory modules. In all cases, these are expressed as a range and in most cases, the high end of the range was utilized for the University of Georgia. The guideline is derived by taking the number of faculty members (including department chairs, plus graduate assistants and technical staff) and multiplying that number by the space per faculty module. These categories are in the office tables by department.

The CEFPI guidelines used are as follows:

DISCIPLINE	RESEARCH LABS
Aerospace & Aeronautical Engineering	425
Ag Economics	60
Agricultural Engineering	425
Agronomy	400
Animal Sciences	350
Anthropology	200
Architecture	120
Art	200
Art History	50
Astronomy	200
Biological Sciences Business & Management	80
Ceramic Engineering	375
Chemical Engineering	350
Chemistry	375
Civil/Construction/Transport	425
Communications	90
Computer & Information Science	80
Computerized Writing & Reading Skills	100
Dairy Science	350
Dentistry	250
Developmental Studies	20
Drama & Theater	20
Economics	100
Education	90
Electrical/Electronics/Communications	350
Engineering	375
Engineering Mechanics	350
Environmental Design	350
Foreign Languages	90
Geography	100
Geology	375
Health Professions (except Medicine)	300
History	20
Home Economics	200
Horticulture	300
Language & Literature	20
Law	85
Mathematics	20
Mechanical Engineering	375
Metallurgical Engineering	375
Metallurgy	325
Mining & Mineral Engineering	450
Music	20
Natural Resource Management	50
Optometry	275
Pharmacy	375
Philosophy	20
Physical Sciences	350
Physics	375
Political Science	20
Poultry Science	350
Psychology	225
Kellgion Social Sciences	20
Social Work	100
Sociology	20
Statistics	85
Studies Abroad	20
Textile Engineering	375
Veterinary Medicine	375

For some non-laboratory units with minimal research space, where guideline application would have greatly over generated any reasonable need, existing space was carried forward. For units with facilities, but no staff in the research categories identified in the UGA staff data, existing space was carried forward.

2.5.5 Office Space

The CEFPI guideline determines office space needs based on major categories of staff and an application of space amounts for a number of special needs. The University of Georgia provided staffing information with individual job titles, job family groupings, department names, full-time or part-time status, and FTE. The consultant then placed each individual into a major category shown in the table below. The guideline does not always provide adequate service or conference space for some units. The consultant applied additional space to those units where the guideline under-generated space.

Table 1. Office Opace - Opace per l'ersor	· · · · ·
Staffing Type	ASF per Person
President	300
Dean	250
Vice President	250
Provost	250
Associate Dean	200
Asst Vice Pres	200
Assoc Vice Pres	200
Assoc Provost	200
Executive/Administrative	180
Director	180
Chair	180
Asst Director	180
Faculty(Studio)	220
Faculty	140
Professional	150
Technical	140
Clerical	120
Graduate Assistant	70
Lecturer/Adjunct	70
Student Worker	70
Teaching Assistant	40
Police Officer	30
Special Needs	
Additional Service Space	500
Additional Conference Space	300
Service (per employee) Minimum	30
Conference (per professional) Minimum	20

2.5.6 Library Space

Most of the guideline systems utilize one set of factors for collections, another for readers, and a third for service space. The following application is the one used by Paulien & Associates. It takes the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) collections guideline, which is also used by CEFPI. The guideline assumes that .10 ASF per volume is used until 150,000 volumes, at which point, the factor drops to .09 ASF. After 300,000 volumes are reached, the factor goes down to .08 ASF and then down again to .07 ASF above 600,000 volumes.

Until recently, the reader space calculations have generally been based on seating for 25% of the student body. ACRL suggests that if a college or university has more than 50% of its students in residential housing, it should have one reader station for every four full-time equivalent students. If less than 50% were on-site, it would be calculated at one for every five students (20%). The consultant chose to apply the 25% factor to undergraduate headcount, 25% factor to graduate students and 10% to the total faculty FTE. The consultant believes CEFPI's 25 square feet per reader station is not adequate because of increasing use of electronic library carrels. The midpoint of the ACRL guideline, 30 square feet, has been utilized.

CEFPI suggests 25% for service and staff space. ACRL, in their most recent guidelines, changed this category to 12.5%. The consultant used the 12.5% figure as this represents the most accurate figure in the profession.

The application of library space needs guideline at University of Georgia is based on the 1996 IPEDS report provided by the University. For the target year 2002, collection growth rates for the fiscal year 1996 were applied over a six-year period. For the target year 2007, collection growth rates for the fiscal year 1996 were applied over a eleven-year period.

The existing space for the School of Law Library and its proportional share of generated guideline space is shown with the School of Law in the Space Needs Analysis Summary Tables since this library reports directly to that academic unit.

2.5.7 Physical Education/Recreation

Many of the guideline systems have included this space category, but none have chosen to include athletics, because its needs for dedicated space vary significantly based on the level of athletics and the specific program elements at a given institution.

CEFPI suggests a core of 20,000 ASF for physical education/recreation and an additional five square feet per student above the 1,000 student enrollment level. The consultant chose to use the guideline from Bareither and Schillinger's book, <u>University Space Planning</u>. This guideline is calculated first by allocating 12.1 square feet for all undergraduates. It provides the same factor for graduate students, but assumes only 25% will utilize the facilities. It also provides 12.1 ASF for academic and non-academic staff, and assumes only 15% will use the facilities. We have used the full time faculty and the full time staff numbers in deriving this part of the formula.

2.5.8 Athletics

Due to the varied space requirements of indoor athletic space, there is no one guideline that addresses this space category.

2.5.9 Assembly/Exhibit

The guideline systems that address this space category do so on the basis of campus size. CEFPI has a larger core figure of 22,450 ASF, which is intended for "a college of university with a minimum of 5,000 FTE and an active Fine Arts program". CEFPI then adds another 5,000 ASF for "the addition of an extensive music program." For the University of Georgia, the consultant used the 27,450 ASF as the normative guideline figure plus an additional 6 ASF per students over 5,000 FTE.

2.5.10 Student Union Space

CEFPI suggests a formula of 9 square feet per student for each graduate and undergraduate student for Student Center space.

2.5.11 Physical Plant

CEFPI suggests a guideline of 8% of all square footage on campus with the exception of existing physical plant space. The consultant has found, in most cases, that these percentages generate significantly greater amounts of space than exist on campus. The consultants have found, from previous studies, that the average percentage is approximately 5% and believe this number to be more appropriate at the University of Georgia.

Since housing maintenance is handled separately, residence life facilities were excluded. Also excluded were parking facilities and physical plant space itself.

2.5.12 Central Computer Space

CEFPI bases their central data processing/computer space guideline on a core space of 4,500 ASF plus a rate of 1 to 3 ASF per FTE student over and above a total FTE of 5000. Based on the technological changes since this guideline was established, and the fact that central computer space tends to take up less room than in years past, the consultant chose to use 1 ASF per FTE student over 5000.

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	September 9, 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	IV.C Parking Space Projections
From	Ayers/Saint/Gross and LRE Engineering, Inc.
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering **LRE Engineering** 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The Future of parking at the University of Georgia is dependent on policies set by the UGA community. With the development of the Physical Master Plan, the University has the opportunity to take large steps toward minimizing traffic, and creating a more healthful, pedestrian friendly campus. This endeavor will require the development of new parking policies and an attitude of cooperation and excitement about the overall improvement of the campus environment.

1. FUTURE PARKING NEEDS

There are 17,333 parking spaces at the University of Georgia with about 15,500 parking spaces that currently serve the enrollment of 29,000 students. If that proportion of students to spaces were maintained in the proposed plan, we would need to provide 18,700 spaces for a total enrollment of 35,000 students.

2. LAND AREA REQUIRED FOR PARKING

A rough estimate of the area required to accommodate 18,700 spaces is around 6,545,000 SF, or about 150 acres of surface parking. With the construction of new parking decks, much of that surface parking could be contained in a smaller footprint, and more areas would remain for open space, building sites and agricultural land.

3. ALTERNATIVE PARKING AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

It is recommended that the University conduct an in-depth traffic and parking study. The study should focus on identifying methods that could be incorporated into University policy to ensure a quality pedestrian environment and lessen the presence of vehicular traffic on campus.

Key elements to incorporate in the detailed study are as follows:

- Study the possibilities of closing or limiting vehicular access on interior campus streets.
- Provide parking decks along the periphery of campus and parking policies that would encourage people (if they must drive to campus) to park in one place and stay there for the duration of their campus visit.

- Study the types of parking policies that would provide a fair method of permit pricing (possibly modifying the current system based on the convenience or accessibility of decks) and facilitate the financing of the needed decks.
- Minimize the need for cars on campus
 - 1. Provide transit access to the peripheral nodes of parking and a bus loop system that maximizes the use of the outer streets and frees the interior of campus for safe and pleasant pedestrian and bike travel.
 - 2. Provide for more services on campus to minimize the need for cars, especially during the day.
 - 3. In support of the University's goal of increasing housing, explore the possibilities of giving students that live on campus the option of paying for parking near their dorm or parking their cars in a more remote lot for free.
 - 4. Make efforts to ensure regional cooperation so that the transit system will be as efficient as possible.
 - 5. Efforts should be made to support parking policies that encourage designated zone parking. This concept has already been introduced by parking services by the issuance of zoned residential permits. The zoning of permits would decrease traffic in and around campus by encouraging people to remain parked in one place for the day. This practice would support the proposed pedestrian, bike, and mass transit systems.

4. EXISTING PARKING CONFIGURATION

In Section III.A.5 a complete inventory of the University of Georgia parking lots was performed. One of the criteria of this inventory was to determine if the parking lots were configured for the greatest efficiency. For the most part, the configuration of existing parking lots was considered to be efficient although there were six exceptions where the layout was confusing. These lots were as follows: Lot 22-Veterinary Medicine, Lot 33-Stegeman Coliseum, Lot 36-Aderhold, Lot 44-Barrow, Lot 45- Connor, and Lot II4-Ramsey Center.

Because one of the goals of the Master Plan is to provide for a more pedestrian campus and to push vehicles to the periphery of the campus, locating parking adjacent to individual uses is not always considered desirable. Under existing conditions, many of the parking areas are not located adjacent to the facilities they serve, although the locations of the lots are appropriate based on the constraints of the campus roadway system and building locations.

5. AVAILABLE OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS FOR PARKING

All of the future parking deck locations proposed for the campus are located on University of Georgia property. Because of the ability to locate parking structures on existing university property, potential off-campus lands suitable for university parking were not pursued in depth. There are two large leased lots on the North East corner of the campus that are essential in providing spaces for the North Campus area. Every effort should be made to secure the use of these lots in the future. The university is bounded by the City of Athens to the north, the North Oconee River to the east and a mixture of residential and commercial developments to the west. With these constraints on the north and east sides, the west is the most viable location to pursue off campus land for parking. However, the development of the Master
Plan determined that the most viable locations for additional parking were in fact on current university property.

6. CRITERIA FOR LOCATION SIZE AND TYPE OF PARKING FACILITY

The criteria for the location of new parking facilities dictates that these facilities be located on the periphery of the campus in order to remove internal traffic away from surface streets. Also, the decks should be accessible from a roadway classified as a collector street or higher and the parking facilities should be distributed about the campus in order to provide the appropriate number of spaces for each of the various sections of campus. As previously stated in paragraph 2 of this memorandum, parking decks are the recommended approach to providing additional parking, as opposed to surface lots, in order to increase parking density and maintain more space for building sites and open spaces. The size of parking will vary depending upon the location of the parking facility on the campus and the constraints of the site on which the facility is to be developed. For parking facilities used to service the general campus, student population etc., the minimum size should be in the range of 300 to 350 spaces. Smaller decks are appropriate for specific uses but the major decks needed to service the general university population should be larger.

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	September 14, 1998			
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan			
Subject	IV.E Camp	ous Infrastructure Projections		
From	Heery			
То	Ayers/Saint	t/Gross		
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519	The followi Master Plan approach to TABLE OF	ing is the preliminary expansion of the Table of Contents for this Physical n per the Template from the Board of Regents. This addresses the preliminary o campus infrastructure projections phase of this project. CONTENTS		
Architecture and Engineering Heery International	IV.E	Campus Infrastructure Projections		
999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367	IV.Ea	Steam		
404/881-9880	IV.Eb	Chilled Water		
1 07 404/073-1203	IV.Ec	Water (fire protection, potable water)		
Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858	IV.Ed	Sanitary Sewer		
	IV.Ee	Gas		
	IV.Ef	Electrical		
	IV.Eg	Stormwater		
<i>Traffic Engineering</i> LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800	IV.Eh	Communications (voice, databand, videoband)		

Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

IV.E Campus Infrastructure

Future Requirements

a) Heating Utilities

The approximate 6,000,000 SF of conditioned space proposed on the main campus consists of 3,690,000 SF of new Academic space and 2,870,000 SF of new Housing space minus approximately 680,000 SF to be demolished. The projected heating load of this new space was estimated based on existing load densities per square foot for each type of facility served. Buildings in the south area of campus were assumed to be more energy intensive, science, lab and Veterinarian type of occupancy. Peak heating loads were estimated for each building at the following rates:

Housing: 25 BTU/ SF Academic Buildings (North Campus): 25 BTU/SF Academic Buildings (South Campus): 33 BTU/SF

Total projected additional heating needs totaled 175,000 MBH or over 5,200 boiler horsepower if provided by steam or hot water boilers.

b) Chilled Water Utilities

As with heating loads additional chilled water cooling loads were based on existing building loads. Dorm loads were increased slightly to address the increase in ventilation now required by code. As with heating buildings in the south areas of campus were assumed to be slightly more energy intensive. Additional peak cooling loads were estimated for each building at the following rates:

Housing:
Academic Buildings (North Campus):500 SF/ TON
400 SF/ TON
250-350 SF/ TON

Total projected additional cooling needs totaled 17,800 tons.

Adequacy of Existing Facilities

a) Heating Utilities

Existing heating for the main campus is accomplished by a central steam plant with distribution and equipment 15 to 20 years old. As discussed in section III.B.1 this system is in need of upgrade and renovations. The steam condensate distribution is beginning to require leak repair in places as is typical of systems reaching this age. The high first cost, distribution energy losses, impact on landscaping and outcroppings of rock make an expanded existing or new steam plant an unlikely solution for the new building loads.

The existing steam plant capacity is near its capacity if a spare boiler is maintained for backup. Without a spare, nearly 65,000 MBH additional load could be carried - depending on location of new loads and adequacy of existing steam distribution lines. This would meet only about 1/3 of future growth needs.

The additional heating needs will not be met with the existing central steam plant. Proposed additions and existing campus square footage heating loads will be over 80% beyond the existing steam plant capacity.

b) Chilled Water Utilities

Most of the main campus is cooled with electric centrifugal chillers arranged in local distributed loops. These loops have been gradually built up over the

years by cross connecting existing chillers in individual buildings and locating a few new chillers in strategic locations. Most of the existing chillers are relatively new and in good condition. One large 1,300 ton steam absorption chiller would be removed when its building is scheduled for demolition as per the Master Plan. The existing chiller capacity and associated loops are:

- 2,300 tons of chillers not on loops 2,710 tons north loop chiller subtotal 1,740 tons other north loop area chillers with limited connections 2,550 tons central loop chiller subtotal 770 tons west dorm loop chiller subtotal (500 tons of chiller subtotal)
- 6,500 tons south loop chiller subtotal (minus 1,300 ton chiller)
- 1,550 tons vet school loop chiller subtotal 800 tons PVAC loop chiller subtotal
- 2,350 tons River Road Student Phys. Act. loop chiller subtotal

21,270 tons Total Existing Chiller capacity

Existing chiller capacity is limited for anything but very small additions. Typically new buildings with significant load must be provided with new stand alone chillers. The limited cross connect loops are not as flexible as central chilled water systems and can be difficult to operate and control in an efficient manner.

Proposed additions and existing campus square footage cooling loads will be twice the existing total chiller capacity.

Future Impacts of Facility Requirements

Heating Utilities a)

The existing steam heating plant will likely be gradually decommissioned over the next 15 to 20 years. Some outlying buildings have already begun to utilize natural gas in individual boilers installed with each building. While this provides efficient use of energy with high efficiency boilers and minimizes first cost it may limit the Universities future options should natural gas prices or supply fluctuate.

Existing buildings may be very difficult to retrofit with new gas hot water boilers due to limited space available for boiler rooms and flue piping.

An alternative recommended whenever building density allows is hot water circulated from Small Central Utility Buildings (SCUB). These plants would pump 180 degree F hot water only a limited distance to nearby buildings and yet still provide some of the flexibility of a central heating plant. This flexibility includes the ability to switch fuels when supply or price requires. Additionally the smaller low pressure hot water boilers will offer considerable maintenance reduction over existing high pressure steam boilers.

Most existing buildings now convert steam to hot water in each building. The hot water distribution system would tie into this existing building hot water distribution. Higher demand needs for domestic hot water should still be provided by individual gas hot water heaters in housing and dining buildings.

Lower pressure hot water plants would not require the same degree of maintenance and attendance now required by the existing steam boiler plant. In general hot water boilers and distribution have a much lower life cycle cost than steam distribution systems.

Hot water piping should parallel the routes of chilled water distribution piping discussed below. In the case of open space, "green" areas distribution routes should be planned in advance and conduit or small tunnels provided to minimize disturbance to permanent landscaping.

These SCUB's could be located and developed in at least eight locations across the main campus and would be tied into chilled water loops of a similar scale to the existing loops but with greater flexibility of operation and efficiency.

The following table IV.E.3-1 illustrates the possible arrangement of SCUB plants that would address the Master Plan square footage. Typically these plants would reach a maximum size of 40,000 to 60,000 MBH heating capacity (1,000 to 1,700 boiler horsepower total) with 3 or more boilers for load flexibility and backup.

Existing buildings that now utilize steam would be gradually converted over to hot water as the central steam plant is decommissioned. Most buildings convert steam to hot water for internal heating distribution already. The new hot water connection would replace the existing steam to hot water convertor with a mixing and control valve.

b) Chilled Water Utilities

Chilled water capacity will be required by each new building since the existing chilled water loops are not flexible enough, nor do they have adequate capacity for anything above a small building addition.

As with heating utilities, chilled water would be more efficiently delivered from small central utility buildings or SCUB's strategically located across the main campus to minimize distances chilled water is pumped. These plants would typically build out to a maximum chiller capacity of 3,000 to 6,000 tons with 4 or more chillers sized to provide optimum load efficiency.

Chilled water SCUB plants may utilize existing building loops in order to make efficient use of existing chilled water distribution piping and minimize impact to landscaping.

The SCUB plants ideally would be located in or near then new parking garages or garage additions to increase maintenance access and to minimize noise and cooling tower vapor in the campus core.

Unlike most of the existing chilled water loops the SCUB plants could utilize variable speed chilled water pumping to reduce pumping and operating costs during mild cooling weather.

SCUB plants would almost always include both chillers and hot water boilers. Chilled and hot water piping distribution would be parallel to buildings served. Laboratory buildings or other buildings with high outside ventilation rates requiring reheat along with dehumidification would be prime candidates for engine driven chillers that would produce 180 degree hot water while simultaneously producing chilled.water.

 Table IV.E.3 -1

 Projected Heating and Cooling Loads for Each Sub Central Utility Building (SCUB)

SCUB Plant Number SCUB Location	1 North Campus	2 North Central Campus	3 West Campus (Dorms)	4 Central Campus (Science)	5 Southwest Central Campus	6 Southeast Central Campus	7 South Campus (Vet School)	8 River Road Campus	Total All SCUB Plants
Corresponds to ASG Precinct: Existing Chilled Water Loop	N North Loop	C none	W West Campus	S Science Loop	S South Campus Loop	South Campus Loop	LW Vet School Loop	LS Student Act / PTAC Loops	
COOLING LOADS									
Existing Academic Tons	3,460	1,755	-	2,755	2,253	2,866	2,519	1,320	16,928
Existing Housing Tons	26	336	780	-	509	-	164	-	1,814
Existing Total (after demo) Tons	3,485	2,091	780	2,755	2,762	2,866	2,683	1,320	18,742
New Academic Tons	343	1,049	469	837	1,153	2,994	2,009	2,721	11,576
New Housing Tons	1,006	484	1,628	1,030	318	472	144	1,137	6,219
New Total Loads Tons	1,348	1,533	2,098	1,867	1,472	3,466	2,153	3,858	17,795
Total Plant Build out Tons	4,834	3,624	2,877	4,622	4,234	6,332	4,836	5,178	36,537
HEATING LOADS									
Existing Academic MBH Loads	34,730	15,676	21,052	21,052	20,669	23,008	21,108	11,653	168,948
Existing Housing MBH Loads	257	3,356	12,875	12,875	5,094	-	2,048	-	36,504
Existing Total (after demo) MBH Loads	34,986	19,031	33,927	33,927	25,762	23,008	23,156	11,653	205,452
New Academic MBH Loads	3,425	10,493	3,290	8,373	11,533	29,940	20,093	27,207	114,355
New Housing MBH Loads	12,570	6,050	15,648	-	3,980	5,895	1,800	14,215	60,158
New Total Loads MBH Loads	15,995	16,543	18,938	8,373	15,513	35,835	21,893	41,422	174,513
Total Plant Build out MBH output	50,981	35,575	52,866	42,301	41,276	58,843	45,050	53,074	379,965
Total Plant Build out (Boiler H.P.)	1,523	1,063	1,579	1,263	1,233	1,758	1,346	1,585	11,349
Total Existing & New Square Feet Served	2,039,248	1,799,568	1,454,639	1,608,299	1,582,393	2,054,305	1,750,091	1,856,762	14,145,305

Timing or Phasing Requirements

a&b) Heating and Chilled Water Utilities

Ideally SCUB plants could be built from the chiller, boiler, mechanical room budgets included in each new building. The final location and logistics of phasing in each building should be studied in more detail. Life Cycle cost studies of SCUB hot water and chiller plants compared against individual gas boilers and electric chillers in each building should be used to verify the concept.

The optimum time for siting a SCUB plant is planned with a major construction project such as parking garages or new housing construction.

Routing of new chilled water and hot water distribution lines should be planned in advance in order to provide minimal disruption into the open green spaces addressed in this master plan. Where possible empty conduits could be provided in short lengths for future piping runs.

Locations and Configuration of Future Facilities

a&b) Heating and Chilled Water Utilities

See Table IV.E.3-1 and the proposed map in VI.E.a&b of this Master Plan.

c) Potable Water

The University of Georgia supplies both potable and fire protection water to the main campus via a water distribution system. Athens/Clarke County owns and operates a large portion of the water distribution system. It is the intent of the University to relinquish all responsibilities of the water distribution system to Athens/Clarke County

The Athens/Clarke County Water Treatment Facility permitted capacity is 28 MGD. The facility generates between 23 and 24 MGD in an effort to supply water to University of Georgia and county customers. The county plans to expand the existing facility to generate 32 MGD by the year 2001. Currently the University of Georgia consumes annually 1,785 million gallons of water.

The Master Plan recommends the construction of several new buildings throughout the campus. Providing services to these newly constructed facilities will require connecting to the existing water systems. Additional fire hydrants and water valves are shown on the plans to provide the necessary fire protection for each building.

Athens/Clarke County Water Treatment Facility currently supplies water to the campus. These new additions to the existing water systems must meet the following minimum codes:

A separate line shall be provided for both the fire protection and domestic water line.

A double detector check valve assembly shall be provided on the fire supply line if it is located in a vault at the connection to the public water system.

A reduced pressure zone backflow preventer shall be placed on the potable water supply line.

Services to all newly constructed buildings will be connected to the existing water system. The capacity of the existing system should be upgraded to handle the additional demands placed on the system due to the new building construction.

d) Sanitary Sewer

Athens/Clarke County owns and maintains the main sanitary sewer collection system located on the University of Georgia Campus. The sanitary sewer lines serving the North and East campus quadrangles are owned and serviced by the University maintenance staff. Several new buildings will be located along Lumkpin Street where a major distribution line is located. This line will continue to provide services to existing buildings as well as offer services to the new buildings. The capacity and condition of the existing line should be closely examined as the new buildings are brought on line. As the sanitary sewer line proceeds towards the North Oconee Plant, it will become necessary to increase the pipe size along Lumpkin Street to handle the existing and proposed development. The existing system consists of terra cotta (vitrified clay) and ductile iron pipe on the older sections. When the existing system was upgraded the newer lines used concrete truss pipe for sizes up to 12 inches in diameter. Ductile iron pipe was used to replace the larger pipes. The same criteria should be used to replace and upgrade the sanitary sewer system as the university expands. The capacity of the existing pipes appears to be adequate to handle the present conditions of the line. As the University prepares to increase its population the additional demands placed on system will also increase.

The quantity and flow patterns of domestic sewage are affected principally by population and population increase; population density and density change; water use; water demand, and water consumption; industrial requirements; commercial requirements; expansion of service geographically; groundwater geology of the area; and topography of the area. In order to accommodate the projected sanitary loads, the estimate may be based on the gcd of water being consumed by an existing similar community. Sewage flow can range between 70% to 130% of water consumption.

Reports of infiltration are minimum on the sanitary line at this point. Water may infiltrate sewer lines through poor joints, cracked pipes, walls of manholes, or perforated manhole covers. Infiltration increases the sewage load.

Most proposed buildings are located in areas where sanitary sewer lines are located. There are areas where the sanitary line will need to be extended in order to tie into existing sanitary lines. Additional manholes are shown on the plans every 300 foot to provide access to the lines for maintenance. Once the buildings are defined and the intended use is determined a more intensive evaluation will need to be conducted on the capacity of the line.

Waste water from the University of Georgia is treated at the North Oconee Plant that is owned and operated by Athens/Clarke County. Athens/Clarke County has plans to upgrade the North Oconee Plant. The permitted capacity of the plant is 10 MGD. Currently the campus produces 1.2 MGD of waste water. In an effort to eliminate odor and filtration problems the county has plans to upgrade the plant by the year 2006.

To handle excessive discharge from the Animal Science Complex a pretreatment system was constructed. This facility should be monitored by the University to prevent future violations of the Athens/Clarke County codes for BOD and suspended solids limits.

The addition of grease traps to the existing sanitary system would help facilitate the removal of suspended grease from the sanitary effluent.

e) Gas

The University of Georgia is divided into two service areas, North and South campus, which supply natural gas to the campus. Sanford Stadium represents the physical boundary line between the two areas.

The North Campus service area is currently being operated and maintained by the Atlanta Gas Light Company. Approximately two years ago Atlanta Gas Light undertook a program to replace existing cast iron mains with polyethylene pipes. Some areas on campus have reported distribution pressure to be approximately 100 psi, while other areas are supplied with 60 psi of pressure. Each building service entrance is furnished with meters and regulators.

The University owns and operates the natural gas to South Campus. Atlanta Gas Light provides 100 psi to the main distribution line via a master meter. The pressure is reduced to 12 psi at the meter station. The operating pressure for the site mains and building branch lines is 12 psi. The pressure inside each building is reduced by regulators.

The current piping materials used in both systems are either black steel or polyethylene. A 14-16 gauge tracer wire is provided with the polyethylene piping for utility location purposes. Two types of cathodic protection are provided for the black steel piping for various locations throughout the system.

In the proposed location of several new buildings there are no gas services or gas lines provided for the proposed structures. Therefore it is recommended that new gas loops and additional gas lines are added to existing gas lines to supply natural gas service to new buildings and accommodate the growth. If the intent of the University is to supply natural gas throughout the campus then this plan will accommodate their needs.

f) Electrical Infrastructure

f.1 Future Requirements

Section III described the existing electrical utilities. This section provides the Campus Infrastructure Projections as they are applicable to the planning objectives described in the "Future Campus Requirements" study (Paulien & Associates).

As identified previously, the campus electrical demand growth has not been as projected at 2% mainly due to aggressive energy conservation measures by the UGA operations and maintenance groups and by energizing of some load blocks directly from the Georgia Power distribution system, thereby not totalizing to the master UGA power meter.

Attached is the latest campus **MW** demand information available, along with the future projections.

The configuration of the analysis will be per the following criteria:

f.1.a. Existing facility demand load projections will be based on a 1% per year increase. This component of the demand projection will not consider any increases due to new construction:

*Basis: No new buildings	s on-line Existing	Building Megawat	t Demand Growth	Table 1
Fiscal Year (Jul-Jun)	Actual	Projected in 1993	1998 Projections	1998 Projections
			15 Year @ 1%	20 Year @ 1%
			Growth*	Growth*
1994	30.5	35.5		
1995	32.7	37.02		
1996	34.5	39.54		
1997	33.9	40.86		
1998	34.7	45.01		
1999			35.0	35.0
2000			35.4	35.4
2001			35.8	35.8
2002			36.1	36.1
2003			36.5	36.5
2004			36.8	36.8
2005			37.2	37.2
2006			37.6	37.6
2007			38.0	38.0
2008			38.3	38.3
2009			38.7	38.7
2010			39.1	39.1
2011			39.5	39.5
2012			39.9	39.9
2013			40.3	40.3
2014				40.7
2015				41.1
2016				41.5
2017				41.9
2018				42.3

f.1.b The demand MW growth impact due to new buildings will be based on the following increases in square footage:

New Building Scheduled Impact

Per Information From Study By Paulien & Associates, Inc.

Study through year 2007 Table		
Year	2002	2007
Personnel:		
Students	32,500	35,000
Faculty & Staff	8,796	9,428
Totals	41,296	44,428
Space Requireme	nts (SF): In addition	to present
Housing	1,980,000	2,200,000
Academic	1,475,135	1,870,874
Parking Deck/Lot	735,000	1,250,000
Totals	4,190,135	5,320,874

|--|

Proposed SF:	10,628,630	
Balance	1,117,621	After 2007

f.1.c Considering the impact of the above expansion program the loads were calculated on the basis of 5.7 VA/SF for all new building square footage. The tabulation utilizes a load factor of .65 to account for the non-coincident nature of the Housing and Academic loads. Whereby the total demand load will not reflect both loads occurring at the substation at the same time.

The tabulation includes a 1% load growth allocated to the **new** building demands as they are scheduled on-line throughout different time periods.

f.1.d In summary the following **MW** demand impacts are projected: (See table 1 for existing, and table 3 for combined load data)

No new buildings (1% growth of existing loads)		Existing +New +1% growth of both	
<u>Year</u>	MW	MW	
2002	36.1	47.5	
2007	38.0	66.6	
	The	e projections reflect the MW load which in turn projections	cts th

These projections reflect the **MW** load which in turn projects the financial impact of the growth program, or the power billing. In order

to determine the impact of the program on the electrical power infrastructure, the projections need to be reflected in **MVA** (Megavolt Amperes). The conversion requires application of .85 power factor. The following table outlines the electrical **MVA** power load impact to the infrastructure: (See table 3 for complete data)

<u>No new buildi</u>	<u>ngs (1% growth of existing loads)</u>	Existing +New +1% growth of both
Year	MVA	MVA
2002	42.5	56.
2007	44.7	78.3

f.2 Adequacy of existing facilities

These projections indicate the need for additional capital and equipment commitments in order to meet not only the present growth pattern (ignoring new buildings). It also indicates that the impact of the proposed growth plan will create a need for funding to be allocated to accommodate the electrical infrastructure required created by such growth. Of more immediate impact will be the addition of a third transformer to the existing substation. Presently, the total capacity of the existing transformers is 45 MVA. At this moment the present demand exceeds 34.7 MW which directly translates to 40.8 MVA. Today's reserve margin is 4.2 MVA. This reserve margin amounts to approximately 9.33 %. Typical reserve margins range from 20-33% for commercial and institutional loads. Data center and critical facilities maintain 100% reserve margins. Therefore, as has been mentioned earlier the need for a third transformer is a reality at this time. This third transformer would be able to sustain load growth until the year 2018 if no new buildings were added and demand were growing at 1% per year. In this event the reserve margin would be at or above 33% until the year 2018.

f.3 Future impact of new facilities

Given the new building growth projections, the impact of the program will create a need for a new electrical substation by the year 2007, when demand is expected to expand from 73.8 to 78.3 MVA, exceeding the three transformer capacities. Under this scenario, by the year 2003, reserve capacity will be under 15%. These numbers could vary greatly and the infrastructure need would be different, if the expansion program were not as contemplated.

The immediate investment contemplated for the third substation transformer is estimated at \$750,000.

The investment required to accommodate the new program will consist of a second substation as well as additional ductbank and cabling required to add approximately fifteen (15) new 12,470 V ductbank distribution circuits to the existing Campus. Of these circuits, five (5) are currently in the planning stage. Ten (10) additional circuits will need to be located throughout campus.

At least five (5) additional ductbank routes will be needed for standby-emergency power should the University decide that centralization of standby power capacity is to be funded.

A new site will need to be reserved for a second substation.

Following in the next page is a detailed tabulation of the above demand growth projections:

Existing Plus New B	uilding MW and MVA	Demand Growth		Table 3
Fiscal Year (Jul-Jun)	1998 Projections	Estimated New	Total Expected MW	MVA Substation
	20 Year MW @ 1%	Building Demand	Load for Existing	Load
	Growth*	MW Impact	Substation	
1994				
1995				
1996				
1997				
1998				
1999	35.0	1.8	36.2	42.6
2000	35.4	5.1	40.0	47.0
2001	35.8	5.1	43.7	51.4
2002	36.1	5.1	47.5	55.9
2003	36.5	5.2	51.3	60.3
2004	36.8	5.2	55.1	64.8
2005	37.2	5.2	58.9	69.3
2006	37.6	5.2	62.7	73.8
2007	38.0	5.2	66.6	78.3
2008	38.3	0.8	67.3	79.1
2009	38.7	0.8	68.0	79.9
2010	39.1	0.8	68.7	80.8
2011	39.5	0.8	69.4	81.6
2012	39.9	0.8	70.1	82.4
2013	40.3	0.8	70.8	83.3
2014	40.7	0.8	71.5	84.1
2015	41.1	0.8	72.2	84.9
2016	41.5	0.8	72.9	85.8
2017	41.9	0.8	73.6	86.6
2018	42.3	0.8	74.3	87.4

f.4 Locational requirements

No locational or additional campus space requirements are needed with the third substation transformer.

It is recommended that the additional ductbank locations be coordinated within the new program green area-landscaping plan.

The second substation impact will be financial as well as geographic since an adequate location or site needs to be allocated to accommodate this equipment. The present substation occupies approximately 45,000 SF. of space. It is projected that a second substation will require approximately the same space.

Several locations can provide an option for the location of this substation by minimizing the impact on the campus aesthetics as well as the neighboring, privately owned properties: Reserve a space near the Chicopee complex.

Locate in the Lower South and East campus.

f.5 Standby Power requirements

The following describes the need for standby power throughout the campus. Cogeneration is not considered since this option had been studied previously, however, with the increases in research facilities and networking capabilities, the University could experience the necessity to increase its standby power capacity in order to provide protection to critical research, academic, and computer loads.

This protection could take the form of UPS as well as generation capacity. UPS capacity can be provided locally, per facility, on an asneeded basis. UPS units provide back up power for a very limited time. Generators will be needed in order to sustain life safety and longer power outage occurrences.

It is recommended that a decentralized, area location approach be implemented for the generators, coordinated with the need for a similar Heating Ventilating and Air Conditioning strategy. This semicentralized standby power capacity approach would be a recommended option to the University in lieu of providing emergency or standby power at the time each new facility is added, or providing one large standby generator plant.

These standby power and life safety needs per building have been projected at 1 VA/SF of the total existing and future academic square footage of the Campus.

The standby power capacity has been allocated by areas, in order to provide an alternative to building specific units as each new building is constructed. This tabulation serves to compare as well to the alternative of one large generating station.

> The areas selected were: North Campus Central Campus West Campus South Campus Lower East and East Campus Lower West Campus

				Та	ble 4
	Standby Power Req	uirements (Incl.	Existg. & Prop	osed Bldgs.)*	
No.	Area	SF	VA/SF	Required kVA	Select:
1	North Campus	1,659,936	1	1660	1- 1500 KW 12,470 V. Generators
2	Central Campus	1,443,517	1	1444	1-1500 KW 12,470 V Generator
3	West Campus	210,263	1	210	Served from South Campus
4	South Campus	4,099,189	1	4099	3-1500 KW 12,470 V Generators
5	Lower South & East Campus	3,064,424	1	3064	3-1500 KW 12,470 V Generators
6	Lower West Campus	685,965	1	686	Served from LS &E Campus
		11,163,294		11,163	-

Following is a tabulation of the projected requirements:

* This is not intended for cogeneration. Should cogeneration be necessary, future investment in controls and protection circuitry could allow that option.

The above table reflects the projected generating capacity for the selected regions. It is recommended that the location of these units be coordinated with the construction of new parking deck facilities such as to accommodate the space requirements of both within the same area. Should the option of a large unit be considered, it would be feasible to locate at the Chicopee Complex, near the second electrical substation area.

g) Stormwater

There are four major drainage basins that collect stormwater runoff from the main campus of the University of Georgia.

The easternmost basin contains the North Campus quadrangle and the Milledge Hall/ Payne Hall quadrangle. This basin discharges stormwater directly into the north fork of the Oconee River.

The Tanyard Creek drainage basin covers the eastern half of the North Campus and a large part of the Central Campus. Tanyard Creek also drains a portion of the City of Athens from Milledge Avenue east to the Main Campus. New building construction in this area does not increase the impervious area

The southeastern basin encompasses the South Campus and the recently developed East Campus. The stormwater flows into an unnamed creek. This basin includes portions of the City of Athens as far west as the intersection of Lumpkin Street, Milledge Avenue, and Milledge Circle.

The southernmost basin includes the remaining areas of the South Campus. Stormwater in this basin currently flow into Lake Herrick. Lake Herrick provides minimal stormwater detention.

The master plan recommends that many of the new buildings should be constructed on existing parking lots. Taking this approach minimizes the impact to impervious areas. Currently there are several parking lots on the campus. The stormwater runoff from these lots is being handled by a combination of drains and pipes. A stormwater management plan is currently not in place at the University. As new buildings are added to the campus the storm sewers in that area have been either upgraded or replaced with a new stormwater infrastructure. As long as new buildings are constructed on existing parking lots, the need to provide regional detention is minimum. However, once green spaces (pervious areas) are converted to hardscape (impervious areas) the stormwater runoff will be increased. The amount will depend on how much pervious areas are eliminated.

The information provided for the stormwater infrastructure was very minimum. An intensive hydrology study should be conducted to evaluate the existing storm sewer system. This study should include assessing the physical condition of the pipeline and capacity upgrade system as recommended by the report.

h) Communications Infrastructure

h.1 Future Requirements

Voice

There are five Campus Communications hubs with the AT&T Definity Generic 2, PBX switches. The current Master Plan expansion program will create a need for the addition of new switch sites as needed. The existing communications ductwork has the capability for additional growth. As switch sites are added, more supporting equipment will be added to the Ramsey Center Central facility.

Any new buildings should be designed to be provided with cabling that connects to the nearest switch site.

The increased number of users and facilities will create a need to add more numbers with the possibility of different multi-prefix digits in order to accommodate the growth.

Data Distribution

At present the University of Georgia has initiated a Data and Communications Network implementation plan based on a study by IBM Corporation in September 1997. The plan developed by this study has been identified as Project "VENUS" for Virtual Electronic Network For University Services. This project intends to create a fiber optic network infrastructure to connect approximately 200 buildings over an Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) backbone.

The total number of network attached devices is presently estimated to be approximately eight thousand. The project VENUS study estimated a system growth up to twelve thousand network devices.

The study and project mentioned above is currently being implemented. With further centralized funding, planning, and implementation efforts, it is envisioned that the VENUS project will provide an excellent academic payback for the University System.

The network topology described by the study proposed a matrix backbone with starred connections for clustered buildings. Each connection could be assumed to be a network switch. A total of twelve buildings were assigned to each switch node.

The VENUS Project has been designed for future growth by nature of its modular structure approach, the same pattern should be applied to the new expansion program such that the network topology and redundancy presently contemplated are maintained. The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	7/27/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Proposed Land Acquisition / Disposition (Section IV F)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture

Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The University of Georgia's long and narrow physical layout echoes the time when the current North and South parts of campus were two individual campuses. North Campus was the original Franklin College of Arts and Sciences, and in the 1920's the South Campus area became the home for the State Agricultural School. The eventual linkage of the two campuses created the long and narrow form that exists today. The distance between North and South Campus creates a difficult environment for many elements of circulation but creates particular hardships for pedestrians.

1. Class Change Time

The long walking distance necessitates longer class change times. If the campus were to expand to the east and/or west like disciplines could be located within a closer proximity to one another.

2. Growth Potential

The growth potential for many different disciplines in the North Campus area is landlocked because of its long and narrow character.

3. Balance of Buildings and Open Space

Future expansion could also help provide the land area needed for a balance of buildings and open space on campus. If the current ratio of buildings to open space on North Campus is used as the touchstone for the rest of campus, there are many opportunities for infill on South Campus, but the land area of North Campus has reached its capacity of development. Eastward and Westward expansion could provide many opportunities for North Campus growth, not only in academic space but housing and student services as well.



7/27/98



UGA Property Line



Areas of Desired Expansion

Proposed Land Acquisition/ Disposition

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure IV F 1



















The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	8/20/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Preliminary Physical Master Plan / Alternative Concepts (Template Section V)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia
	The objective of this section is to explore concept alternatives for the campus plan which

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE

Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 1. Exploration of Concept Alternatives

issues identified in Sections II-A and II-B.

The extensive study and observation of the University of Georgia's existing campus conditions served to showcase the positive attributes of campus and made clear the needs and challenges faced by the University. This understanding of UGA's strengths and weaknesses fueled the discussions of alternatives for the Physical Master Plan that could both embrace the positive characteristics of the campus and propose creative and yet practical solutions to the negative elements of the campus. The major challenges the University has to face are products of two major elements: the absence of a comprehensive open space system, and the lack of a built environment with clear and consistent design characteristics.

meet future programmatic requirements identified in Section IV and address the goals and

For each major precinct of campus, different alternatives of building placement and open space were explored. Figure V 1 shows examples of design options explored for the Central, East and South Campus areas. The design process was complemented by ongoing meetings with campus officials, faculty, staff and students to discuss their concerns and desires for each area. Athens Clarke County officials worked in close cooperation with the Master Planning Team, particularly in discussions of traffic issues such as in the development of the Lumpkin Street improvement / realignment. As different schemes evolved for each area, the desired objectives for the designs remained constant. Each scheme was based on the interconnectivity of open space, pedestrian comfort and a logical and ordered system of building sites.

2. Selection of Preliminary Physical Master Plan

After the flood of options and dust of ideas settled, a Preliminary Master Plan Scheme (Figure V 2) was selected. From this plan, proposed building square footages, beds provided by proposed housing and parking spaces represented by the proposed plan were calculated. These findings were weighed against national standards to see if provisions were being made in the design for the University's current needs and future growth (see Figure V4).



CENTRAL CAMPUS



SOUTH CAMPUS



EAST CAMPUS















Alternative Concepts

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure V1





Not to Scale

5/5/98



Legend







Proposed Parking Decks

Preliminary Master Plan

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure V 2

	A. EXISTING FACILITIES FOR ENROLLMENT OF 29,409 STUDENTS	B. FACILITIES REQUIRED BY NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR ENROLLMENT OF 25,400 STUDENTS ¹	C. FACILITIES REQUIRED BY NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR ENROLLMENT OF 32,500 STUDENTS	D. FACILITIES REQUIRED BY NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR ENROLLMENT OF 35,000 STUDENTS
MAIN CAMPUS FACILITIES without Residential Life and Parking Decks	7,659,367 GSF	8,737,104 GSF ²	9,502,501 GSF	10,037,963 OSF ²
RESIDENTIAL LIFE FACILITIES	2,404,850 GSF 5,950 BEDS	4,879,850 GSF ^J B,000 BBDS ⁴	5,374,850 GSF ³ 9,500 BEDS ⁴	5,704,850 GSF ³ 11,900 BEDS ⁴
PARKING				
Decks	1,167,900 GSF 4,202 SPACES	NA	NA	NA
Surface Parking	11,308 SPACES	NA	NA	NA
Total Spaces	15,510 SPACES	15,510 SPACES	17,300 SPACES	18,700 SPACES
TOTAL FACILITIES GSF	10,952,245 GSF	NA	NA	NA

NOTES

• Gross Square Feet = (GSF)

ς.

- Area totals do not incorporate the existing building deficiency factor developed / detailed in the UGA 1996 Building Condition Survey.
- 1. 29,400 Students represents the Fall 1996 enrollment. This enrollment was established as the baseline for the Space Analysis prepared by Paulien Associates
- 2. Area requirements from Paulien Associate's July 16, 1998 draft of template section iv, future campus requirements
- 3. The calculations for residential life include area requirements from Paulien Associate's July 16, 1998 draft of template section IV, Future Campus Requirements for the approximate number of beds and facilities (dining halls, study/lounges, etc.) required to supply enough housing for all freshmen and sophomores to live on campus.
- 4. Beds required based on University Plan to house Freshmen and Sophomores in on-campus residential life facilities

1/25/99

University of Georgia Space Requirements for Main Campus

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure V 4

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	8/20/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Preliminary Physical Master Plan / Precinct Studies (Section V)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

1. Precinct Studies

A more detailed look at the Preliminary Plan was possible through a series of precinct studies. Summaries of these studies are represented in Figures V5a-g. The campus was divided into six major areas: North, Central, South, West, Lower West, and Lower South and East Campus. Each major area of campus was studied individually to test the compatibility of its programmatic components. Reviewing the proposed plan at this scale facilitated the study of important adjacencies and the distribution of certain elements in an area.

One important factor to the success of the proposed plan would be the distribution of periphery parking decks. The removal of surface parking on the interior of campus provided the area needed to incorporate a significant open space system and future proposed building sites. A more detailed study provided a way to ensure that the decks on the periphery of a campus precinct would be adequate to serve that area.

North Campus is used as an example throughout the plan for the balance of building density to open space. The separation of each district or precinct from the whole facilitated the study of building density provided in the proposed plan and the comparison of the precincts to the scale and character of North Campus.

Care also needed to be taken in the placement of housing so that it was grouped in such a way as to encourage a sense of community and at the same time provide a fair distribution of those communities throughout the Main Campus area.

The completion of these studies brings the process one step closer to the development of a final proposed Physical Master Plan.

NORTH CAMPUS

Space and Parking

Allocation Diagram



(Net assignable totals do not include parking decks).

EXISTING

Buildings:	
Parking:	
Housina:	

1,841,354 gross square feet 964,450 net assignable sf 3,064 spaces 146 beds

e feet Buildings: ble sf Parking: Housing:

Ρ

R O P O S E D ildings: 2,684,508 gro 1,276,552 ne rking: 3,058 spi using: 176* be

gross square feet net assignable sf spaces beds

NORTH CAMPUS TOTALS

Buildings		Parking		
existing to remain:	1,808,908 gsf	existing to remain:	1,987	spaces
	942,819 nsf	new:	1,071	spaces
		total:	3,058	spaces
new:	800,600 gsf			
	333,733 nsf			
total:	2,684,508 gsf 1,276,552 nsf	Housing existing to remain: new: total:	146 30 176*	beds beds beds
		*(after renovations by year 2007) total:	132	beds
			Fiç	gure V5a

CENTRAL CAMPUS

Space Parking Allocation and Diagram



EXISTING

Buildings: 856,245 570,830 Parking: Housing:

gross square feet net assignable sf spaces beds



PROPOSED

Buildings:	1,961,458
	1,114,365
Parking:	1,045
Housing:	828*

gross square feet net assignable sf spaces beds

(Net assignable totals do not include parking decks).

1,426

516



CENTRAL CAMPUS TOTALS

Buildings

existing to remain:

960,258 gsf 543,535 nsf

1,001,200 gsf 570,830 nsf

1,961,458 gsf 1,114,365 nsf

Parking

existing to remain: new: total:

349 spaces 696 spaces 1,045 spaces

Housing

existing	to remain:	516 beds
new:		312 beds
total:		828 beds

*(after renovations by year 2007) total:

738 beds

Figure V5b

SOUTH CAMPUS

Space and Parking



EXISTING

Buildings:	2,805,929	gross square feet
	1,712,860	net assignable sf
Parking:	2,729	spaces
Housing:	8,45	beds

(Net assignable totals do not include parking decks).

Allocation Diagram



PROPOSED

Buildings:	5,401,867
	2,953,485
Parking:	3,761
Housing:	2,945*

gross square feet net assignable sf spaces beds



SOUTH CAMPUS TOTALS

2,571,467 gsf

1,556,552 nsf

2,830,400 gsf

1,396,933 nsf

5,401,867 gsf

2,953,485 nsf

Buildings

existing to remain:

new:

total:

Parking

existing to remain: new: total: 1,661 spaces 2,100 spaces 3,761 spaces

Housing

existing to remain: new: total:

*(after renovations by year 2007) total:

2,748 beds

845 beds

2,100 beds

2,945 beds

Figure V5c

WEST CAMPUS

Space and Parking Allocation Diagram



EXISTING

Buildings:	1,109,885	gross square feet
	582,164	net assignable sf
Parking:	2,470	spaces
Housing:	4,243	beds

(Net assignable totals do not include parking decks).



PROPOSED

Buildings: 1,595,707 762,045 Parking: 2,340 Housing: *4,525 gross square feet net assignable sf spaces beds



WEST CAMPUS TOTALS

Buildings existing to remain:

new:

total:

Parking

existing to remain: new: total:

1,723 spaces 617 spaces 2,340 spaces

Housing

1,595,707 gsfexisting to remain:762,045 nsfnew:total:

944,107 gsf

471,645 nsf

651,600 gsf

290,400 nsf

3,436 beds 1,089 beds 4,525 beds

*(after renovations by year 2007) total:

4,525 beds

Figure V5d

LOWER SOUTH AND EAST

Space Parking Allocation a n d Diagram



EXISTING

Buildings:	1,736,544	gross square feet
	964,450	net assignable sf
Parking:	4,153	spaces
Housing:	195	(Married Housing
-		Units)

PROPOSED

Buildings:	4,334,314
	2,279,963
Parking:	2,336
Housing:	*1,491

gross square feet net assignable sf spaces beds

(Net assignable totals do not include parking decks).



LOWER SOUTH AND EAST CAMPUS TOTALS

Buildings

existing to remain:

total:

1,684,814 gsf 929,963 nsf

2,649,500 gsf 1,350,000 nsf

4,334,314 gsf 2,279,963 nsf

Parking	
existing to remain:	
new:	1
total:	2

552 spaces 1,784 spaces 2,336 spaces

Housing

existing to remain:	195 beds
(Married Housing Units)	
new:	1,296 beds
total:	1,491 beds

*(after renovations by year 2007) total: (assumes one bed per MH unit)

*1,491 beds Figure V5f

LOWER WEST CAMPUS

Parking Allocation and Space



EXISTING

Buildings: 416,404 277,603 1,668 Parking: Housing: 227

gross square feet net assignable sf spaces beds



PROPOSED

Buildings:	976,004
	417,336
Parking:	1,985
Housing:	227

gross square feet net assignable sf spaces beds

> 985 spaces 1,000 spaces

> 1,985 spaces

Diagram

(Net assignable totals do not include parking decks).



LOWER WEST CAMPUS TOTALS

416,404 gsf

277,603 nsf

559,600 gsf

139,733 nsf

976,004 gsf

417,336 nsf

Buildings

existing to remain:

new:

Parking

new:

total:

total:

Housing	
existing to remain:	

existing to remain:

existing to remain:	227
new:	0
total:	227

*(after renovations by year 2007) total:

227

Figure V5e

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

То	University of Georgia
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
Subject	Preliminary Physical Master Plan / Review of Proposed Preliminary Plan (Section V)
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Date	8/20/98

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500

410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367

404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 After taking a closer look at the campus through precinct studies, a step back to look at the overall cohesiveness of the design is beneficial to see if the overall objectives of the plan were maintained. The cornerstone of the proposed design was to provide a simultaneous increase of both open / green-space and building density. The removal of surface parking from the interior of campus would be the key vehicle to making this happen.

1. Review of Proposed Plan Objectives and Attributes

1.1 Parking

If the current ratio of parking to the number of students were maintained, when enrollment reached 32,500 students there would need to be 18,700 parking spaces available on the main campus. This is roughly 150 acres of surface parking. The four existing decks take up about 27 acres of that surface parking and the proposed eight decks would swallow up approximately 100 more acres of surface lots, leaving only 22 acres of surface parking left. The footprint of both existing and proposed decks would occupy about 22 acres (see Figure V 6).

The main campus of the University of Georgia occupies approximately 600 acres. With 150 acres of surface parking needed, 22 acres taken up in the footprint of decks, and 22 acres of surface parking left, that leaves 106 acres free for open space and new building sites. The use of decks over surface parking could salvage over one sixth of the campus land back from asphalt.

1.2 Existing / Proposed Diagrams

Figures V 7a and V 7b provide a diagrammatic visual review of existing versus proposed open space, building density, parking, and campus transportation circulation routes. The dramatic campus-wide differences between the existing and proposed diagrams become evident at such a small scale.



Not to Scale 9/2/98

Legend



Area needed for 18,700 parking spaces in decks (22 acres)

Main Campus Area (600 acres)





Area needed for 18,700 spaces in surface parking (150 acres) Surface Parking VS Decks

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure V 6



Preliminary Master Plan Existing Open Space Diagram

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan





Preliminary Master Plan Proposed Open Space Diagram

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan





Preliminary Master Plan Existing Building Diagram

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan





Preliminary Master Plan Proposed Building Diagram

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan




Preliminary Master Plan Existing Parking Diagram

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan





Preliminary Master Plan Existing Bus Route Diagram

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan





Preliminary Master Plan Proposed Bus Route Diagram

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan







Preliminary Master Plan Proposed Parking Diagram

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan



Date	July 7, 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Land and Building Use / (Section VI.A)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners
Ayers/Saint/Gross

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture

Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726

Traffic Engineering

Fax 404/876-6858

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

1. PROPOSED LAND USE

Currently, the University does not have formally defined areas of land use on the Main Campus. North Campus has generally been associated with the Arts, Humanities, and campus administration while South Campus has been considered home for the Sciences. Land and building issues have been addressed accordingly, encouraging the juxtaposition of like disciplines in order to facilitate campus transit and ensure the efficient distribution of utilities and services.

In the course of the Plan development, five issues pertaining to land use have clearly not reached a final resolution.

- 1. Parking Policy
- 2. Veterinary Medicine
- 3. Greek Housing
- 4. Agricultural Lands
- 5. On Campus Housing

These issues are either in a state of rapid evolution or require a more detailed study than this plan will allow. There is the need for a more comprehensive parking study to be commissioned in conjunction with the development of new comprehensive parking policies and financing options (see section IV C Parking Space Projections).

A separate detailed study should be conducted for Veterinary Medicine's land and facilities needs. The study is required not only to define their extensive and immediate needs but also to facilitate consensus building within the School. The complex demands of the small and large animal hospitals combined with the academic and research facilities will require a professional study beyond the scope of the Physical Master Plan.

Greek housing is another complex land use issue; the scope of which goes beyond the Physical Master Plan. Comprehensive discussions of the future of Greek housing on campus have already begun and should continue in order to develop a strategy to address the problem of degenerating Greek facilities.

The College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences (CAES) has many outstanding land-use issues that need to be addressed. These include the consolidation of the

University's agricultural lands, and the future growth and development of the three major extension campuses. The CAES has developed a Facilities and Land Use Task Force Report which includes facilities and land use policies and recommendations for the main campus animal related programs. This report is exemplary of what should be developed for the other CAES campuses and facilities. Similar to the College of Veterinary Medicine, the whole of the CAES is comprised of many complex elements including both academic and extension. This complex structure combined with the various locations of the facilities merits the need for a more comprehensive and detailed study.

The University housing department should develop an implementation and financing plan to carry out the University's goals of developing the capacity on campus to house all freshmen and sophomores, as shown on the proposed physical master plan.

2. BUILDING USE

Natural adjacencies of compatible programs and buildings have occurred in different areas, but this network has remained loose without the development of formally defined districts. The proposed plan recommends a continued effort to group buildings of compatible uses. The proposed plan reflects the unwritten goal that elements of like disciplines be located in close proximity to one another (see Figure VI.A 2). This would facilitate the distribution of utilities and service functions that like disciplines would share. This could also have a positive effect on campus transit and interdisciplinary academic, research, and service interactions.

Building sites have been shown on the proposed plan that fall into 3 categories (housing, parking and academic). It is strongly suggested that UGA develop policies that will continue to refine the process of assigning building uses to proposed buildings. Policies should be adopted that facilitate a detailed and comprehensive examination of sites to determine their best uses, taking into consideration the context of immediate surroundings as well as the whole campus.

It should be understood that for any University there would be a natural cycle of obsolescence of buildings. There will not only be a constant need for new facilities, but also for the restoration and substantial renovation of older buildings. The latter is a major concern for older institutions like UGA. While the University's replacement value of buildings is about 26% of Georgia's University System total, UGA maintains 64% of the buildings which are over 50 years or older in the entire system. With age factored into the formula, UGA's needs represent 33% of the system total as calculated by the Regents' formula.

Included in the appendix is the University of Georgia's FY 1997 Building Condition Evaluation, and a summary of the estimated building correction costs. Over time the continued patchwork and retrofitting of an old building for a new use may prove more costly than the construction of a new facility. The price tag for neglecting the renewal of campus infrastructure increases every year. Current policies associated with MRR funding do not allow for the process of renovating older buildings to work as efficiently as possible.

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT DENSITY

The proposed plan incorporates a concentrated effort to provide the needed future facilities for approved and anticipated growth on contiguous campus land. The strategy of identifying future building sites on areas in close proximity to or between existing buildings is referred to in this plan as infill. This increased density will provide for the preservation of agricultural lands adjacent to campus and the efficient use of infrastructure and the campus transit system, while creating a better walking campus and a better sense of community. This concentration of new development on contiguous land will provide the opportunity for buildings to be used as the defining edges of open spaces. These open spaces will then contribute to the creation of a network of open spaces that provides the backbone of a clear comprehensive campus plan.

4. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONES / RECOMMENDED LAND ACQUISITIONS

The highlighted areas in Figure VI A 4 are properties that are not currently owned by the University, but would be optimal sites if acquired for future growth, given their proximity to the academic core of campus. As these properties become available for acquisition, it is strongly recommended that the University seriously consider their purchase.



Not to Scale Date 8/20/98

Legend

Academic
 Residential Life
 Service / Outreach
 Student Life
 Parking

Proposed Building Use (Main Campus)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI A 2



The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI A 4

7/15/98



Campus Property Line





Recommended Land Acquisitions

Date	September 9, 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	VI.B Vehicular Circulation and Parking
From	LRE Engineering, Inc.
То	University of Georgia

The purpose of this technical memorandum is to define the layout of the proposed vehicular circulation system and how it will work with the parking plan.

Ayers/Saint/Gross

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architects and Campus Planners

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan

1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

1a. CIRCULATION AND PARKING

1.1 Vehicular Circulation System

The University of Georgia is a mature campus with a well-defined street system. The combination of the campus' density and the rolling topography eliminates the potential for many new roadways to address circulation problems on campus. Furthermore, it is important that the circulation plan support the parking plan which, as stated in section IV.C, recommends that parking structures be moved to the periphery of the campus and interior campus streets be closed or have vehicular access on these streets limited. The Physical Master Plan addresses vehicular circulation and parking on a broad scale. A more indepth detailed study should be completed to document the potential of future street closings/redesign.

The circulation plan for the University Georgia campus proposes to close several local streets while realigning existing roadways in order to open up developable area for buildings within the campus and move vehicles away from the campus core. The characteristics of the circulation system for the campus consists primarily of two lane roadways with turn lanes and traffic signals at major intersections. Important elements in the development of the vehicular system include the coordination of signals, pedestrian signals at well-defined crosswalks, sidewalks adjacent to the roadways, and bicycle lanes where appropriate.

Shown in figure VI.B.1a are the proposed local street closings and new roadway realignments. Also shown are proposed parking deck locations with the anticipated parking capacity for each deck. The major elements of the circulation plan include the following:

- The realignment of Lumpkin Street to intersect Baxter Street at Hull Street and then extended to East Broad Street to connect with Pulaski Street
- The closure of Lumpkin Street from Baldwin Street to just south of Baxter Street
- The closure of many local streets including D. W. Brooks Drive, Green Street and East Green Street

- The reconstruction of the Sanford Drive/Cedar Street intersection
- The redesign of some of the surface streets serving East Campus and the Ramsey Center

In order to close the local streets as identified in the list above and as shown in figure VI.B.1, it will be necessary to verify that service access can be maintained to campus facilities. Though most of the facilities will still be accessible from surface streets, it will be necessary that some of the greenways be "driveable" for specific service vehicles and special event parking.

The most ambitious component of the vehicular circulation plan is the realignment of Lumpkin Street. It is projected that the intersection of Baxter and new Lumpkin Street will require signalization as will the intersection of the new street at East Broad Street. The new street is proposed to align with Pulaski Street.

1.2 Parking Location

There are nine proposed parking decks as shown in figure VI.B1a. Consistent with the parking deck location criteria, these decks are accessible from collector and arterial streets. The location of the decks serves two purposes from a transportation standpoint. First, the decks should be located at points to intercept traffic at major entrances and along high volume corridors in the campus. This will help to reduce the penetration of vehicles into the campus and reduce pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. Second, the decks should provide reasonable access, either by shuttle or walking, to major activity areas.

The *Proposed Circulation and Parking* diagram is currently only available in the Master Plan hard copy; however, the generating CAD drawing is available in the *CAD Files* folder.

Date	July 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Proposed Bus and Bicycle Circulation (figure VI B 2b)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia
	The purpose of this technical memorandum is to discuss the proposed circulation routed for
Architacts and Campus Plannars	buses and bicycles on the University of Georgia campus.

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The overall size of the Main Campus of the University of Georgia makes it necessary to promote modes of transportation, other than walking, to get people to their destinations in a timely manner. Currently, traffic congestion from automobiles and buses on the interior of the campus makes bicycling a less than desirable mode of transportation. Separation of

the campus makes bicycling a less than desirable mode of transportation. Separation of buses and bicycles from each other as well as from pedestrians is a desirable condition for both safety and efficiency.

1. BUS ROUTES

1.1 Perimeter Bus Loop

By relocating the primary bus routes to the roads along the perimeter of the campus: Broad Street to the north, Jackson Street, East Campus Road and River Road to the east, College Station Road to the south, and Agriculture Drive, part of Sanford Drive and Lumpkin Street to the west, traffic congestion on the interior of the campus can be alleviated. Head times between buses would be shortened to compensate for less frequent stops and the overall number of different routes would be reduced. Part of the success of this proposal hinges on the development of a diverse network of pedestrian and bicycle routes, running primarily east – west, that will facilitate easy movement from bus stops to the interior of the campus.

1.2 Shuttle Buses and Handicap Transportation

For safety in the evenings and for special events, smaller shuttle buses that would take the rider closer to their final destination within the interior of the campus could be employed. Transportation of disabled riders would be handled in a similar fashion with either established routes or an "on-call" system.

2. BICYCLE CIRCULATION

2.1 Primary Bicycle Routes

Relocating the primary bus routes to the roads along the perimeter of the campus will help make the Main Campus of the University of Georgia much more hospitable to bicyclists. The goal of this plan is to create a continuous link from downtown Athens to Lake Herrick

and to the existing regional multi-use trail system. The primary bicycle route will be a designated lane, separated from other modes of transportation and marked by a universally recognized symbol. The primary bicycle route will be located along a course that reduces conflict between automobiles and bikes by minimizing the number of crossings on streets that carry daily car traffic.

Along roads shared with motorized vehicles, a four foot wide lane will be marked on each side of the pavement where possible. Where the road is too narrow to accommodate two bike lanes, a single lane will be designated. If conditions allow, the single lane will be located on the side of the road that runs uphill with the flow of traffic.

For safety, major pedestrian routes will also be separated from bicycle traffic by a designated and well-marked lane. On the interior of the campus, primary routes will be along limited access streets where possible to make separation of vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians more practical.

2.2 Secondary Bicycle Routes

Secondary bicycle routes will serve as east – west connectors from the periphery of the campus to the primary bicycle route. They will carry a lower volume of traffic, but where possible designated lanes will be provided.



Date	July 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Proposed Open Space System (figure VI C 1)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia
	The purpose of this technical memorandum is to discuss the proposed open space system
Architects and Campus Planners	on the University of Georgia campus.

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE

Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates

899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The quadrangles on North Campus are characteristic of desirable open spaces because the scale of the structures surrounding them define the spaces without imposing on them. As a person walks through North Campus they are able to navigate by knowing where they are within a space rather than by knowing the address or name of a particular building. Unfortunately, most of the existing open spaces on the University of Georgia campus do not share this character. In general, the other existing spaces are more disjointed and vary greatly in general character.

The goal of the Master Plan is to create a network of open spaces that become the way finding system for the campus. The pedestrian experience will encompass three major types of open spaces: naturalized space, streetscapes and quadrangles. These spaces will be woven together by the placement of future buildings and the renovation of existing streets and open spaces.

1. NATURALIZED SPACE

Naturalized spaces on the University of Georgia Campus are defined as areas dominated by informally arranged vegetation that connect the campus with its natural site elements. The primary naturalized spaces on the proposed plan are the Tanyard Creek area, including Lumpkin Street, and the area to the west of the Oconee River, including East Campus Road and the remnant woodlands on South Campus. These areas will be preserved and enhanced to further define character and role in the landscape. Other, smaller naturalized spaces may occur throughout the campus and the large naturalized area near Lake Herrick will remain intact.

2. STREETSCAPES

The University of Georgia campus has streets of many sizes and functions. In order to provide a safe and aesthetically desirable walking environment, each general type of street will have a character that suits its function and defines its role in the transportation hierarchy. The street types are defined as follows:

2.1 Publicly Accessible Streets at the Edge of Campus

High volume streets such as Lumpkin Street, Broad Street, Baxter Street, East Campus Road and College Station road are included in this category. These roads must accommodate automobiles and buses at a relatively high rate of speed as well as bicycles and pedestrians. Pedestrian safety at crossings is of the greatest importance on this type of road. Pedestrians should be directed to defined, signalized crosswalks at each intersection and discouraged from crossing streets at random.

2.2 Publicly Accessible Streets on the Interior of Campus

Examples of this type of street include Baldwin Street, portions of Sanford Drive and Carlton Street. The volume of automobile and bus traffic varies on these streets, but the number of pedestrians crossing these streets is high. Pedestrian safety is a major concern on these streets. Because of the total volume of pedestrians, especially at peak times, great numbers of people cross the street at places other than defined crosswalks. For this reason, traffic calming devices such as speed breakers and raised crosswalks are proposed for this type of street.

2.3 Limited Access Streets

D.W. Brooks Drive, "Old" Lumpkin Street, portions of Sanford Drive, Soule Street and Green Street are all proposed as limited access streets on the interior of the campus. These streets will be for use by bicycles and pedestrians only with motorized use limited to emergency and service vehicles. Where possible asphalt will be removed and replaced by concrete sidewalks (of a size suitable to handle vehicles if necessary) and green space.

3. QUADRANGLES

Quadrangles are defined green spaces that act as landmarks along circulation corridors (streetscapes). The edges of these spaces are primarily defined by buildings. As much as possible the character of these spaces will reflect the quadrangles on North Campus: a landscape of primarily grass and shade trees with multiple paved walkways. Quadrangles will be used as informal gathering and recreation areas and will be the notable spaces by which a pedestrian can navigate.



Dhysical Master Dia

Fax 303/832-3380

Date	July 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Proposed Pedestrian Circulation (figure VI C 2)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
To Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347 8519	University of Georgia The purpose of this technical memorandum is to describe the proposed pedestrian circulation for the University of Georgia campus. As described in the "Existing Conditions" portion of this document (figure III A 4.2), walking is one of the most desirable defining characteristics of the collegiate experience. Good walking campuses are characterized by compact form and a system of pathway
Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283 Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan	The north portion of the existing campus serves as a model for good pedestrian circulation. Rich texture is provided by the presence of multiple routes and many landmarks, both large and small, that punctuate the routes and provide intermediate destinations for the walker. Historically, the main campus of the University of Georgia has been perceived as several discrete campus districts without strong pedestrian links between them. The goal of the proposed pedestrian circulation system is to create a more unified walking campus by emulating the desirable qualities of north campus in the other campus districts.
1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858 <i>Traffic Engineering</i> LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309	Central to achieving this goal is the notion that automobile circulation and parking must be removed from the interior of the campus and limited to periphery of the campus. Removing the cars not only makes a safer place to walk, but it also frees space in the interior of the campus to create a rich pedestrian environment of many routes and intermediate destinations. Ultimately a person will be able to walk from the arch on north campus all the way to Lake Herrick on the extreme south campus, or to any destination in between, along an enjoyable, easily navigated pedestrian route that is relatively unimpeded by automobile and bus traffic
404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797 <i>Academic Programming</i> Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272	Because of the hilly terrain on the University of Georgia campus handicap accessibility is a constant concern. Wherever possible accessible routes will be provided and compliance with all laws regarding accessibility coordinated with the office of accessibility.



Existing

Building

Building

Distances

Proposed

Walking





Proposed Pedestrian Circulation - Plan

University of Georgia / Physical Master Plan

Date	July 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Proposed Athletic and Recreational Facilities (figure VI D 1)
From	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan
То	University of Georgia
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519	The purpose of this technical memorandum is to discuss the proposed outdoor recreation opportunities proposed for the University of Georgia campus. The University of Georgia's Athletics Department has long held an important presence on campus. The prominent position of Sanford Stadium on campus is a constant reminder of the powerful influence of athletics on the UGA Campus.
Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283	Overall, the on-campus recreational opportunities will remain as they are currently with space divided between intercollegiate and intramural athletics, natural recreation space, and informal and designated recreation space (see figure III A 6.1).
Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan	1. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryar 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 With the exception of Sanford Stadium, the majority of UGA's intercollegiate athletics facilities currently occupy a large area in the lower west portion of campus. This area seems well suited for this use and these facilities such as the Coliseum, Foley Field and the existing practice fields will remain intact. Pedestrian access for spectators at Sanford Stadium will be greatly enhanced by the development of a plaza area to the north of the stadium and reconfiguration of some the entrance gates.

The Athletic Association is anticipating some new development in the near future. Included in the appendices is a list of the UGA Athletic Association Capital Projects. It is strongly recommended that these efforts be coordinated with the implementation of the UGA Master Plan. Title Nine (concerning the equality of men and women's facilities) has spurred a lot of the latest physical growth in athletics because of the effort to maintain a balance between the women and men's facilities. Growth and expansion has generally reached a point of equilibrium, but should an imbalance occur, there would be the need for new facilities and again this development should be coordinated with the implementation of the UGA Master Plan.

2. INTRAMURAL ATHLETICS

This Comprehensive Master Plan shows an addition or expansion to the Ramsey Center because of the overflow of people in the current facility. It also shows that Legion Pool (underutilized in its current location) is relocated in the Lake Herrick area. The proposed Alumni Center building will not diminish intramural fields near Lake Herrick on South Campus.

3. NATURAL RECREATION SPACE

Natural spaces such as Lake Herrick and the corridor adjacent to the Oconee River will be enhanced to provide recreational opportunities in the form of trails and to stabilize and prevent erosion and degradation.

4. INFORMAL RECREATION SPACE

The proposed plan creates many more opportunities for informal recreation by emphasizing the creation of quadrangles, particularly at housing areas where students congregate. While not created specifically for recreational purposes, these areas will be suitable for passive recreation and small active pastimes such as Frisbee and hacky-sack.

5. DESIGNATED RECREATION SPACE

Some designated recreation areas such as tennis, basketball, and volleyball courts, swimming pools or picnic areas will be removed to allow space for proposed buildings. The outdoor swimming pool known as "Legion Pool" will be removed, but a new outdoor swimming facility is proposed near Lake Herrrick.



1":400"

800 1200 98

Legend



Intercollegiate Athletic Facility

Intramural Recreation Facility

Designated Recreation



Physical Master Plan

Figure VID 1

Facilities

Recreational

University of Georgia

Proposed Athletic and



Existing buildings are represented in grey and existing parking decks are represented in yellow. Physical Master Plan Existing / Proposed Diagrams Existing Buildings

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan





Proposed buildings are represented in red while existing buildings are represented in grey. Proposed parking decks are represented in yellow. Physical Master Plan Existing / Proposed Diagrams Proposed Buildings

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan





Physical Master Plan Existing / Proposed Diagrams Existing Figure Ground

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan





Physical Master Plan Existing / Proposed Diagrams Proposed Figure Ground

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan



Date	September 14, 1998		
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan		
Subject	VI.E Campus Infrastructure		
From	Heery		
То	Ayers/Saint/Gross		
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202	The follow Master Pla approach t	ving is the preliminary expansion of the Table of Contents for this Physical an per the Template from the Board of Regents. This addresses the preliminary to campus infrastructure phase of this project.	
410/347-8500	TABLE OF CONTENTS		
Fax 410/347-8519	VI.E	Campus Infrastructure Projections	
Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE	VI.Ea	Steam	
Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880	VI.Eb	Chilled Water	
Fax 404/875-1283	VI.Ec	Water (fire protection, potable water)	
Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858	VI.Ed	Sanitary Sewer	
	VI.Ef	Gas	
	VI.Eg	Stormwater	
Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797	VI.Eh	Communications (voice, databand, videoband)	
Academic Programming			

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

VI.E Campus Infrastructure Projections

a) Heating Utilities

The following graphic depicts the multiple Sub Central Utility Building (SCUB) zones and a rough approximation of locations of those buildings. It is assumed that these independent plants would generally be located at or in garage structures due to both access and noise impact. The final location of these plants could be within a new building or freestanding structures depending on timing of construction and the need.

Existing steam lines shown on the graphic would gradually be replaced with hot water lines paralleling the new chilled water distribution piping.

More detailed planning is required to find optimum plant siting and utility piping routes. In the case of housing and dining halls a life cycle cost study should be performed to determine if local gas boilers would be more cost effective, but allowing for higher cost of non-interruptible gas.

b) Chilled Water Utilities

As with the Heating Utilities graphic the projected chilled water SCUB zones are superimposed over existing chilled water distribution piping. The SCUB zones should logically follow the existing chilled water loops as much as possible to simplify the transition and to make use of as much existing distribution piping as possible.

Both chilled and hot water piping should be routed with careful attention to the planned open green spaces. Pipe crossing these areas should be sized for future needs or encased in a tunnel or conduit to minimize future disturbance to landscaped areas.

As with hot water distribution a more detailed study is required for optimum cooling/heating plant locations, piping routes and timing to satisfy both existing and future cooling and heating needs. The optimum design for these plants would be a modular design that would allow for expansion on central manifolds as needs dictate.

Also recommended for study are potential systems that would optimize energy cost and efficiency. This would include systems such as engine driven chillers which could provide chilled water during higher cost peak energy cost periods and provide hot water recovered from engine jacket and exhaust heat.

c) Potable Water

The Master Plan recommends the construction of several new buildings throughout the campus. Providing services to these newly constructed facilities will require connecting to the existing water systems. Additional fire hydrants and water valves are shown on the plans to provide the necessary fire protection for each building. Services to all newly constructed buildings will be connected to the existing water system. The capacity of the existing system should be upgraded to handle the additional demands placed on the system due to the new building construction.

d) Sanitary Sewer

Most proposed buildings are located in areas where sanitary sewer lines are located. There are areas where the sanitary line will need to be extended in order to tie into existing sanitary lines. Additional manholes are shown on the plans every 300 foot to provide access to the lines for maintenance. Once the buildings are defined and the intended use is determined a more intensive evaluation will need to be conducted on the capacity of the line.

e) Gas

New gas loops and additional gas lines are added to existing gas lines to supply natural gas service to new buildings and accommodate the growth. If the intent of the University is to supply natural gas throughout the campus then this plan will accommodate their needs.

f) Electrical Infrastructure

An addition of a third transformer to the existing substation will be required. No locational or additional campus space requirements are needed with the third substation transformer. It is recommended that the additional ductbank locations be coordinated within the new program green area-landscaping plan. Given the new building growth projections, the impact of the program will create a need for a new electrical substation by the year 2007. It is estimated at this time that the most ideal location for a second substation seems to be adjacent to the Chicopee Complex.

It is recommended that a decentralized, area location approach be implemented for the generators, coordinated with the need for a similar Heating Ventilating and Air Conditioning strategy. This semi-centralized standby power capacity approach would be a recommended option to the University in lieu of providing emergency or standby power at the time each new facility is added, or providing one large standby generator plant.

The standby power capacity has been allocated by areas, in order to provide an alternative to building specific units as each new building is constructed.

The following areas marked in the illustration are suggested locations for the generation:

North Campus	Generating Plant No. 1
Central Campus	Generating Plant No. 2
South Campus	Generating Plant No. 3
Lower South & East Campus	Generating Plant No. 4

It is recommended that the location of these units be coordinated with the construction of new parking deck facilities such as to accommodate the space requirements of both within the same area. Should the option of a

large unit be considered, it would be feasible to locate at the Chicopee Complex, near the second electrical substation area.

g) Stormwater

The information provided for the stormwater infrastructure was very minimum. Due to insufficient data it was not possible to complete a map and offer additional information to the stormwater system.

h) Communications Infrastructure

Voice

There are five Campus Communications hubs with the AT&T Definity Generic 2, PBX switches. The current Master Plan expansion program will create a need for the addition of new switch sites as needed. The existing communications ductwork has the capability for additional growth. As switch sites are added, more supporting equipment will be added to the Ramsey Center Central facility.

Any new buildings should be designed to be provided with cabling that connects to the nearest switch site.

Data Distribution

Project "VENUS" (Virtual Electronic Network for University Services) intends to create a fiber optic network infrastructure to connect approximately 200 buildings over an Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) backbone.

The total number of network attached devices is presently estimated to be approximately eight thousand. The project VENUS study estimated a system growth up to twelve thousand network devices.

The project mentioned above is currently being implemented.

The network topology described by the study proposed a matrix backbone with starred connections for clustered buildings. Each connection could be assumed to be a network switch. A total of twelve buildings were assigned to each switch node.

The VENUS Project has been designed for future growth by nature of its modular structure approach, the same pattern should be applied to the new expansion program such that the network topology and redundancy presently contemplated are maintained. The following diagrams are currently only available in the Master Plan hard copy:

Proposed Steam Utilities

Proposed Chilled Water Utilities

Proposed Potable Water Utilities

Proposed Natural Gas Utilities

Proposed Sanitary Utilities

Proposed *Electrical* Utilities

Proposed Stormwater Utilities

Proposed Communications Utilities

However, the generating CAD files are available in the CAD Files folder.

Date	9/9/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Comprehensive Plan (Section VI F)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

The University of Georgia Comprehensive Plan is represented here in three ways. An illustrative to portray the overall essence of the plan, diagrams to highlight specific defining elements, and prescribed edges diagrams that clarify the relationship between the built environment and the natural.

1. ILLUSTRATIVE

The illustrative of the Physical Master Plan (Figure VI F) serves as an inviting cover to a book that describes the process of combining the built environment with the natural to create a superior academic environment. This visual, without the clutter of detailed data and descriptions, clearly illustrates the heart of this Master Plan: the interconnectivity and enhancement of open space and the creation of order in the built environment.

2. DIAGRAMS

Figure VI Fa provides at a quick glance of the "before and after" of the built environment. Figure VI Fb illustrates dramatic changes in major elements of circulation on campus. Parking lots disappear while simpler more organized routes of circulation are developed.

3. PRESCRIBED EDGES

The dialog between buildings and the natural environments they occupy is the loudest voice heard by anyone experiencing a campus. The perceivable edges created by the alignment of building facades or landscape features create the limits of the outdoor environment, just as walls create the limits of a room. The more defined or perceivable the edge created, the more memorable and navigable the space becomes to the observer. In a campus or pedestrian oriented environment the relationship of one open space to another is just as important as the juxtaposition of buildings. Figures VI F 1a-f delineate the prescribed edges created by the location of existing and proposed buildings and the network of open spaces they define.

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367

404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380



Not to Scale

7/98



Legend

Proposed BuildingsExisting BuildingsProposed Decks

Comprehensive Plan

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan



Black area represent existing surface parking. Red represents existing parking decks. Physical Master Plan Existing / Proposed Diagrams Existing Parking

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan




Not to Scale November 1997 Proposed parking decks are represented in red. Surface parking is represented in black. Physical Master Plan Existing / Proposed Diagrams Proposed Parking

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI Fb 2





Not to Scale November 1997 Purple lines represent existing roads. The width of the line represents the heirarchy of the most heavily traversed to to the least traversed roads. Physical Master Plan Existing / Proposed Diagrams Existing Traffic

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI Fb 3





Not to Scale November 1997

Purple lines represent proposed road network. The width of the line indicates the hierarchy of the most traveled to the least traveled.

Parking decks are represented in red.

Physical Master Plan Existing / Proposed Diagrams Proposed Traffic

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI Fb 4





Legend



prescribed proposed building edge

geometric relationship guidelines

primary quadrangles

secondary informal open space

preserved remanant forest

Prescribed Edges North Campus

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI F 1a





Legend



prescribed proposed building edge
geometric relationship guidelines
primary quadrangles
secondary informal open space

preserved remanant forest

Prescribed Edges Central Campus

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI F 1b



Legend





geometric relationship guidelines primary quadrangles secondary informal open space

prescribed proposed building edge

preserved remanant forest

Prescribed Edges West Campus

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI F 1c



Legend



Prescribed Edges Lower West Campus

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI F 1d





Legend



prescribed proposed building edge





primary quadrangles

secondary informal open space

preserved remanant forest

Prescribed Edges South Campus

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI F 1e







Legend



geometric relationship guidelines



primary quadrangles

secondary informal open space

preserved remanant forest

Prescribed Edges Lower South and East Campus

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VI F 1f









The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	10/12/98						
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan						
Subject	Cost Estimates for Building, Infrastructure, and Site Improvements (Section VII A)						
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross						
То	University of Georgia The objective of this work element is to document preliminary cost estimates for building,						
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross	site and infrastructure improvements.						
222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore MD 21202	Documents Included:						
410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519	Area Calculations for Proposed Buildings and Open Spaces (Figure VII A Ex1-6)						
Architecture and Engineering	Graphic (Figure VIIA Labeling Proposed Buildings and Open Spaces)						
999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367	Cost Estimates (Divided into Seven Precincts)						
404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283	Summary of Costs						
Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858	Note : Because information on the proposed Food Science facility was not available until after the completion of Section VI, it was not included in that section but is represented in Section VII as S26 for implementation purposes.						
<i>Traffic Engineering</i> LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797							
Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380							

UNIVER	SITY OF G	EORGL	A PHYS	SICAL MA	ASTER P	LAN / A	SG PROJ	ECT # 97
Prelimina	ry Area Calc	ulations f	or Propo	sed Buildir	ngs and Pa	rking Dec	ks	
CALCULAT	ED FROM JUL	Y 98 PLAN	[35,983		gsf = gros	ss square feet	
Building / Open Space Number	Building Use	Area Per Floor, gsf	Number of Floors	Total Area, gsf	Area Per Car / Bed , gsf	Number of Cars	Number of Beds	Area of Open Space, acres
NORTH CA	MPUS							
N1	residential life	4,000	4	16,000	400		40	
N2	residential life	6,800	4	27,200	400		68	
N3	residential life	4,800	4	19,200	400		48	
N4		5,400	4	21,600				
N5		17,250	4	69,000				
N6	residential life	15,800	4	63,200	400		158	
N7	residential life	10,800	4	43,200	400		108	
N8	residential life	15,000	4	60,000	400		150	
N9	residential life	28,000	4	112,000	400		280	
N10	residential life	15,000	4	60,000	400		150	
NP1		95,000	5	475,000	350	1,357		
subtotals				966,400		1,357	1,002	
OS1								1.29
OS2								1.68
OS4								2.3
OS5								0.82
OS6								1.65
OS7								0.44
subtotals								8.18

Building /		Area Per			Area Per			Area of
Open Space		Floor,	Number	Total Area,	Car / Bed ,	Number of	Number of	Open
Number	Building Use	gsf	of Floors	gsf	gsf	Cars	Beds	Space, acres
CENTRAL (CAMPUS							
C1	residential life	11,400	4	45,600	400		114	
C2	residential life	10,200	4	40,800	400		102	
C3	residential life	19,200	4	76,800	400		192	
C4		11,200	4	44,800				
C5A		32,900	4	131,600				
C5B		24,000	2	48,000				
C6A		42,700	4	170,800				
C6B		12,265	2	24,530				
C7	residential life	18,500	4	74,000	400		185	
C8	residential life	16,800	4	67,200	400		168	
C9	residential life	14,400	4	57,600	400		144	
C10	residential life	14,400	3	43,200	400		108	
CP1		50,000	2	100,000	350	286		
CP2		28,800	5	144,000	350	411		
subtotals				1,068,930		697	1,013	
OS3								1.03
OS8								1.42
OS9								1.93
OS10								1.1
OS11								1.09
OS12								1.1
OS13								0.48
OS14								1.12
OS15								1.73
subtotals								11

								Area of
		Area Per			Area Per			Open
Building		Floor,	Number	Total Area,	Car / Bed,	Number of	Number of	Space,
Number		gsf	of Floors	gsf	gsf	Cars	Beds	arcres
WEST CAM	PUS							
W1	residential life	12,000	5	60,000	400		150	
W2	residential life	10,200	5	51,000	400		128	
W3	residential life	12,000	5	60,000	400		150	
W4	residential life	7,500	5	37,500	400		94	
W5	residential life	12,000	5	60,000	400		150	
W6	residential life	12,000	5	60,000	400		150	
W7	residential life	12,100	5	60,500	400		151	
W8	residential life	9,000	5	45,000	400		113	
W9	residential life	13,200	5	66,000	400		165	
W10	residential life	6,500	5	32,500	400		81	
W11A		5,000	2	10,000				
W11B		6,300	2	12,600				
W11C		12,000	3	36,000				
W11D		9,000	2	18,000				
W11E		5,000	2	10,000				
O HOUSE EX	residential life	5,000	9	45,000	400		113	
WP1		43,200	6	259,200	350	741		
WD EXP				410,200	350	1,172		
subtotals				1,333,500		1,913	1,444	
OS16								3.81
OS17								5.33
OS18								5.33
OS19								1.51
OS20								0.36
subtotals								16.34

		A Dow			Arros Dan			Area of
D		Area Per	NIh ou	T-4-1 Amon	Area Per	NT how of	N h on of	Open
Building		Floor,	Number	Total Area,	Car / Bed,	Number of	Number of	Space,
Number		gsi	of Floors	gsi	gsi	Cars	Beds	arcres
SOUTH CAN	MPUS							
S1	residential life	10,800	4	43,200	400		108	
S2		12,000	4	48,000				
S3		26,000	4	104,000	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
S4		14,000	4	56,000				
S5	residential life	10,200	4	40,800	400		102	
S6	residential life	30,000	4	120,000	400		300	
S7		28,500	4	114,000				
S8	residential life	29,600	4	118,400	400		296	
S9		43,600	4	174,400				
S10		25,000	4	100,000				
S11		55,000	4	220,000				
S12	residential life	10,800	4	43,200	400		108	
S13	residential life	18,800	4	75,200	400		188	
S14		6,500	4	26,000	 		 	
S15 (not used	.)							
S16 (not used	.)							
S17 (not used	.)							
S18 (not used	.)							
S19		40,400	4	161,600				
S20	residential life	25,000	4	100,000	400		250	
S21	residential life	11,800	3	35,400	400		89	
S22		13,600	3	40,800				
S23		21,600	4	86,400				
S24		28,200	4	112,800				
S25	residential life	10,200	4	40,800	400		102	
S26		6,095	3	18,285				
SP1		120,000	6	720,000	350	2,057		
SP2		126,000	5	630,000	350	1,800		
SD EXP				107,800	350	308		
subtotals				3,337,085		4,165	1,543	
OS21	1							1.42
OS22								1.27
OS23	1							3.67
OS24	1			1				1.33
OS25	1			1				0.45
OS26	1			1				0.97
OS27	1			1				1.05
OS28				,	[[3.48
OS29								0.56
OS30								0.76
subtotals								14.96

Building Number		Area Per Floor, gsf	Number of Floors	Total Area, gsf	Area Per Car/Bed, gsf	Number of Cars	Number of Beds	Area of Open Space, acres
LOWER SO	UTH AND EAS	ST CAMP	US					
LS1		12,800	4	51,200				
LS2		29,800	4	119,200				
LS3		18,200	4	72,800				
LS4		29,900	4	119,600				
LS5		8,400	4	33,600				
LS6		41,800	4	167,200				
LS8	residential life	9,000	4	36,000	400		90	
LS9	residential life	9,000	4	36,000	400		90	
LS10		14,000	4	56,000				
LS11		14,000	4	56,000				
LS12		24,800	4	99,200				
LS13		9,000	4	36,000				
LS14		9,800	4	39,200				
LS15		12,000	4	48,000				
LS16		26,000	4	104,000				
LS17	residential life	11,700	5	58,500	400		146	
LS18	residential life	14,700	5	73,500	400		184	
LS19	residential life	14,700	5	73,500	400		184	
LS20	residential life	11,700	5	58,500	400		146	
LS21	residential life	9,350	5	46,750	400		117	
LS22	residential life	19,250	5	96,250	400		241	
LS23		76,900	4	307,600				
LS24		23,400	3	70,200				
LSP1		124,900	6	749,400	350	2,141		
subtotals				2,608,200		2,141	1,198	
OS31								1.43
OS32								1.52
OS34								1.15
OS35								3.26
OS36								1.57
OS37								1.7
OS38								1.38
OS40								7.81
OS41								5.48
subtotals								25.3
LAKE HER	RICK			4				
LH1		45,600	4	182,400				
subtotals		,		182,400				
OS39				*				1.11
LOWER WE	EST							
LW1		52,400	4	209,600				
LWP1		70,000	6	420,000	350	1,200		
subtotals				629,600		1,200		

GRAND TOTALS FOR PROPOSI	ED AREA CA	LCULATION	NS		
TOTAL PROPOSED GSF					10,126,115
TOTAL GSF FOR PROPOSED PAR	S			4,065,750	
TOTAL PROPOSED PARKING SP.	ACES				11,473
TOTAL GSF FOR PROPOSED HO				2,479,500	
TOTAL PROPOSED BEDS					6,200
TOTAL PROPOSED OPEN SPACE	, ACRES				76.89



Not to Scale

7/98



Legend



Proposed Buildings

Proposed Open Space Projects

Implementation

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VII A

		NORTH	CAMPU	JS		
Building / Open Space Number	Building/Land Use	Area Per Floor, gsf	Number of Floors	Total Area, GSF	Unit Cost	Total Cost
N1	residential life	4,000	4	16,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 1,643,040
N2	residential life	6,800	4	27,200	\$ 102.69	\$ 2,793,168
N3	residential life	4,800	4	19,200	\$ 102.69	\$ 1,971,648
N4	academic bldg.	5,400	4	21,600	\$ 127.27	\$ 2,749,032
N5	academic bldg.	17,250	4	69,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 8,781,630
N6	residential life	15,800	4	63,200	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,490,008
N7	residential life	10,800	4	43,200	\$ 102.69	\$ 4,436,208
N8	residential life	15,000	4	60,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,161,400
N9	residential life	28,000	4	112,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 11,501,280
N10	residential life	15,000	4	60,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,161,400
NP1	parking deck	95,000	5	475,000	\$ 34.58	\$ 16,425,500
subtotals				966,400		\$ 69,114,314
OS1	quadrangle			56,190	\$ 12.00	\$ 674,280
OS2	plaza			73,180	\$ 18.00	\$ 1,317,240
OS4	plaza			100,190	\$ 18.00	\$ 1,803,420
OS5	field-like			35,720	\$ 7.00	\$ 250,040
OS6	quadrangle			71,880	\$ 12.00	\$ 862,560
OS7	plaza			19,170	\$ 18.00	\$ 345,060
subtotals				356,330		\$ 5,252,600

		CENTRA	L CAMI	PUS		
Building / Open Space Number	Building/Land Use	Area Per Floor, gsf	Number of Floors	Total Area, GSF	Unit Cost	Total Cost
C1	residential life	11,400	4	45,600	\$ 102.69	\$ 4,682,664
C2	residential life	10,200	4	40,800	\$ 102.69	\$ 4,189,752
C3	residential life	19,200	4	76,800	\$ 102.69	\$ 7,886,592
C4, see note 1.	academic bldg.	11,200	4	44,800	\$ 127.27	\$ 5,701,696
C5A, see note 1.	academic bldg.	32,900	4	131,600	\$ 127.27	\$ 16,748,732
C5B, see note 1.	academic bldg.	24,000	2	48,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 6,108,960
C6A, see note 1.	academic bldg.	42,700	4	170,800	\$ 127.27	\$ 21,737,716
C6B	academic bldg.	12,265	2	24,530	\$ 127.27	\$ 3,121,933
C7	residential life	18,500	4	74,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 7,599,060
C8	residential life	16,800	4	67,200	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,900,768
C9	residential life	14,400	4	57,600	\$ 102.69	\$ 5,914,944
C10	residential life	14,400	3	43,200	\$ 102.69	\$ 4,436,208
CP1	parking deck	50,000	2	100,000	\$ 34.58	\$ 3,458,000
CP2	parking deck	28,800	5	144,000	\$ 34.58	\$ 4,979,520
subtotals				1,068,930		\$ 103,466,545
OS3	plaza			44,870	\$ 18.00	\$ 807,660
OS8	quadrangle			61,860	\$ 12.00	\$ 742,320
OS9	plaza			84,070	\$ 18.00	\$ 1,513,260
OS10	plaza			47,920	\$ 18.00	\$ 862,560
OS11	plaza			47,480	\$ 18.00	\$ 854,640
OS12	field-like			47,920	\$ 7.00	\$ 335,440
OS13	quadrangle			20,910	\$ 12.00	\$ 250,920
OS14	quadrangle			48,790	\$ 12.00	\$ 585,480
OS15	plaza			75,360	\$ 18.00	\$ 1,356,480
subtotals				479,180		\$ 7,308,760

NOTES:

1. These four building sites generally represent the proposed Student Learning Center. More detailed program and budget planning has been developed for this project as a part of the Capital Outlay Plan. The current total project budget for this project is \$44,024,000.

		WEST (CAMPUS	5		
Building / Open Space Number	Building/Land Use	Area Per Floor, gsf	Number of Floors	Total Area, GSF	Unit Cost	Total Cost
W1	residential life	12,000	5	60,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,161,400
W2	residential life	10,200	5	51,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 5,237,190
W3	residential life	12,000	5	60,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,161,400
W4	residential life	7,500	5	37,500	\$ 102.69	\$ 3,850,875
W5	residential life	12,000	5	60,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,161,400
W6	residential life	12,000	5	60,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,161,400
W7	residential life	12,100	5	60,500	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,212,745
W8	residential life	9,000	5	45,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 4,621,050
W9	residential life	13,200	5	66,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,777,540
W10	residential life	6,500	5	32,500	\$ 102.69	\$ 3,337,425
W11A, see note 1.	academic bldg.	5,000	2	10,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 1,272,700
W11B, see note 1.	academic bldg.	6,300	2	12,600	\$ 127.27	\$ 1,603,602
W11C, see note 1.	academic bldg.	12,000	3	36,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 4,581,720
W11D, see note 1.	academic bldg.	9,000	2	18,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 2,290,860
W11E, see note 1.	academic bldg.	5,000	2	10,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 1,272,700
O HOUSE EXP	residential life	5,000	9	45,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 4,621,050
WP1	parking deck	43,200	6	259,200	\$ 34.58	\$ 8,963,136
WD EXP	parking deck			410,200	\$ 34.58	\$ 14,184,716
subtotals				1,333,500		\$ 93,472,909
OS16	plaza			165,960	\$ 18.00	\$ 2,987,280
OS17	quadrangle			232,170	\$ 12.00	\$ 2,786,040
OS18	field-like			232,170	\$ 7.00	\$ 1,625,190
OS19	plaza			65,780	\$ 18.00	\$ 1,184,040
OS20	field-like			15,680	\$ 7.00	\$ 109,760
subtotals				711,760		\$ 8,692,310

NOTES:

1. These five building sites generally represent both the proposed J. W. Fanning Leadership Center and the proposed Chappelle Matthews Public Service Complex. More detailed program and budget planning has been developed for these projects as a part of the Capital Outlay Plan. The current total project budget for the J.W. Fanning Leadership Center is \$4,750,000. The current total project budget for the Chappelle Matthews Public Service Complex is \$9,692,500.

		SOUTH		US			
Building / Open Space Number	Building/Land Use	Area Per Floor, gsf	Number of Floors	Total Area, GSF	U	nit Cost	Total Cost
S1	residential life	10,800	4	43,200	\$	102.69	\$ 4,436,208
S2	science bldg.	12,000	4	48,000	\$	193.22	\$ 9,274,560
S3	science bldg.	26,000	4	104,000	\$	193.22	\$ 20,094,880
S4	science bldg.	14,000	4	56,000	\$	193.22	\$ 10,820,320
S5	residential life	10,200	4	40,800	\$	102.69	\$ 4,189,752
S6	residential life	30,000	4	120,000	\$	102.69	\$ 12,322,800
S7	science bldg.	28,500	4	114,000	\$	193.22	\$ 22,027,080
S8	residential life	29,600	4	118,400	\$	102.69	\$ 12,158,496
S9	science bldg.	43,600	4	174,400	\$	193.22	\$ 33,697,568
S10, see note 1.	science bldg.	25,000	4	100,000	\$	193.22	\$ 19,322,000
S11	science bldg.	55,000	4	220,000	\$	193.22	\$ 42,508,400
S12	residential life	10,800	4	43,200	\$	102.69	\$ 4,436,208
S13	residential life	18,800	4	75,200	\$	102.69	\$ 7,722,288
S14	science bldg.	6,500	4	26,000	\$	193.22	\$ 5,023,720
S15 (not used)							
S16 (not used)							
S17 (not used)							
S18 (not used)							
S19, see note 2.	academic bldg.	40,400	4	161,600		\$127.27	\$ 20,566,832
S20	residential life	25,000	4	100,000	\$	102.69	\$ 10,269,000
S21	residential life	11,800	3	35,400	\$	102.69	\$ 3,635,226
S22	science bldg.	13,600	3	40,800	\$	193.22	\$ 7,883,376
S23	science bldg.	21,600	4	86,400	\$	193.22	\$ 16,694,208
S24	science bldg.	28,200	4	112,800	\$	193.22	\$ 21,795,216
S25	residential life	10,200	4	40,800	\$	102.69	\$ 4,189,752
S26	science bldg.	6,095	3	18,285	\$	193.22	\$ 3,533,028
SP1	parking deck	120,000	6	720,000	\$	34.58	\$ 24,897,600
SP2	parking deck	126,000	5	630,000	\$	34.58	\$ 21,785,400
SD EXP	parking deck			107,800	\$	34.58	\$ 3,727,724
subtotals				3,337,085			\$ 347,011,642
OS21	quadrangle			61,860	\$	12.00	\$ 742,320
OS22	quadrangle			55,320	\$	12.00	\$ 663,840
OS23	plaza			159,870	\$	18.00	\$ 2,877,660
OS24	quadrangle			57,930	\$	12.00	\$ 695,160
OS25	plaza			19,600	\$	18.00	\$ 352,800
OS26	plaza			42,250	\$	18.00	\$ 760,500
OS27	quadrangle			45,740	\$	12.00	\$ 548,880
OS28	plaza			151,590	\$	18.00	\$ 2,728,620
OS29	plaza			24,390	\$	18.00	\$ 439,020
OS30	quadrangle			33,100	\$	12.00	\$ 397,200
subtotals				651,650			\$ 10,206,000

NOTES: see next page

SOUTH CAMPUS

NOTES:

1. This building site generally represents the proposed Addition to the Pharmacy Building. More detailed program and budget planning has been developed for this project as a part of the Capital Outlay Plan. The current total project budget for this project is \$22,500,000.

2. This building site generally represents the proposed PVAC Phase III, Dance and Drama Buildings. More detailed program and budget planning has been developed for this project as a part of the Capital Outlay Plan. The current total project budget for this project is \$22,000,000.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA PHYSICAL MASTER PLAN
Preliminary Area Calculations for Proposed Buildings and Parking Decks
CALCULATED FROM JULY 98 PLAN

LOWER SOUTH AND EAST CAMPUS							
Building / Open Space Number	Building/Land Use	Area Per Floor, gsf	Number of Floors	Total Area, GSF	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
LS1	science bldg.	12,800	4	51,200	\$ 193.22	\$ 9,892,864	
LS2	science bldg.	29,800	4	119,200	\$ 193.22	\$ 23,031,824	
LS3	science bldg.	18,200	4	72,800	\$ 193.22	\$ 14,066,416	
LS4	science bldg.	29,900	4	119,600	\$ 193.22	\$ 23,109,112	
LS5	science bldg.	8,400	4	33,600	\$ 193.22	\$ 6,492,192	
LS6	science bldg.	41,800	4	167,200	\$ 193.22	\$ 32,306,384	
LS8	residential life	9,000	4	36,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 3,696,840	
LS9	residential life	9,000	4	36,000	\$ 102.69	\$ 3,696,840	
LS10, see note 1.	academic bldg.	14,000	4	56,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 7,127,120	
LS11, see note 1.	academic bldg.	14,000	4	56,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 7,127,120	
LS12, see note 1.	academic bldg.	24,800	4	99,200	\$ 127.27	\$ 12,625,184	
LS13, see note 1.	academic bldg.	9,000	4	36,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 4,581,720	
LS14, see note 2.	academic bldg.	9,800	4	39,200	\$ 127.27	\$ 4,988,984	
LS15, see note 2.	academic bldg.	12,000	4	48,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 6,108,960	
LS16	academic bldg.	26,000	4	104,000	\$ 127.27	\$ 13,236,080	
LS17	residential life	11,700	5	58,500	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,007,365	
LS18	residential life	14,700	5	73,500	\$ 102.69	\$ 7,547,715	
LS19	residential life	14,700	5	73,500	\$ 102.69	\$ 7,547,715	
LS20	residential life	11,700	5	58,500	\$ 102.69	\$ 6,007,365	
LS21	residential life	9,350	5	46,750	\$ 102.69	\$ 4,800,758	
LS22	residential life	19,250	5	96,250	\$ 102.69	\$ 9,883,913	
LS23	academic bldg.	76,900	4	307,600	\$ 127.27	\$ 39,148,252	
LS24	academic bldg.	23,400	3	70,200	\$ 127.27	\$ 8,934,354	
LSP1	parking deck	124,900	6	749,400	\$ 34.58	\$ 25,914,252	
subtotals				2,608,200		\$ 287,879,328	
OS31	field-like			62,290	\$ 7.00	\$ 436,030	
OS32	quadrangle			66,210	\$ 12.00	\$ 794,520	
OS33	quadrangle			57,500	\$ 12.00	\$ 690,000	
OS34	plaza			50,090	\$ 18.00	\$ 901,620	
OS35	quadrangle			142,000	\$ 12.00	\$ 1,704,000	
OS36	quadrangle			68,390	\$ 12.00	\$ 820,680	
OS37	quadrangle			74,050	\$ 12.00	\$ 888,600	
OS38	quadrangle			60,110	\$ 12.00	\$ 721.320	
OS40	plaza			340,200	\$ 18.00	\$ 6,123,600	
OS41	plaza			238,710	\$ 18.00	\$ 4,296,780	
subtotals	<u> </u>			1,159,550		\$ 17,377,150	

NOTES:

1. These four building sites generally represent the proposed PVAC Phase II, School of Art Buildings. More detailed program and budget planning has been developed for this project as a part of the Capital Outlay Plan. The current total project budget for this project is \$35,000,000.

2. These two building sites generally represent the proposed Addition to the Georgia Museum of Art. More detailed program and budget planning has been developed for this project as a part of the Capital Outlay Plan. The current total project budget for this project is \$8,600,000.

CALCULATED TROM JULT 76 TLAN						
LAKE HERRICK						
Building / Open Space Number	Building/Land Use	Area Per Floor, gsf	Number of Floors	Total Area, GSF	Unit Cost	Total Cost
LH1, see note 1.	academic bldg.	45,600	4	182,400	\$ 127.27	\$ 23,214,048
subtotals				182,400		\$ 23,214,048
OS39	field-like			48,350	\$ 7.00	\$ 338,450

LOWER WEST CAMPUS						
Building / Open Space Number	Building/Land Use	Area Per Floor, gsf	Number of Floors	Total Area, GSF	Unit Cost	Total Cost
LW1	science bldg.	52,400	4	209,600	\$ 193.22	\$ 40,498,912
LWP1	parking deck	70,000	6	420,000	\$ 34.58	\$ 14,523,600
subtotals				629,600		\$ 55,022,512

NOTES:

1. This building site generally represents the proposed Alumni Center Complex. More detailed program and budget planning has been developed for this project as a part of the Capital Outlay Plan. The current total project budget for this project is \$23,000,000.

SUMMARY OF COSTS										
	NORTH	CENTRAL	WEST	SOUTH	L. S. & EAST	LAKE H. &				
BUILDINGS AND OPEN	CAMPUS	CAMPUS	CAMPUS	CAMPUS	CAMPUS	L.W. CAMPUS	TOTAL			
SPACE	GSF	GSF	GSF	GSF	GSF	GSF	GSF	Un	it Cost	Total Cost
BUILDINGS:										
SCIENCE BLDG.	0	0	0	1,065,258	563,600	209,600	1,838,485	\$	193.22	\$ 355,232,072
ACADEMIC BLDG.	90,600	419,730	86,600	161,600	816,200	182,400	1,757,130	\$	127.27	\$ 223,629,935
RESIDENTIAL LIFE	400,800	405,200	577,500	652,400	479,000	0	2,514,900	\$	102.69	\$ 258,255,081
PARKING DECK	475,000	244,000	669,400	1,457,800	749,400	420,000	4,015,600	\$	34.58	\$ 138,859,448
										\$ -
TOTAL BUILDINGS							10,126,115			\$ 975,976,536
										\$ -
BUILDING SITEWORK:										\$ -
SITEWORK							10,126,115	\$	6.00	\$ 60,756,690
UTILITIES							10,126,115	\$	1.50	\$ 15,189,173
										\$ -
TOTAL SITEWORK							10,126,115			\$ 75,945,863
										\$ -
INFRASTRUCTURE:										\$ -
UTILITIES							6,110,515	\$	5.50	\$ 33,607,833
SCUB - CHILLED WATER							6,110,515	\$	5.00	\$ 30,552,575
SCUB - HEATING							6,110,515	\$	3.50	\$ 21,386,803
										\$ -
TOTAL INFRASTRUCTURE							6,110,515			\$ 85,547,210
										\$ -
OPEN SPACE:										\$ -
FIELD - LIKE	35,720	47,920	247,850	0	62,290	48,350	442,130	\$	7.00	\$ 3,094,910
QUADRANGLE	128,070	131,560	232,170	253,950	468,260	0	1,214,010	\$	12.00	\$ 14,568,120
PLAZA	192,540	299,700	231,740	397,700	629,000	0	1,750,680	\$	18.00	\$ 31,512,240
										\$ -
TOTAL OPEN SPACE							3,406,820			\$ 49,175,270
										\$ -
TOTAL										\$ 1,186,644,878

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	October 12, 1998				
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan				
Subject	Capital Improvement and Phasing Plan				
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross				
То	University of Georgia The objective of this work element is to prepare a ca	pital budget by phased 5-year			
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202	increments based upon the cost estimates and to pre- increments to the target year. The phasing plan wil likely short- and long-term improvements and projec	pare phasing plans for five-year l reflect priority projects as well as ts.			
410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519	Each phase represented below lists the projects on li within each five-year period. The plan numbers assign	ine that are estimated to be complete gned to each project are general			
Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA, 30367	estimates of where the programs may be accommod restrict the programs to those particular sites. This i purposes only.	lated on the plan and are not meant to s strictly for very preliminary planning			
404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283	In Figures VII B-A through VII B-G, the projects of for each five-year increment are graphically represent are built.	n the main campus that are projected nted. Buildings are colored in as they			
Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858	The building lists include foreseeable capital projects the buildings that would be on line for these particula building sites to accommodate these projects as they number of building sites are marked to be completed program. The "Unassigned Buildings" title at the er	and do not necessarily include all of r five-year periods. The plan provides occur. For each phase a certain l but are not assigned a particular and of each building category serves as a			
Traffic Engineering	marker for these unnamed projects.				
1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797	Implementation Period: "Phase A" represents projects that are currently in p Regents)	lanning (as approved by the Board of			
	Phase A:	Plan #			
Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156	Building: Student Learning Center Animal Science Arena AGTEC Facility (GRA)	C5A, C5B, C4, C6A			
303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380	Parking Deck Veterinary Medicine Bio Resources Fac	NP1			
	J. W. Fanning Leadership Center Alumni Center Complex	W11C LH1			

Unassigned Buildings

Open Space:

Herty Field

Phase B:

Building:	
PVAC II – School of Art	LS10, LS11, LS12
PVAC II - Georgia Museum of Art Addition	LS14, LS15
RDC Conference Center Auditorium (Tifton)	
Parking Deck	SP2
Pharmacy Addition	S10
College of Agriculture	
Land Acquisition – Phase I & II	
Student Housing	LS16, LS17,
	LS18, LS19, LS20
Food Science Addition	S26
Unassigned Buildings	
Open Space:	
Reed Alley	OS14, OS15
D.W. Brooks	OS23
East Campus Gateway	OS40
East Campus Residential Quad	OS37

Phase C:

Building:	
PVAC III – Drama and Dance Departments	S19
Parking Deck	LWP1
PDRC Poultry Housing Facility	
Student Housing	W1, W2, W3, W4, W10
Unassigned Buildings	
Open Space:	

Central Campus / Tate Center AreaCPVAC / College Station RoadCEast Campus QuadC

OS9, OS14 OS32, OS33, OS34, OS41 OS36, OS38

Phase D:

Building: Library Building – Special Collections and Repository Marine Education and Research Center

	(Sapelo Island) Renovate Memorial Hall Parking Deck Student Housing Unassigned Buildings Open Space:	LSP1 C1, C2, C3 W5, W6, W7, W8, W9
	Lumpkin Improvement Ag Drive Conner Hall	OS4, OS7 OS31 OS22
Phase	Е:	
	Building: Chapelle Matthews Public Service Complex Environmental Health Science	W11A, W11B, W11C, W11D, W11E
	Moore College	
	Candler Hall	
	Music Library Parking Dook	SD1
	Student Housing	N6 N7 N8 N9 N10 C8
	Unassigned Buildings	110, 117, 110, 117, 1110, 00
	Open Space	
	West Parking Quad	OS19
	Hooper Street Area	OS12
	Green Street	OS28
Phase	F: Destration and	
	Environmental Science Project – Phase I Animal Science Facility – Tifton Research and Teaching Greenhouses Horse Unit Establishment	
	Parking Deck	CP2
	Student Housing	C7, C9, C10
	Unassigned Buildings	
	Open Space:	
	Legion Field	OS17
	Open Space between	
	Old Lumpkin and New Lumpkin OS16	

Phase G:	
Building:	
Science Library – Add 3 Stories	
Beef Operations	
Fine Arts – Auditorium Only	
Parking Deck	WDEXP, WP1
Student Housing	
Environmental Science Project – Phase II	
Unassigned Buildings	
Open Space:	
Residential Quads	OS5, OS6
Chemistry Quad	OS21
East Campus	OS35
(Link to East Campus Road)	

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	10/20/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Capital Improvement and Phasing Plan (Graphics)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508

Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The following graphics represent the build out for the five-year increment phasing plan. Major known capital projects that are to occur on Main Campus are listed and the approximate locations of those projects are colored in bright red. Major open space projects are represented in green. These graphics are strictly meant for diagrammatic purposes and are not to be considered as representations of exactly where and how future build out will occur. Dark red represents buildings that are not listed and are referred to in the preceding document as "Unassigned Buildings." It should be understood that the buildings listed would not be the only buildings or projects completed within each five year phasing period. The unassigned buildings will serve as place markers for this future development.

Project Title

Student Learning Center Parking Deck Vet Med Bio Resources Facility J. W. Fanning Leadership Center Alumni Center Complex Student Housing

Open Space

Herty Field Baldwin / Sanford Intersection



Not to ScaleFive Year ImplementationPhase A10/9/98

Capital Improvement Program and Phasing Plan (Main Campus)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VII B-A



PVAC II - School of Art PVAC II - GA Museum of Art Addition Parking Deck Pharmacy Addition Student Housing Food Science Addition

Open Space

Reed Alley D. W. Brooks East Campus Gateway East Campus Residential Quad



Five Year Implementation Phase B Not to Scale 10/9/98 and Phasing Plan

Capital Improvement Program (Main Campus)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VII B-B



PVAC III - Drama and Dance Departments Parking Deck Student Housing

Open Space

Central Campus / Tate Area PVAC College Station Rd East Campus Quad



Not to Scale Five Year Implementation Phase C Capital and Phase C Capital (Main C

Capital Improvement Program and Phasing Plan (Main Campus)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VII B-C



Library Building - Special Collections Parking Deck Student Housing

Open Space

Lumpkin Improvement AG Drive **Conner Hall**



Five Year Implementation Phase D Not to Scale and Phasing Plan 10/9/98

Capital Improvement Program (Main Campus)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VII B-D



Chappelle Matthews Public Service Complex Environmental Health Science Music Library Parking Deck Student Housing

Open Space

West Parking Quad Hooper Street Improvement Green Street Improvement



Capital Improvement Program Five Year Implementation Phase E Not to Scale 10/9/98 and Phasing Plan

(Main Campus)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VII B-E


Project Title Building

Environmental Science Project -Phase I Parking Deck Student Housing

Open Space

Legion Field Intersection of Old Lumpkin and New Lumpkin



Five Year Implementation Phase F Not to Scale and Phasing Plan 10/9/98

Capital Improvement Program (Main Campus)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VII B-F



Project Title Building

Science Library - Addition Environmental Science Project-Phase II Parking Deck Student Housing

Open Space

NW Campus Residential Quads Chemistry Quad East Campus (link to East Campus Road)



Capital Improvement Program Five Year Implementation Phase G Not to Scale 10/9/98 and Phasing Plan

(Main Campus)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan

Figure VII B-G



The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Physical Master Plan Design Standards (Section VII C)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia
	Section VII C 2b – Site Design Character

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The objective of the Site Design Standards is to encourage a unified visual image throughout the campus. Stressing consistency of planning principles, site design details and landscape design across the entire campus will develop an identifiable sense of place. The site design character should reflect and support the architectural design standards as outlined in section VII C 2a.

The specific site design elements defined in this section are intended to guide designers in the selection and placement of materials in order to integrate and unify all regions of the Main Campus of the University of Georgia.

The two main components of site design are hardscape and landscape. As outlined in these guidelines, hardscape elements consist of site amenities, site furnishings, lighting, paving, safety and security devices and signage. The landscape component addresses streetscapes, quadrangles and naturalized landscapes.

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Site Design Standards

Table of Contents

1. Site Amenities

- A. Bus Shelters
- B. Kiosks
- C. Gateways and Thresholds
- D. Site Walls and Seat Walls

2. Site Furnishings

- A. Benches
- B. Trash Cans
- C. Ash Urns
- D. Removable Bollards
- E. Post and Chain
- F. Bicycle Racks
- G. Drinking Fountain
- H. Group Newspaper Boxes
- I. Picnic Tables

3. Lighting

- A. Pedestrian Lighting
- B. Lighted Bollard

4. Paving

- A. Pedestrian Pathways
- B. Crosswalks and Curbcuts
- C. Stairs
- D. Bicycle Routes

5. Site Safety and Security

- A. Handrails and Guardrails
- B. Fencing
- C. Screen

6. Signage

7. Landscape

- A. Streetscapes
- B. Quadrangles
- C. Naturalized Landscapes

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Site Design Standards

1. Site Amenities

Constructed objects with an architectural character are considered site amenities. The design of these objects should reflect the style and materials defined in the architectural design standards. The following design standards should be adhered to when constructing and placing site amenities on the University of Georgia campus.

A. Bus Shelters

Bus shelters should be located where space is available and the volume of riders and traffic patterns justify their use. The shelters should not be obtrusive to its setting and should be illuminated for safety and partially enclosed to offer protection from wind and rain. Seating should be provided within the shelter.



bus shelter (plan)

bus shelter (elevation)

B. Kiosks

In areas with high volumes of pedestrian traffic, an element is needed to organize and concentrate notices and flyers regarding campus activities. A kiosk that provides minimal protection from rain suits this purpose and can help to define the identity of outdoor spaces as part of the University of Georgia campus.



kiosks

Site Design Standards

C. Gateways and Thresholds

Columns, walls and decorative fences should be used to define campus entrances and boundaries. The dimensions and materials demonstrated in the columns located at the intersection of Herty Drive and Broad Street serve as a good guide for construction of future columns. Decorative brick walls and black iron fencing should be used in conjunction with columns at major campus entrances.



gateways and thresholds

D. Site Walls and Seat Walls

Whether for seating, retaining soil, or as a design feature, any site wall should be constructed of natural stone. Grey granite is native to the Athens, Georgia area and should be utilized for wall construction. Low walls should be constructed entirely of granite and taller retaining walls should have a granite veneer over its structural components. Walls should have only vertical and horizontal mortar joints. A granite cap should be used on all seat walls; the width of the cap should be equal to the width of the top of the wall.



site walls and seat walls

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Site Design Standards

2. Site Furnishings

The use of standardized furnishings throughout the campus will unify the outdoor spaces and establish an identity unique to the University of Georgia. The University currently has standards for some site furnishings such as benches and trash receptacles. In the future, efforts should be made to replace existing site furnishings that do not conform to the design standards and to ensure that all new construction utilizes the items described in the design standards. The following design standards should be adhered to when constructing and placing site furnishings on the University of Georgia campus.

A. Benches

Manufacturer/Vendor	r:
TimberForm by Colu	imbia Cascade/
Slagley Architectural	& Recreation Products
	P.O. Box 496
	Greenville, AL 36037
	Phone: (800) 753-8707
	or (334) 382-7789
	Fax: (334) 382-9847
Model:	Renaissance Bench
	with Armrests, #2806-6
Size:	6 ft. length
Finish/Color:	Color-coated Steel/Black Suede
Special Features:	Permanent surface mount



e bench

B. Trash Receptacles

Manufacturer/Vendor	r:				
TimberForm by Columbia Cascade/					
Slagley Architectural & Recreation Products					
	P.O. Box 496				
	Greenville, AL 36037				
	Phone: (800) 753-8707 or				
	(334) 382-7789				
	Fax: (334) 382-9847				
Model:	Renaissance Litter				
	Container, #2811-OT				
Finish/Color:	Color-coated Steel/Black				
	Suede				
Special Features:	Open Top				



trash receptacle

Site Design Standards

C Ash Urns				
Manufacturer:		4 ¹ /2"	5 ⁷ /8"	
Forms & Surfaces				
	6395 Cindy Lane			
	Carpinteria, CA 93013	11 7/8"		+ ⁴¹ /2"
	Phone: (800) 451-0410			
	Fax: (805) 684-8620		48"	11 ⁷ /s"
Model:	Buttler Ash Receptacle with			
	medium canister,			┿╾└─━┘
	#AE5601 (single pole mounted)			
	and #AE5603 (wall mounted)			
Finish/Color:	Pole: Frost-Black Powdercoat		+ ====	
	Canister: Bronze Anodized			

standing ash urn and wallmount ash urn

D. Removable Bollards

Manufacturer/Vendor	:			
Valley Iron and Steel Company/				
	Lumen Source			
	1005 Alderman Drive			
	Alpharetta, GA 30005			
	Phone: (770) 521-9940			
	Fax: (770) 521-9944			
Model:	Cast Iron Bollard,			
	#VI-BO-14/30"			
Finish/Color:	Painted Black			
Special Features:	Removable Mounting			



removable bollard

E. Post and Chain

For temporary barriers in pedestrian settings, an easy to install, simple post and chain device is required.



post and chain

Site Design Standards

F. Bicycle Racks

Manufacturer: Brandir International, Inc. 200 Park Avenue, Suite 303E New York, NY 10166 Phone: (212) 505-6500 Fax: (212) 505-6813 ribnrack@aol.com Ribbon Rack - 7 bicycle, Model: #RB-07IG Size: 62.375" length Hot-dipped galvanized Finish/Color: Special Features: Inground anchor mount



bicycle rack

G. Drinking Fountains

Manufacturer:	
Murdoch	2488 River Road
	Cincinnati, OH 45204
	Phone: (513) 471-7700
	Fax: (513) 471-3299
Model:	Antifeeezing Drinking
	Fountain, #M-30
Size:	37" height
Finish/Color:	Bowl: Chrome-plated brass
Pedestal:	Painted/dark green



drinking fountain

H. Group Newspaper Boxes

Manufacturer: Go Plastics

	515 Brown Industrial Parkway
	Canton, GA 30114
	Phone: (770) 345-0535
	Fax: (770) 345 0530
Model:	#SS-9
Size:	3 door
Color:	Black



newspaper boxes

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Site Design Standards

I. Picnic Tables

Manufacturer/Recommended Vendor: Victor Stanley, Inc./Contract Connections P.O. Box 1134 Roswell, GA 30067 Phone: (800) 772-8369 or (770) 640-5599 Fax: (770) 446-5677 e-mail: nflcci@msn.com Model: Center Post table, #CP-4,3x4 Size: 3 ft. square top Finish/Color: Wood Components: Ipe, Steel Components: Painted/Black Inground mount **Special Features:**



picnic table

3. Lighting

An essential aspect of any outdoor space, lighting plays a dual role in the visual character campus. During the day light fixtures are part of the site furnishings and help to define the campus' site character. At night lighting is critical for pedestrian and vehicular safety as well as building security. Currently, there is a wide range of fixture types throughout the campus. The lack of uniformity contributes to the disconnected look of the various campus regions. The fixtures described in this section are meant to be both decorative and functional and if placed in an orderly fashion throughout the campus will help to unify all segments of the campus.

A. Pedestrian Lighting

Manufacturer/Vendor:					
Dynamic Lighting/Addison-Parish					
	3988 Flowers Road,				
	Suite 690				
	Atlanta, GA 30360				
	Phone: (770) 458-9911				
	Fax: (770) 457-1665				
Pole Model:	Pittsburgh Series, #D93-				
	12-BLK				
Size:	11'-9" height				
Finish/Color:	Powdercoated/Black				
Luminaire and Lamp: Fixture: Model#					
	D137/G22ACKWH/BLK				
	(150HPS-120v)				



pedestrian lighting

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Site Design Standards

B. Path Light Manufacturer/Vendor: Kim Lighting/Newman Penter James Co., Inc. 3100 Medlock Bridge, Rd Suite 330 Phone: (770) 447-0661 Fax: (770) 449-0833 Model: #SL3/70hps120/BL-P Size: 42 ¾" overall height Finish/Color: Powder-Coat/Black



lighted bollard

4. Paving

The network of pathways that form the pedestrian and bicycle connections throughout the campus should consist of uniform materials that are both attractive and practical to install and maintain. Size requirements for paving vary with the volume of traffic and pavement widths should be determined on a case-by-case basis.

A. Pedestrian Pathways

Typical pedestrian pathways should be constructed of scored concrete. Brick accents should be used to denote significant locations, such as building entrances and major intersections.



Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Site Design Standards



accessible curb cut

C. Stairs

Stairs should be constructed of concrete and should have concrete cheekwalls. Handrails should be mounted on stair treads inside the cheekwalls. All portions of stairs shall comply with A.D.A. and other applicable regulations.

edore flush with Asphalt----- TAPERED CURE

TAPERED CURE

6'-0'



Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Site Design Standards

D. Bicycle Routes

Dedicated bicycle routes should be clearly delineated from vehicular and pedestrian traffic through the use of painted lanes and easily recognizable symbols. Along roads shared with motorized vehicles, a four foot wide lane should be marked on each side of the pavement where possible. Where the road is too narrow to accommodate two bike lanes, a single lane will be designated. If conditions allow, the single lane will be located on the side of the road that runs uphill with the flow of traffic.









5. Site Safety and Security

The need to make outdoor spaces safe for pedestrians is inevitable. Stairs, ramps and severe grade changes must be made safe through the use of handrails and guardrails. Sensitive sites such as detention ponds and materials storage areas require the use of security fencing. Unsightly and/or dangerous areas such as HVAC units and dumpsters can be secured with screen fencing.

A. Handrails & Guardrails

The materials used by the UGA Physical Plant to construct the existing handrails on campus are simple and effective and should be used in future construction. All handrails and guardrails shall comply with A.D.A. and other applicable regulations. Handrails and guardrails should be constructed of steel and finished with black paint. See details below for typical dimensions.





handrail

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Site Design Standards

B. Fencing

The need for security/safety fencing is unavoidable. Where fencing is required, either by code or for security purposes, black, vinyl-coated, chain link fence should be used. The height of the fence should be determined by the University according to the specific situation.





C. Screen fences

Screen fences should be constructed of brick of a type and pattern that match adjacent buildings.



screen fence

6. Signage

Campus signage should follow the guidelines set forth in "Sign System Guidelines", 1998, by Professor Ken Williams which is available at the University of Georgia Physical Plant. A copy of these guidelines can be found in the Appendix. Signage should be used for necessary identification purposes not for wayfinding or detailed location information. If the placement of signage is not discrete and limited, it creates an unattractive and distracting clutter. When used in a very prudent fashion it can contribute to the identity of the campus fabric.

7. Landscape

The campus landscape can be divided into three broad categories: streetscapes, quadrangles and naturalized landscapes.

A. Streetscapes

The University of Georgia campus has streets of many sizes and functions. In order to provide a safe and aesthetically desirable walking environment, each general type of street will have a character that suits its function. The street types are as follows: Publicly Accessible Streets at the Edge of Campus, Publicly Accessible Streets on the Interior of Campus, and Limited Access Streets. Wherever possible, the landscape component of a streetscape should utilize a planted strip separating the sidewalk from the edge of the road. In general, streetscapes should have a simple, orderly appearance. Trees should be arranged in a linear fashion with turf or a low groundcover below. Street trees should be "shade trees" such as Oaks that will grow over or can be pruned above the height of passing traffic.

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Site Design Standards



streetscapes

B. Quadrangles

Quadrangles are defined green spaces that act as landmarks along circulation corridors (streetscapes). The edges of these spaces are primarily defined by buildings. The character of these spaces should be park-like, similar to the quadrangles on North Campus. The planting should be grass and shade trees with multiple paved walkways. Building entrances and other focal points should be accented with shrubs, seasonal color and other ornamental plants.



quadrangles

Site Design Standards

C. Naturalized Landscapes

Naturalized spaces on the University of Georgia Campus are defined as areas dominated by informally arranged vegetation that connect the campus with its natural site elements. Landscape design in naturalized areas should utilize a palette of native plants selected for their compatibility with the micro-climatic conditions on the individual site.



naturalized landscapes

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

	Architectural Design Standards
То	University of Georgia
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
Subject	Physical Master Plan Design Standards (Section VII C)
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Date	10/23/98

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The purpose of this section of the master plan document is to form a basis for the architectural character, composition, and typology of future buildings, groups of buildings and exterior spaces on the University of Georgia campus. This document can serve as a touchstone for architects, landscape architects, planners, and other design professionals working on future UGA projects.

In order to ensure adherence to these architectural standards, it is imperative that the University designate an authoritative party to review and approve physical alterations to the University of Georgia campus. As a policy of the University of Georgia and The University System Board of Regents, the Office of the University Architect for Facilities Planning has been designated by the President to review and approve the aesthetic impact of all facility and grounds alterations to assure compliance with the Physical Master Plan. This review includes the construction of all new buildings and new structures, additions to existing buildings, general maintenance of the exterior of buildings and exterior paint colors, grounds and landscaping additions or changes, and any other general alterations to the physical appearance of the campus.

Design consultants will submit all plans, elevations, models, perspectives or any other renderings that appropriately represent the aesthetic nature of the proposed alterations to the Office of the University Architect for Facilities Planning for their approval. Design consultants will submit these renderings at the schematic design and design development stages. These plans must be approved by the University Architect before the consultant submits the documents to the Board of Regents for their approval and before the consultant may proceed on the subsequent design phase. It is the responsibility of the University unit (IE. Physical Plant Division, University Housing, Athletic Association, Georgia Center for Continuing Education, etc.) initiating the alteration to advise either the President or the University Architects of such planned alterations.

Within five working days following submission of the plans for approval, the Director of The Office of the University Architect for Facilities Planning will provide either written approval of the plans, or a detailed list of deficiencies and concerns that need further

development by the design consultants within five working days following submission by the consultants.

Architectural Design Standards



Main Library



ŀ														
Ī	H	囲	⊞	囲	Ⅲ	Ⅲ	團	囲	團	囲	Ħ	田	田	Π
	囲	田	囲	田	圕	囲	圍	Ħ	圕	囲	囲	圕	⊞	
Ī	⊞	⊞		⊞	围		間		田	田	I	Ħ	田	
								_			442.07			

New College

Old College





Chapel



Demosthenian





Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

2. Existing UGA Building Styles

- A. Vernacular / Georgian / Neo-Classical
- B. Beaux Arts
- C. Modern and Traditional
- D. Modern / Contemporary

3. The Application of American Campus Campus Planning Principles to the University of Georgia

4. Campus Building Typology

- A. The Edge-Defining Type
- B. The Centralized Type
- C. The Composite Type
- D. The Compound Type

5. Massing Diagrams

6. Campus Facade Typology

A. The Planar Facade with Simple OpeningsB. The Planar Facade in ReliefC. The Planar Facade with Clustered OpeningsD. The Frame Facade

7. Conclusion

8. Acknowledgements

Architectural Design Standards

1. Introduction

The purpose of this section of the master plan document is to form a basis for the architectural character, composition, and typology of future buildings, groups of buildings and exterior spaces on the University of Georgia campus. This portion of the document aspires to be both a "mirror" and a "lamp." The buildings already existent on the Athens campus were observed, documented, and analyzed in the course of preparation of this study. Thus the suggestions for future architectural interventions made herein attempt to reflect the best architectural traditions evident on campus.

While many aspects of the University of Georgia's campus make it one of the most memorable compositions of buildings and open-spaces to be found in the nation, it is not the purpose of this document to replicate the historic core in order to create a new architecture of empty nostalgia. The University of Georgia campus forms a collection of buildings from many different time-periods and of various styles. There is not a unique "University of Georgia style" per se, rather the notable buildings built over the course of time, reflect both the needs of the moment and the traditions of architecture compatible with the context of the Athens campus.

It is hoped that the insights gleaned from a reading of this section will enable the campus community to better recognize and understand the architectural traditions of the campus, while simultaneously forming a touchstone for architects, landscape architects, planners, and other design professionals working on future projects. Since innovation is always understood relative to some context, the traditions suggested by this portion of the document are intended to "light-the-way" for future projects.

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

2. Existing UGA Building Styles

Below is an outline of the various "styles" of buildings that can be found on the UGA campus and a brief indication of their characteristics:

A. Vernacular / Georgian / Neo-Classical

<u>Examples:</u>	
Old College	Phi Kappa Society
New College	Demosthenean Society
Chapel	

Observations:

- Domestic scale unassuming character with exception of the Chapel
- Generally more wall than window
- Visual tension between proportions of opening and wall (i.e., the proportions of the wall are often more dominant than the proportions of window)
- Architectural elements are often integral to the building's construction.
- Vertical bay structure and vertically oriented openings.
- Spartan vocabulary, restrained use of ornament.
- Pragmatic elements modulate facade (e.g., downspout, chimneys, entrances)
- Facade is not overly "deep" except when a portico element is added to recognize entry.







New College

One Conside





Chapel



Demosthenian

riysical Master Flan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

B. Beaux-arts:

Examples:

Peabody Hall Memorial Hall Business School





Observations:

- Monumental scale compatible with domestic core of campus
- Range of proportion of window to wall
- System of ornamentation may not be directly tied to constructional technique, rather it is tied to broader cultural ideals related to building type (i.e., you know it is a "library" by its appearance, but what you see may or may not directly be related to how it was built.)
- Use of sophisticated proportioning systems
- Division into 3-parts vertically and horizontally clear hierarchy of parts
- Facade is "sculpted" in 3-dimensions as if carved from a block of clay.
- Preference for symmetry, however complex over-lapping local symmetries are sometimes used to produce localized picturesque effects.
- · Generally incorporates historical references



Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

C. Modern and Traditional

Examples:

Library Fine Arts Building Additions Sanford Hall



Sanford Hall

Observations:

- A more monumental scale
- Recognition of frame construction techniques in aesthetic of vertical surface
- Often more window than wall or an equivalent proportion of window and wall
- Facade is "layered" as a series of flat, planar surfaces composed within the constraints of a modest dimension.
- System of ornamentation is restrained, however attempts to relate constructional techniques to cultural ideals related to building type (i.e., you know it is a "library" by its appearance, and you have an idea of how it was built.)
- Draws inspiration from history and ideas of contemporary life



Main Library

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

D. Modern/Contemporary

Examples:

Chemistry Annex

Observations:

- Vertical surfaces are less likely to be designed as "facades"
- Overall massing dictates form buildings less likely to participate in campus space-making
- Openings are "slots" or "zones" where wall surface is omitted rather than an incised opening
- Character of building is particular to the whim of the architect, client, donor..
- Building does not necessarily communicate an idea of what it is or how it was built.
- Un-clear hierarchy of parts
- Scale is indeterminate
- Abstract form preferred over forms of "traditional building" i.e., roofs, walls, doors, windows, are replaced with horizontal planes, vertical planes, and various kinds of apertures.
- Preference for asymmetrical massing and the picturesque over symmetry
- Notion of the Zeitgeist prevails, history and tradition are devalued draws little upon immediate physical context.



Chemistry Annex

Architectural Design Standards

3. The Application of American Campus Planning Principles to The University of Georgia

The planning principles exhibited on American campuses are truly a unique art form. While the traditions of campus planning in the United States are closely related to attitudes concerning building and the landscape developed between the 16th and 19th centuries in England, France, and Italy, the application of these principles to the built form of the university is an artform which evolved principally in this country. The close relationship between built form and the landscape is a characteristic of campus planning that is the taproot of this artform. From Thomas Jefferson's University of Virginia, to Saarenin's Cranbrook Academy, this tradition remained unbroken until the Second World War.

One of the most readily identifiable characteristics of this tradition was the creation of exterior spaces which could be likened to interior rooms. In the diagram illustrated in Figure 1, a prototypical room is drawn alongside a university quadrangle of similar proportions. Nearly everyone is familiar with the sense of enclosure and protection afforded by a room's bound-

ing surfaces — walls enclose space; windows admit light and air while permitting views to the exterior world; doors permit access; and typically there is some element of focus within the room, perhaps a hearth. It is readily evident that every element performs a role supporting the larger notion of "room." That is, walls alone do not the room make. The interdependency of elements and the specialized tasks they play relegate elements of the room to hierarchical roles in the overall composition. That is a door to the room will serve to frame a view of the room's principal feature — the hearth, and all along the corners of the room will be subservient to both the former and later elements.



Figure 1

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

Likewise, the exterior room of a campus quadrangle has features which might be seen as analogous to that of a traditional interior room. The library may dominate the composition in much the same manner as the hearth, while a pair of buildings axially disposed across the quadrangle from this principal feature might serve the same threshold purposes as that of a door. One might readily see that a successful composition of a college quadrangle requires that the buildings operate in concert with one another. Sometimes buildings are called upon to play more assertive roles, that of a "hero," like the library, or the matching buildings forming the campus threshold. The heroic buildings, however, require substantial amounts of good "soldier" buildings to form the backdrop against which these more assertive buildings might be seen.

In planning and building a new campus or on a portion of an existing campus it is very important to understand the role that individual buildings are required to play. Too many heroic structures would be like a room full of guests all talking at the same time. Too few heroic buildings would be like a party where none of the guests ever arrived — a bit of a bore. In planning a successful campus composition, one seeks to strike a balance between the "heroes" and the "soldiers." Experience has shown that every trustee, donor, president, dean, every department chair, or faculty member, usually like to view their "new building" as aspiring to be a "hero." And, while much might be said of the heroic nature of the common foot-soldier, it is recommended that the creation of heroic buildings on college campuses be limited to those building types which embody and relate the most universal and lofty aspirations of the entire institution — churches, libraries, places of assembly, etc.



Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

4. Campus Building Typology

A. The Edge-Defining Type

This building type often performs the role of the common foot-soldier, but it may also take on heroic assignments. The generic configuration of the type is that of an elongated rectilinear volume. Most often entry is achieved on the center of one of the long faces, however edge entries, or entry from one of the narrow elevations is also possible (see facade guidelines). This building type commonly aligns its eaves and ridge lines, not the gable end, to the quadrangle thus reinforcing the geometry of this exterior room. A central corridor gives access to the rooms. Typically the corridor is double loaded, however in some instances a single loaded corridor may serve the needs of the program. The length of this building type may vary from 120 feet to 300 feet, while the width of the type is generally in the neighborhood of 45-90 feet. When this type exceeds the 90 foot width dimension natural lighting and ventilation of the interior spaces becomes impossible. Thus, depending upon the actual intended use of buildings of this type, care should be given to the width of the block.

There are a variety of methods for distributing this type in a campus plan (Figure 2).

- Illustrates this building type located as a central element on the long side of a campus quadrangle — the building performs both the role of edge definer and central focus.
- 2) Much the same might be said about the positioning of the type in this configuration, however because the building alone forms the edge of the narrow side of a long quadrangle, it tends to take on a more heroic dimension.
- 3) In this instance the type is paired to form both the wall to the quadrangle as well as a threshold to the campus.
- 4) The final illustration of this type in context is interesting because it presents its end elevation to the major quadrangle of the campus while forming the edge of a new quadrangle behind the first building discussed in this drawing.

Examples of this building type on the UGA campus are Old College and New College, at other institutions, Nassau Hall, Princeton and Old East and Old West at UNC Chapel Hill. The type might accommodate housing, classrooms, laboratories, administrative activities, and a wide variety of other functions. It is typically the most prevalent variety of building to be found on college campuses. This type along with the Centralized Type form the two essential building blocks of campus architecture from which all other types might be derived.

Architectural Design Standards





Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

B. The Centralized Type

This building type is often associated with an heroic posture within a campus plan, however, the type might defer to other buildings depending upon its specific context. The general configuration of the type is that of a compact rectilinear volume, however other platonic forms are also associated with this type — circular, octagonal, or other centralized forms. Entry is most often achieved on the center of one of the narrow facades and the type most often presents its gabled end to the quadrangle thereby gaining a certain amount of visual attention. Generally the type houses one large open space internally — often conceived of as a space of assembly. The dimensions of the type vary dramatically and should be determined based upon a mitigation of the concerns of the context against those of the building's function.

There are a variety of methods for distributing this type in a campus plan, refer to Figure 3.

- Illustrates this building in a central position on the long edge of a campus quadrangle (a position analogous to that of a hearth in a room).
- 2) The positioning of a pair of buildings around a principal campus axis forms both edge and threshold to the quadrangle.
- 3) The placement of the type in this position affords four separate exposures the building is seen in the round (from all sides). This later placement can present problems in servicing the building if the concerns of use are not properly mitigated against those of the campus context. A chapel or assembly hall might be well served by this location, while a dining hall might not work well with the context given an intensive service component of the program.

Examples of this building type on the UGA campus are the Chapel and the Phi Kappa building, at other institutions, the Rotunda at the University of Virginia and Whig and Clio Halls at Princeton. The type might accommodate various assembly activities: chapel, lecture hall, gymnasium, dinning hall, etc. When used in conjunction with the Edge Defining Type in a single unified composition an unlimited variety of building forms might be created.

Architectural Design Standards





Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

C. The Composite Type

While many contemporary building programs might not be readily addressed by either the Edge-Defining or the Centralized Types alone, in combination the two building types form the essential characteristics of the Composite Type. It is more difficult to talk about general configurations of this type because the possible combinations and recombinations of the basic "building blocks" of typology are limitless. For an insight into the variety of possibilities see, N.C. Curtis, *Architectural Composition*, Cleveland: Jansen, 1927.

The characteristics of how this building type might address a quadrangle are similar to those outlined in both of the previous two types. Again the actual dimension of the type may vary dramatically, so once again a mitigation of the contingencies of the site against those of building use are highly recommended.

Once again there are a variety of methods for distributing this type in a campus plan, Figure 4.

- Illustrates the simplest form of the type a Centralized Type has been joined with two flanking Edge-Defining Types to form an articulated wall to the quadrangle. The central element provides accent to the quadrangle while the flanking volumes carry the "wall" of the space along the edge of the quad.
- 2) This illustration of the type is a much more complex combination of the campus buildingblocks. A central space of assembly is aligned with the axis of the quadrangle and is used in combination with a series of edge-defining volumes. A forecourt is formed between the campus quadrangle and the central volume, while a automobile forecourt is formed by the wings which extend downward at ninety degree angles to the long axis of the quadrangle. To the far right, a service court is formed, and to the top, edgedefining types wrap the centralized volume to form an internal courtyard.
- 3) In comparison to the previous example, this configuration of the type is very tame. In fact, the type is created by relocating the edge-defining elements at 90 degree angles to the position occupied in example one thus, forming a forecourt. The advantage of this type is that large building programs can be accommodated in this configuration with out dimensionally abandoning a 70 foot maximum building-wing width.

Architectural Design Standards

Examples of this building type on the UGA campus are the Fine Arts Building and the Business School, at other institutions - Bancroft and Mahan Halls at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis. Most complex programs can be accommodated by this typology.





Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

D. The Compound Type

In many cases contemporary programs call for very large footprints to accommodate specialized activities. While the advantage of these large footprints is that many activities can be located in an efficient proximity to one another, the liability is that these types of buildings often become hermetically sealed and connections between interior spaces and the exterior world become severed. Faculty, staff, and students can find themselves living out their entire academic life in these "megastructures" without ever stepping foot outside of their own domain. In short the danger of these "academic malls" are that they often do not contribute in an effective manner to the over-all well being of the university. However, when properly designed these big buildings can indeed contribute well to the life of a campus.

Of primary interest is care given to issues of scale and proportion. Where ever possible, the massiveness of the building should be mitigated by elements in concert with the human scale of the campus environment. The Typical Plan in Figure 5 illustrates a Edge-Defining Type used as a frontispiece, or head house, for a much larger building mass. The site-section diagrams located above the typical plan drawing also illustrate two techniques for masking the massiveness of the "large footprint" building. The up-hill site illustrates a laboratory building nestled into the grade to minimize the impact of its height and girth, while the down-hill site illustrates a parking structure carved into the hillside behind an academic building. The upper deck of this later building is then landscaped and treated as a garden terrace.

Again, there are a variety of methods for distributing this type in a campus plan, Figure 5.

- Illustrates a very large laboratory building which is flanked by two classroom buildings and headed up by an administrative/office wing which mediates a connection to the quadrangle.
- 2) Is a center for continuing education which presents a face both to the outside world (bottom edge) and to the campus quadrangle (right edge). These wings, joined by a rotund element mask the large parking structure located behind. Access to the parking structure is from the extreme right edge of the footprint. It should be noted that care would be given to the surface of the parking structure to create a "handsome" facade in concert with the vocabulary of the campus.

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

3) Illustrates a large student center with large dining halls, meeting rooms, ball-rooms, and recreational spaces. The configuration presents a forecourt to the campus quadrangle using two Edge-Defining and one Centralized Type in order to mask the large footprints of the big assembly halls. To the far right a service court provides access for deliveries and waste removal.

Successful examples of this building type are Cabel Hall at the University of Virginia, the Physics and Astronomy Building at Johns Hopkins University, the Student Center at Carnegie Mellon, Barton Hall at Cornell University, and the original buildings on the campus of Duke University.



Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

5. Massing Diagrams

These series of diagrams are intended to suggest the limitless rational combinations and recombinations of the "building blocks" to form more complex compositions appropriate to elaborate programs. Each diagram builds upon the previous drawing suggesting a process of elaboration and combination. Note that the massing is not dependent upon a singular response to issues of symmetry/asymmetry, center/edge, base condition, or roof. Both designers and members of the campus community are encouraged to imagine their own formal inventions as an extension of this exercise.







Figure 7

Figure 8
Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

6. Campus Facade Typology

Each of the facade variations illustrated herein derives from the previously mentioned observation, documentation, and analysis of the UGA campus. The proportions of openings and wall-surfaces are derived from UGA traditions and may not be directly applicable to other campuses, however, many of the techniques for creating hierarchical "readings" of the facades are generic in nature.

Typically this study recognizes two generic architectural conditions — that of the wall and that of the frame. Both types are to be found alone and in combination on the UGA campus. Once again, the observations made herein are not an attempt to advocate specific styles, however, it is explicitly the intention of this portion of the document to encourage the development of rationale for the vertical surfaces. Thomas L. Schumacher's, "Scull and the Mask," as well as, "The Palladio Variations," (*Cornell Journal of Architecture*, New York: Rizolli) are excellent starting points for discussion of facade making themes. Since a building on a college campus is likely to be kept in service for in excess of 100 years, it is important to give the design of facades considerable attention.

A. The Planar Façade with Simple Openings

This type is derived in part from New College. The aesthetic derives from bearing wall construction techniques. The façade type is characterized by a series of regularly spaced windows of equal dimension. Not only do the windows act as "figure" in the composition of the façade, but the spaces between are also imbued with figural properties. That is, the windows are as interesting to the eye as the wall.

Windows read as discrete architectural elements positioned within the fabric of the wall. The head of the window is characterized by a lintel or flat arch, which occasionally serves as a location for ornamentation. The sills of the window are often stone and project from the surface of the wall. Following the logic of bearing wall construction, the general proportion of each window is that of a vertical rectangle, in this case a square root of two or golden section rectangle. The windows are typically double hung and sub-divided into smaller panes.

In this façade type, the ground floor of the building is given special prominence by rustication or by belt coursing. This treatment permits the composition of the wall to relate well to the ground plane. Typical of many buildings on UGA's campus, the building is capped by a gabled metal roof that is selectively articulated with masonry elements (chimneys, cupolas, etc.). There are examples of very successful buildings on the UGA campus in which the roof is not expressed. Typically, however, these buildings (such as Peabody Hall) terminate the wall with a cornice, or other element which forms a distinct profile against the sky.





Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

Planar Façade Variations

In this series all of the openings in the façade are created through the use of equally spaced windows of identical dimension. Hierarchy is achieved by manipulating the reading of the wall surface and by adjusting the relationship between the opening and the wall.

Variation A This façade uses a "surround" treatment to distinguish the windows on the first floor from those on the ground and upper floor levels. This treatment may be useful in breaking up the monotony of a façade composed of regularly spaced windows. Additionally, the treatment gives distinction to the first story above the ground level as a place of prominence within the building.

Variation B This façade uses beltcourses and rustication to produce a horizontal effect. This treatment may be an appropriate strategy for making tall facades to appear more in scale with a lower context. Additionally, the treatment may be appropriate when the building is intended at a "background" element in a composition wherein the intention is not to have the eye come to rest on this particular building.

Variation C This façade develops a strong reading of "center" by creating an intersecting gable at the mid-point of the composition. Addition of an attic element and the positioning of chimneys create a strong sense of center. This may be an appropriate treatment when the building is an important element of a group plan, such as the main building of a college, or a prominent building on an open space or quadrangle.

Variation D This façade is characterized by a development of localized centers at the extremities of the façade. The result is a dual centered façade. The use of a segmental gable that penetrates the eaves-line of the roof, strategically positioned chimneys, and downspout, create an emphasis upon the edges of the over-all composition. This treatment may be used in conjunction with elements of Variation C to create a hybrid that emphasizes both center and edge simultaneously. The type may be most appropriate for buildings with multiple entries, for buildings that attempt to down-play their hierarchical importance on a quadrangle or open space, or for buildings which contain more than one academic department.



Figure 10

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

B. The Planar Facade in Relief

This type is very similar to the previous example, however it differs in that the surface is developed in terms of relief or depth of the wall surface. The amount of relief may vary from only a few inches to that of many feet (in the case of a free-standing portico). Through the introduction of relief, a hierarchical reading of the openings (windows and doors) can be developed.



Planar Facade in Relief Variations

In this series all of the openings in the facade are created through a use of equally spaced windows of identical dimension. Hierarchy is achieved by manipulating the degree of surface relief either in front of or behind the dominant wall plane.

Variation A This facade uses a modestly scaled series of pilasters in front of the dominant wall surface to create a centralized reading and emphasis upon the entry. An element breaking the roof-line (perhaps an elevator core) further emphasizes the centrality of the composition.

Variation B This facade creates a large centralized element by "excavating" or carving into the dominant wall plane in order to create a series of vertical openings articulated as pilasters. The vertical scale of this gesture suggests a more monumental and perhaps heroic character than Variation A.

Variation C This facade balances emphasis to both center and edge by once again "excavating" the dominant wall plane in order to create a rhythm of pilasters. The cadence of vertical openings is terminated at the left and right of the facade by a reassertion of the dominant plane and the creation of secondary entrances on the ground-floor within these zones.

Variation D This facade uses modestly scaled elements applied to the dominant plane of the facade in order to create emphasis at the edges of the composition (in this case the center is down-played). By covering half of this diagram, one can imagine an asymmetrical application of this technique.





nystear Master Fran Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

C. The Planar Facade with Clustered Openings

This type is likened to the first example in that there is little relief in the surface of the facade. It achieves its goals in establishing hierarchy by clustering openings of identical proportion and dimension. The type suggests a hybrid of frame and wall characteristics.

Planar Facade with Clustered Openings Variations

In this series all of the openings in the facade are created through a use of windows of identical dimension. Hierarchy is achieved by manipulating the spacing of windows and other openings.

Variation A This facade develops a hierarchical reading by means of creating a cluster of windows at the center of the composition. The end bays of the composition terminate the composition by paring windows in order to create figural emphasis.

Variation B This facade develops a duality of reading — it emphasizes center through placement of the door and the symmetry around the center, but it creates a tension between center and edge because the large groupings of windows left and right compete for the eye's attention.

Variation C This facade utilizes a more articulated symmetry to create a bi-partite composition. The actual center of the facade is distinctly down-played in favor of development of the dual figure groupings around a vertical axis. Dual doors on the ground level reinforce the notion of a two-part composition.

Variation D This facade emphasizes the edge elements through tiers of paired windows located in the end bays. The emphasis upon edge is further advanced by the position of the doors on the ground floor.







Figure 14

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

D. The Frame Facade in Relief

This final example is similar to the previous example in that it employs clustering of openings, however it also utilizes modest relief in order to establish hierarchical readings.



Frame Facade in Relief Variations

Hierarchy is developed by the manner in which the window or opening is surrounded and the degree to which elements such as spandrels are expressed as materially separate from the actual window openings.

Variation A This facade develops a distinct reading of centrality by contrasting the scale of the figure grouping on center with those repetitive bays located to the left and the right of center. The door element is placed on center to further emphasize this portion of the composition.

Variation B This facade emphasizes the edge by employing large-scale figure groupings to the extreme right and left of the composition. As in the previous example, doors are associated with the large-scale figures in order to underscore the compositional strategy.

Variation C This facade is almost the same as Variation B, however the emphasis upon edge has been played down by utilizing large-scale figure groupings in the central range of the facade. The emphatic statement of edge seen in Variation B gives way to a more subtle suggestion of edge in Variation C.

Variation D This facade uses the smaller bays which were prevalent in Variation A in order to create edge emphasis. The end bays containing the doors feature spandrels which are distinguished from the material of the windows, thus presenting a greater degree of solidity and emphasis upon termination of the facade rhythm.



Figure 16

Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

7. Conclusion

Architects commissioned for UGA buildings should not underestimate the challenge of designing within the shadow of the architects of UGA's early campus buildings. To understand how to integrate a new project into the fabric of UGA's campus, one needs to read thoroughly the overview of UGA's history, that summarizes the founding fathers' intentions for the University.

- Stewardship of the land
- Balance of buildings and open space
- Consistent architectural language

The buildings of North Campus relate to one another along connecting axes. Buildings were aligned along open spaces forming an architectural edge enclosing exterior space and creating outdoor rooms. Walks and roads were generally laid out on axes, tying the campus together.

Essential to UGA's growth is the infilling of future buildings within the existing campus such that clear, memorable open spaces are formed. In this regard, site selection is vital to the success of each new building, and the success to the campus as a whole.



UGA's North Campus



Founders Memorial Garden



Physical Master Plan by Charles Leavitt (1906)

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

Even more important is the successful integration of new buildings with the broad surrounding context. By definition, a campus is a collection of interrelated buildings and supporting facilities arranged in and around open space. The challenge, then, is for every UGA architect to think globally (campuswide) and to act locally (site specific).

Therefore, in initiating the design process for any building or open space on UGA's campus, each design team should begin with a comprehensive look at the campus context and history. This first step should include an analysis of the site: its history, pedestrian and vehicular traffic, infrastructure, service, views and vistas, topography, vegetation, massing, and architectural character. In synthesizing this analysis, a primary goal of all building projects within UGA's campus should be to create clear, simple open spaces and quadrangles that connect to other existing or proposed adjacent spaces. In this regard, buildings should be budgeted to extend their site work as far as is reasonably possible. At the schematic design phase, site plans should show the ground floor plan of the building within the overall campus context and adjacent open space.

These guidelines do not advocate the replication of the original campus buildings in the design of new buildings. Rather, they suggest the continuing evolution of the principles used in those original campus buildings. Using similar scale, proportions, form, materials, and hierarchy one can design in harmony with the existing grounds and buildings.

The design for both grounds and buildings should then refer to these guidelines in the spirit of both recollection and invention. Examples of this attitude can be seen at other campuses, acting as relevant paradigms for UGA's architects and planners. Some of these examples include the images pictured at right.



Harvard Law School -Kallman McKinnel Wood



Princeton University-Koetter Kim



Syracuse University -Bohlin Cywinski Jackson



Carnegie Mellon -Michael Dennis & Associates



Princeton University -Todd Williams & Billie Trien



Johns Hopkins University Ayers/Saint/Gross



Stanford University -Antoine Predock



University of Virginia -Ellenzweig & Associates

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan Design Standards

Filysical Master Flan Design Standards

Architectural Design Standards

In summary, the sustained implementation of UGA's Campus Plan relies on re-establishing many of the principles that Charles Leavitt and the pre-WW II architects established on UGA's campus. Leavitt established in his 1906 physical master plan a balance of building and open space, and a stewardship of the land. Pre-WW II buildings on campus express a consistent, yet inventive architectural language. In this regard, UGA's grounds and buildings should be like a good academic curriculum combining tradition and innovation.

8. Acknowledgements

The University of Georgia Architectural Design Standards text and drawings were written and drawn by Brian Kelly, AIA, Associate Professor, Director, Program in Architecture, University of Maryland.

Date	9/9/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Planning and Review Process (Section VII D)
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia
	The objective of this section is for the University to create a planing and design r

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380 The objective of this section is for the University to create a planing and design review process on campus in order to ensure implementation of the plan in accordance with site and architectural design standards and to deal with the process of change.

1. ASSEMBLE DESIGN REVIEW GROUP

The template provided by the Board of Regents suggests that typical design review group could include the Chief Financial Officer, Director of Campus Planning, Director of the Physical Plant, representative(s) from the faculty senate, Board of Regents program manager, additional representative(s) from the Board of Regents, if appropriate, and outside professional(s).

2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE REVIEW GROUP

The responsibilities of the group need to be defined including: goals, objectives, review criteria, administrative procedures, submittal dates, period of reviews and periods of submission for planning and design review process.

3. DOCUMENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE REVIEW

CREDITS

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan was prepared by the following consultant team under the guidence of the Office of the University Architects for Facilities Planning.

Office of the University Architects for Facilities Planning 382 East Broad Street

Athens, Georgia 30602

Ayers/Saint/Gross

Architects and Planners 222 St. Paul Place Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Heery International

Engineering Consultant 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, Georgia

Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan

Landscape Architects 11 Executive Park Drive, Suite 100 Atlanta, Georgia 30329

Dames & Moore

Traffic Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Paulien & Associates

Space Planning 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, Colorado 80203

F:\1\0 Table of Contents\Credits.doc

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Gratefull acknowledgement is given to the University of Georgia community and members of the Physical Master Plan Committees who contributed their valuable time and information to this master plan.

Steering Committee Mr. Robert Bugbee

Nr. Robert Bagbee
Dr. John Casey
Dr. Dwight Douglas
Dr. Joe Key
Mr. David Lunde
Dr. William Prokasy
Mr. Hubert Parker
Ms. Bryndis Roberts
Mr. John Shafer
Mr. Daniel Sniff
Dr. Eugene Younts

F:\1\0 Table of Contents\Acknowledgements.doc



The University System of Georgia Board of Regents

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

MASTER PLAN Appendix July 22, 1999





Date	9/20/98									
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan									
Subject	Appendix									
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross									
To Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519 Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283	University of Georgia The appendix includes documents or articles of interest corresponding to elements addressed in the Template. APPENDIX – TABLE OF CONTENTS 1. Tifton and Griffin Campuses a. Technical memorandums addressing the Tifton and Griffin Campuses b. Proposed Physical Master Plans 2. UGA FY '97 Building Condition and Evaluation Report 3. MRR (Major Repair and Renovation) Needs Information 4. College of Environmental Sciences (CAES) Facilities and Land Use Task Force (FLUTF) Report									
Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858 <i>Traffic Engineering</i> LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797 <i>Academic Programming</i> Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380	 Historic Resources Documentation School of Environmental Design Class Project (D.W. Brooks Drive Pedestrian Promenade) School of Veterinary Medicine Request for consideration of a Major Academic Capital Project "White Paper" concerning Veterinary Teaching Hospital space issues College of Environmental Sciences (CAES) Information on Proposed Agricultural Land Consolidation The University of Georgia Sign System Guidelines Housing Policy Information UGA Athletic Association Capital Projects (3/99) 									

Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place

Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

Fax 404/875-1283

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

Tifton and Griffin Campuses

A. Technical Memorandums addressing the Tifton and Griffin Campuses

B. Proposed Physical Master Plans

Date	April 20, 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	The University of Georgia College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES)
From	Tifton Campus in Tifton, Georgia
То	Ayers Saint Gross
Architects and Campus Planners	University of Georgia
Ayers/Saint/Gross	The CAES Tifton Campus is an integral part of the University of Georgia's College of
222 Saint Paul Place	Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and is therefore included in the scope of the

222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering

Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

1. HISTORY

The Coastal Plain Experiment Station (CPES) was established by Act Number 457 of the General Assembly of Georgia on August 19, 1918. It grew from 206 acres and one employee in 1919 to about 6,000 acres and 367 employees in 1993.Max H. Bass has written an excellent, comprehensive history of the Coastal Plain Experiment Station. The title of his work is <u>The UGA Coastal Plain Experiment Station...The first 75 Years</u> (copyright 1993, and printed by Lang Printing Company in Tifton, Georgia). The book covers the history of the CPES from 1918 to 1993.

Physical Master Plan. Because of its unique nature and remote location in Tifton, it has

been treated as a separate campus and is addressed in this technical memorandum.

The Rural Development Center (RDC) was opened in 1971 to provide facilities for the CAES service programs at this location.

The name Tifton Campus for this location was introduced in 1997 as the CAES implemented its strategic plan.

2. GOAL FORMULATION

The mission of the CAES Tifton Campus is consistent with the general mission of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. The following is a summary of that mission as well as specific goals of the Tifton Campus.

2.1 Institutional Mission Statement and Strategic Plan

The mission of the University of Georgia College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences is to seek, develop, verify and publish knowledge to enhance the productivity, profitability, and sustainability of agriculture, and to improve environmental quality for the benefit of the people of Georgia and society as a whole; to educate students in the agricultural and environmental sciences and technologies; to disseminate practical information on subjects relating to agriculture, family and consumer sciences and environmental quality to the people of the state, region, and nation; and to encourage the adoption of such information and methods to improve the quality of life.

2.1.1 Twelve Principles

In addition to the CAES mission as stated above, twelve guiding principles for CAES Facility and Land Use Planning were developed and approved. These principles are stated in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES) Facilities and Land Use Task Force (FLUTF) report #1. The purpose of the principles is to ensure that all facilities are located to maximize the value of the function(s) to be served, conform to sound principles of environmental design, pedagogy, ecology, social interest of the community, and resource availability. They are as follows:

- 1. Consistent with the UGA planning policy.
- 2. Supports the CAES mission.
- 3. Facilitates multiple use among teaching, research, and service functions.
- 4. Encourages collaboration and sharing among CAES units, and with other UGA and System units.
- 5. Ensures protection of the environment and sustainability of Georgia's air, land, and water resources.
- 6. Focuses primarily upon future needs.
- 7. Considers need in addition to those of proposing unit.
- 8. Ensures compatibility with current and projected community interests over the design-life of the facility or land.
- 9. Meets accessibility needs and standards for clientele.
- 10. Supports CAES role in "educating" larger UGA population.
- 11. Considers reassignment of current space, use, etc. as first alternative to meet need.
- 12. Incorporates whole-farm systems approach in management of properties.

2.2 GOALS AND ISSUES FOR FUTURE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

The Tifton Campus' charge is to continue to develop and deliver information that will enhance food, feed and fiber production, improve the quality of life, and preserve natural resources. The research service, and education programs that will be the focus of future work at the Tifton Campus include six broad areas of inquiry:

- Crop Production and Management
- Environment and Natural Resources
- Animal Production and Management
- Pest Management
- Applied Plant Genetics Precision Agricultural Systems

The growth in the student population at the main campus could affect Tifton Campus growth in an indirect way. The population increase could result in a slight increase in graduate students at the campus. The need and desire for life-long learning opportunities by non-traditional students will certainly need to continue to be facilitated at locations such as the Tifton campus. This may create a higher demand for distance education, which may increase the need for campus instruction facilities or additions to the Rural Development Center.

3. EXISTING CAMPUS CONDITIONS 3.1 Campus Grounds

3.1.1 Campus Framework

The Tifton Campus is located on 6,000 acres of the "coastal plain" in South Georgia near Tifton, Georgia. The campus is adjacent to the Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College. There are experimental plots placed throughout the campus, as well as plots that form the eastern and western edges of campus. Agricultural lands (both farms that are a part of the campus and private farms), surround the campus.

3.1.2 Building Use and Condition

One hundred forty seven buildings make up the Tifton Campus, and The Rural Development Center (RDC) is housed in one building. The campus currently has several buildings that are in poor mechanical condition, unsafe, technically out-dated, and non-compliant with ADA standards.

The current location of the greenhouses on the eastern edge of campus near Interstate 75 is unsatisfactory. Two large construction projects are underway on the campus (National Environmentally Sound Production Agricultural Laboratory and the Natural Products Lab Building). The current feed mill will be insufficient for the new dairy project (CREMY) and will have to be expanded soon.

3.2 Existing Campus Infrastructure

The majority of utilities are currently above ground, and the demand for new utility lines will soon increase with the completion of new projects (such as NESPAL, Vidalia Onion Laboratory, and the Natural Products Lab).

3.3 Existing Community Setting

The campus is situated in a rural area of South Georgia, just south of the city of Tifton. Interstate 75 runs through the campus as does an active major rail line. The railroad divides the campus. The campus has little interaction with Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College other than the hiring of student workers. Occasionally a class from the College will use the Tifton Campus facilities (greenhouses, etc.) to observe some of the scientific processes conducted there.

4. FUTURE CAMPUS REQUIREMENTS

There are no foreseeable major changes in the current staffing requirements or student populations on campus other than that previously mentioned in 2.2 above.

5. PHYSICAL MASTER PLAN

Many facilities need to be renovated to provide adequate office and laboratory space for faculty and staff. The two most historic and distinguishable CPES buildings, the Tift Building and the Animal Science Building, are desperately in need of rehabilitation.

The ill-sited greenhouses need to be relocated to a more satisfactory location. The existing feedmill needs to be updated and expanded. There also needs to be a general indication of future building sites for indeterminate growth.

5.2 Campus Design Issues

The unique setting of the campus in a rural setting should be considered an asset and enhanced whenever possible. Future building, parking, and plots should be sited to support the existing farm lane / road organization. Rainwater Road should be maintained as the primary campus road. The crescent should be protected as the identifiable open space for the CPES. This space could be enhanced by maintaining the open lawn and strengthening the tree line along the road. Trees could be used to line and strengthen the existing roads / lanes which along with the plots, create the dominant campus structure. The experimental plots echo the structural framework of the entire campus. Because the plots define the campus structure, future plot removal should be carefully considered. Reestablishing the garden plots and recording a comprehensive history of the plots would serve to strengthen the history and character of the campus. The existing arboretum and camellia gardens are quite an asset to the campus and should be maintained as such. The entry drive in front of the RDC and red roofed barns needs to be strengthened, including signs for the station at the entrance off the I-75 exit. A north side entrance to the RDC should be created to respond to the relocation of the highway entry ramp.

The Tifton Campus (e.g. CPES) fosters a rich history that is not readily apparent to the public. A concerted effort should be made to identify and edify that history in such a way that it is perceivable to faculty, staff, students and visitors on campus.

The architectural character of future buildings should take cues from either the farm buildings (white barns with red metal roofs), or the original campus buildings (buff / blonde brick with punched windows and pitched roofs). In the parking framework for the campus, front end or parallel parking should be considered rather than large lots.

The Rural Development Center

The pavilion space at the RDC is limited in use due to the wind / heat environmental conditions. Estimates on the enclosure of this space and the HVAC have been too costly in the past, but a long-term solution should be planned for (maybe with regional input).

Discussions of a very large addition to the RDC (large auditorium / performance space of 3000 seats) should acknowledge the physical and environmental limitations of the RDC site. A formal study of options for the RDC site has been conducted by the Office of the University Architects for Facilities Planning in Athens. Should any such development occur, great care must be taken to ensure that the wetland area (creek) west of the RDC site is enhanced. The existing watershed area that includes campus has already been compromised in such a way that stormwater management has been, and will continue to be a costly challenge to the campus. Sound environmental ways of dealing with

stormwater run-off, should be implemented to reduce run-off, storm water management costs, and ensure a healthier environment for the future.

Such actions would be compliant with the clear environmental goals stated in the UGA College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Mission Statement. Failure to do so would result in the failure of the institution to carry out a core element of its mission.

The campus could strengthen the image of a strong environmental mission statement, by promoting more environmentally sound treatments of stormwater drainage. This action could also promote regional cooperation by providing a "check-point" to slow down the run-off from the watershed in this area which will in turn help prevent the flooding of the downtown areas in Tifton.



Not to Scale 10/5/98

Legend



Proposed Building Sites

Tifton Campus Master Plan

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan





Existing Buildings

Date	April 21, 1998
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	The Georgia Experiment Station in Griffin, Georgia
From	Ayers Saint Gross
То	University of Georgia
Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202	The CAES Griffin Campus is an integral part of the University of Georgia's College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and is therefore included in the scope of the Physical Master Plan. Because of its unique nature and remote location in Griffin, it has been treated as a separate campus and is addressed in this technical memorandum.
410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519	The Georgia Experiment Station (GES) was established in 1889 on 130 acres of what was
Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880	then the Bates farm near Griffin, Georgia. There is a comprehensive history of the Georgia Experiment Station that covers the years 1889 to 1975. B. B. Higgins along with other members of the Georgia Experiment Station Faculty prepared this small internal publication entitled <u>The History of the Georgia Experiment Station</u> . A copy of this history is included in the Appendix.
Fax 404/875-1283 Landscape Architecture	The name Griffin Campus for this location was introduced in 1997 as the CAES implemented its strategic plan.
Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309	2. GOAL FORMULATION

The mission of the CAES Griffin Campus is consistent with the general mission of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. The following is a summary of that mission as well as specific goals of the Griffin Campus.

Institutional Mission Statement and Strategic Plan 2.1

The mission of the University of Georgia College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences is to seek, develop, verify and publish knowledge to enhance the productivity, profitability, and sustainability of agriculture, and to improve environmental quality for the benefit of the people of Georgia and society as a whole; to educate students in the agricultural and environmental sciences and technologies; to disseminate practical information on subjects relating to agriculture, family and consumer sciences and environmental quality to the people of the state, region, and nation; and to encourage the adoption of such information and methods to improve the quality of life.

Twelve Principles: 2.1.1

In addition to the CAES mission as stated above, twelve guiding principles for CAES Facility and Land Use Planning were developed and approved. These principles are stated in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES) Facilities and Land Use Task Force (FLUTF) report #1. The purpose of the principles is to ensure that all

F:\2\Appendix\GRIFFIN.doc

404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

facilities are located to maximize the value of the function(s) to be served and conform to sound principles of environmental design, pedagogy, ecology, social interest of the community, and resource availability. They are as follows:

- 1. Consistent with the UGA planning policy.
- 2. Supports the CAES mission.
- 3. Facilitates multiple use among teaching, research, and service functions.
- 4. Encourages collaboration and sharing among CAES units, and with other UGA and System units.
- 5. Ensures protection of the environment and sustainability of Georgia's air, land, and water resources.
- 6. Focuses primarily upon future needs.
- 7. Considers need in addition to those of proposing unit.
- 8. Ensures compatibility with current and projected community interests over the design-life of the facility or land.
- 9. Meets accessibility needs and standards for clientele.
- 10. Supports CAES role in "educating" larger UGA population.
- 11. Considers reassignment of current space, use, etc. as first alternative to meet need.
- 12. Incorporates whole-farm systems approach in management of properties.

2.2 Goals and Issues for Future Academic Program:

The Griffin Campus' charge is to continue to focus on five broad areas of inquiry. These areas seek to deliver information that could improve the quality of life and preserve natural resources. The research, education, and service programs that will be the focus of the future work at the Griffin Campus include:

- Crop and Pest Management
- Food Safety and Quality Enhancement
- Urban Agriculture
- Applied Plant Genetics
- Environment and Natural Resources

The growth in the student population at the main campus could affect Griffin Campus growth in an indirect way. The population increase could result in a slight increase in graduate students at the campus. The need and desire for life long learning opportunities by non-traditional students will certainly need to continue to be facilitated at locations such as the Griffin Campus. The Griffin Campus has in the past 2 years started a new Continuing Education Program. This program is expected to continue to grow in the near future and its facilities will need to expand with it. The addition of a 300-seat auditorium, support facilities, and parking has been discussed.

3. EXISTING CAMPUS CONDITIONS

3.1 Campus Grounds

3.1.1 Campus Framework

The Griffin Campus is located in Griffin, Georgia approximately 40 miles SE of Atlanta and 90 miles from Atlanta. Although the city of Griffin and the area around it is quickly being swallowed into Atlanta's growth, it still holds on to a small town feel.

The main part of the campus has the feel of a compact rural settlement with a collection of buildings situated on a grid-like road network. This area is at the center of a large open space created by surrounding experimental plot land. This arrangement creates a unique rural town atmosphere.

3.1.2 Building Use and Condition

Many of the facilities at the Griffin Campus are small buildings that have been retrofitted from their original form to fit their current use, such as a lawn mower shed into an office building and a small house into a lab. This has resulted in high inefficiencies due to the large percentage of buildings housing inappropriate uses and high maintenance costs. This inappropriate use of buildings has also resulted in many life safety issues.

3.2 Existing Campus Infrastructure

The above ground utilities are a continuing maintenance problem. Stormwater issues are increasing and need to be addressed. Lack of parking is perceived to be a campus wide problem.

4. FUTURE CAMPUS REQUIREMENTS

There are no foreseeable major changes in the current staffing requirements or student populations on campus, other than the previously mentioned Continuing Education Program.

5. PHYSICAL MASTER PLAN

5.1 Parking and Circulation

The streets and pedestrian paths need to be defined and enhanced so that a perceivable pattern is developed and way finding is facilitated. The pedestrian route from the Flynt building which will house the campus' administrative functions, could be strengthened if it were developed into a tree-lined path that connected its new courtyard entry across the Mule Barn site to Woodroof Drive.

There is a great need for street names, building numbers and a telephone log for 911 / Emergency access system (especially to labs).

The parking problem could be helped by redefining small, unmarked, makeshift lots into consolidated, efficient marked lots and developing neat parallel parking on the streets.

The unique rural town atmosphere that the arrangement of facilities creates, along with the small farm-lane like roads should be considered an asset and enhanced whenever possible. A new paved road south of Woodruff Drive may encourage sprawl of campus buildings to the south, thus would be discouraged.

5.2 Campus Design Issues

The Griffin Campus (e.g.,GES) fosters a rich history that is not readily apparent to the public. A concerted effort should be made to identify and edify that history in such a way that it is perceivable and appreciated by the faculty, staff, students and visitors on campus. The station could benefit from developing facilities that will enhance and make more perceivable a sense of history and place.

There is a need to consolidate and relocate buildings so that the campus reads as a practical grouping of facilities. The smaller plots mixed in with the buildings on the center of campus, moving to the larger plots in the surrounding areas creates an increasing scale of a plot- like grid. Future development should follow this pattern and enhance the existing framework.

The possible widening of Experiment Street to a four-lane highway could increase the campus' exposure to the community. The Pavilion needs landscaping, the addition of walks and ADA access. A landscape committee for the pavilion is being set up. The committee could then turn its attention to the rest of the campus.

Standards for steeper pitched roofs: 6/12 minimum should be set, along with standards for metal buildings. Diagrams for moving overhead utilities below ground should also be developed.

5.3 Campus Safety

Card- controlled access gates at the other two gated entries are needed.



Not to Scale 10/5/98

Legend



Proposed Building Sites

Griffin Campus Master Plan

The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan





Existing Buildings

Ē																			
The University of Georgia	т	е	с	h	n	i	с	а	I	Μ	е	m	0	r	а	n	d	u	m

Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

UGA FY '97 Building Condition and Evaluation Report

F:\2\Appendix\UGA FY '97 Building Condition and Evaluation.doc

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA PAGE 1 FY 1997 BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION GRAND TOTALS

GROSS	AREA: 13,049,190		
REPLAC	CEMENT COST: 1,453,108,433		
BUILDI	ING COUNT: 1,243		
		EST CORRECTION	% OF EST
		COST	REP COST
10	FOUNDATION	6,042,131	. 4
11	CRACKED FOUNDATION	2,032,034	.1
12	APPARENT SETTLEMENT	2,680,028	.2
13	OTHER PROBLEMS	1,330,069	.1
20	SUPERSTRUCTURE	15,218,538	1.0
21	BROKEN OR CRACKED WALLS	6,897,861	. 5
22	ROOF SAGGING	1,286,391	.1
23	FLOOR MOVEMENT EXCESSIVE	3,357,393	.2
24	ROOF PONDS	695,096	. 0
25	OTHER PROBLEMS	2,981,797	.2
30	EXTERIOR SKIN	27,546,010	1.9
31	NEEDS NEW ROOF	7,955,994	.5
32	WINDOWS IN POOR CONDITION	11,566,750	. 8
33	TUCKPOINTING REQUIRED	2,933,874	. 2
34	OTHER PROBLEMS	5,089,392	. 4
40	GENERAL	120,650,146	8.3
41	INTERIOR NEEDS PAINTING	8,640,008	. 6
42	NEEDS NEW FLOORING	9,715,482	.7
43	NEEDS NEW CEILING	6,321,172	. 4
44	INTERIOR WALLS NEED REALIGN	24,208,489	1.7
45	NEEDS NEW FIXED EQUIPMENT	30,806,971	2.1
46	EXITS AND STAIRWAYS	5,366,798	. 4
47	ENTRY RAMP	1,310,455	.1
48	ELEVATOR	9,658,029	.7
49	OTHER PROBLEMS	7,904,486	.5
49A	ASBESTOS	16,718,256	1.2
50	PLUMBING & FIRE PROTECTION SYS	46,076,586	3.2
51	FIXTURE REPLACEMENT	7,233,355	.5
52	NEEDS NEW WASTE AND VENT	10,333,456	.7
53	WATER LINE CAPACITY INADEQUATE	6,637,652	.5
54	SPRINKLER SYSTEM	14,742,328	1.0
55	HANDICAP ACCESS - TOILETS	4,992,182	.3
56	OTHER PROBLEMS	2,137,613	.1
60	HEATING, VENTILATION & AC SYS	93,705,719	6.4
61	HEATING	20,362,004	1.4
62	VENTILATION	27,369,375	1.9
63	AIR CONDITIONING	29,839,260	2.1
64	TEMPERATURE CONTROL	10,848,124	.7
65	OTHER PROBLEMS	5,286,956	. 4
70	ELECT, FIRE ALARM & LIGHT SYS	40,202,524	2.8
71	CAPACITY	5,916,681	. 4
72	DISTRIBUTION	21,097,426	1.5
73	FIXTURES	5,443,798	. 4
74	FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	6,270,810	4
75	OTHER PROBLEMS	1,473,809	.1
80	TOTAL BUILDING DEFICIENCY	349,441,680	24.0

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA PAGE 1 FY 1997 BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SUMMARY BY MAINTENANCE FUND TYPE

MAINT FUND TYPE:	A AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES
GROSS AREA:	3,271,119
REPLACEMENT COST:	273,522,751
BUILDING COUNT:	80

		EST CORRECTION	% OF EST
		COST	REP COST
10	FOUNDATION	615,251	.2
11	CRACKED FOUNDATION	120,545	. 0
12	APPARENT SETTLEMENT	372,549	.1
13	OTHER PROBLEMS	122,157	. 0
20	SUPERSTRUCTURE	1,573,793	. 6
21	BROKEN OR CRACKED WALLS	929,723	.3
22	ROOF SAGGING	94,045	. 0
23	FLOOR MOVEMENT EXCESSIVE	211,626	.1
24	ROOF PONDS	31,347	. 0
25	OTHER PROBLEMS	307,052	.1
30	EXTERIOR SKIN	6,798,778	2.5
31	NEEDS NEW ROOF	750,566	. 3
32	WINDOWS IN POOR CONDITION	3,765,517	1.4
33	TUCKPOINTING REQUIRED	377,034	.1
34	OTHER PROBLEMS	1,905,661	.7
40	GENERAL	20,095,670	7.3
41	INTERIOR NEEDS PAINTING	2,040,050	.7
42	NEEDS NEW FLOORING	2,241,554	.8
43	NEEDS NEW CEILING	1,600,264	. 6
44	INTERIOR WALLS NEED REALIGN	1,369,707	.5
45	NEEDS NEW FIXED EQUIPMENT	3,228,380	1.2
46	EXITS AND STAIRWAYS	1,169,415	. 4
47	ENTRY RAMP	231,470	.1
48	ELEVATOR	3,622,184	1.3
49	OTHER PROBLEMS	1,463,755	.5
49A	ASBESTOS	3,128,891	1.1
50	PLUMBING & FIRE PROTECTION SYS	11,401,543	4.2
51	FIXTURE REPLACEMENT	1,868,786	.7
52	NEEDS NEW WASTE AND VENT	3,095,266	1.1
53	WATER LINE CAPACITY INADEQUATE	1,951,747	.7
54	SPRINKLER SYSTEM	3,108,221	1.1
55	HANDICAP ACCESS - TOILETS	494,381	.2
56	OTHER PROBLEMS	883,142	. 3
60	HEATING, VENTILATION & AC SYS	24,652,396	9.0
61	HEATING	5,480,762	2.0
62	VENTILATION	6,969,514	2.5
63	AIR CONDITIONING	8,123,046	3.0
64	TEMPERATURE CONTROL	2,331,282	. 9
65	OTHER PROBLEMS	1,747,792	. 6
70	ELECT, FIRE ALARM & LIGHT SYS	7,172,169	2.6
71	CAPACITY	1,042,977	. 4
72	DISTRIBUTION	3,215,631	1.2
73	FIXTURES	627,087	.2
74	FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	2,251,325	.8
75	OTHER PROBLEMS	35,149	. 0
80	TOTAL BUILDING DEFICIENCY	72,309,659	26.4

UNIVERSITY OF GECRGIA FY 1997 BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SUMMARY BY MAINTENANCE FUND TYPE

MAINT FUND TYPE: H	B ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
GROSS AREA:	130,075
REPLACEMENT COST:	15,339,886
BUILDING COUNT:	11

		EST CORRECTION	% OF EST
		COST	REP COST
10	FOUNDATION	12,749	.1
11	CRACKED FOUNDATION		. 0
12	APPARENT SETTLEMENT		. 0
13	OTHER PROBLEMS	12,749	.1
20	SUPERSTRUCTURE	83,292	.5
21	BROKEN OR CRACKED WALLS	1,204	. 0
22	ROOF SAGGING		. 0
23	FLOOR MOVEMENT EXCESSIVE		. 0
24	ROOF PONDS		. 0
25	OTHER PROBLEMS	82,088	. 5
30	EXTERIOR SKIN	54,655	. 4
31	NEEDS NEW ROOF		. 0
32	WINDOWS IN POOR CONDITION		. 0
33	TUCKPOINTING REQUIRED		. 0
34	OTHER PROBLEMS	54,655	. 4
40	GENERAL	209,735	1.4
41	INTERIOR NEEDS PAINTING	23,796	.2
42	NEEDS NEW FLOORING	33,708	.2
43	NEEDS NEW CEILING	47,330	. 3
44	INTERIOR WALLS NEED REALIGN		. 0
45	NEEDS NEW FIXED EQUIPMENT	52,741	.3
46	EXITS AND STAIRWAYS	30,912	.2
47	ENTRY RAMP		. 0
48	ELEVATOR		. 0
49	OTHER PROBLEMS	21,248	.1
49A	ASBESTOS		. 0
50	PLUMBING & FIRE PROTECTION SYS	35,764	.2
51	FIXTURE REPLACEMENT	4,250	. 0
52	NEEDS NEW WASTE AND VENT	8,499	.1
53	WATER LINE CAPACITY INADEQUATE	4,250	. 0
54	SPRINKLER SYSTEM	18,765	.1
55	HANDICAP ACCESS - TOILETS		. 0
56	OTHER PROBLEMS		. 0
60	HEATING, VENTILATION & AC SYS	60,840	. 4
61	HEATING		. 0
62	VENTILATION		. 0
63	AIR CONDITIONING		. 0
64	TEMPERATURE CONTROL		. 0
65	OTHER PROBLEMS	60,840	. 4
70	ELECT, FIRE ALARM & LIGHT SYS	98,066	. 6
71	CAPACITY	2,125	. 0
72	DISTRIBUTION	2,125	. 0
73	FIXTURES	25,186	. 2
74	FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	66,756	. 4
75	OTHER PROBLEMS	1,874	. 0
80	TOTAL BUILDING DEFICIENCY	555,098	3.6

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA FY 1997 BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SUMMARY BY MAINTENANCE FUND TYPE

MAINT FUND TYPE:	C COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
GROSS AREA:	539,305
REPLACEMENT COST:	54,424,012
BUILDING COUNT:	216

		EST CORRECTION	% OF EST
		COST	REP COST
10	FOUNDATION	536,941	1.0
11	CRACKED FOUNDATION	248,352	. 5
12	APPARENT SETTLEMENT	238,752	. 4
13	OTHER PROBLEMS	49,837	.1
20	SUPERSTRUCTURE	808,897	1.5
21	BROKEN OR CRACKED WALLS	456,897	. 8
22	ROOF SAGGING	138,452	. 3
23	FLOOR MOVEMENT EXCESSIVE	63,820	.1
24	ROOF PONDS	65,363	.1
25	OTHER PROBLEMS	84,365	.2
30	EXTERIOR SKIN	1,756,154	3.2
31	NEEDS NEW ROOF	506,562	. 9
32	WINDOWS IN POOR CONDITION	792,814	1.5
33	TUCKPOINTING REQUIRED	67,668	.1
34	OTHER PROBLEMS	389,110	.7
40	GENERAL	3,376,537	6.2
41	INTERIOR NEEDS PAINTING	678,210	1.2
42	NEEDS NEW FLOORING	583,700	1.1
43	NEEDS NEW CEILING	152,612	.3
44	INTERIOR WALLS NEED REALIGN	217,186	. 4
45	NEEDS NEW FIXED EQUIPMENT	1,197,343	2.2
46	EXITS AND STAIRWAYS	380,341	.7
47	ENTRY RAMP	79,591	.1
48	ELEVATOR	9,586	. 0
49	UTHER PROBLEMS	57,993	.1
49A	ASBESTUS	19,975	. 0
50	PLUMBING & FIRE PROTECTION SYS	2,056,238	3.8
51	FIXTURE REPLACEMENT	304,196	. 6
52	NEEDS NEW WASTE AND VENT	324,811	. 6
53	WATER LINE CAPACITY INADEQUATE	434,273	. 8
54	SPRINKLER SYSTEM	411,200	. 8
55	HANDICAP ACCESS - TOILETS	547,081	1.0
56	UTHER PRUBLEMS	34,677	.1
60	HEATING, VENTILATION & AC SYS	4,091,590	7.5
61	HEATING	854,274	1.6
62		823,741	1.5
63		1,825,800	3.4
64	TEMPERATURE CONTROL	507,877	. 9
65	OTHER PROBLEMS	79,898	.1
70	ELECT, FIRE ALARM & LIGHT SYS	2,341,819	4.3
/1	CAPACITY	317,827	. 6
72	DISIRIBUTION	1,260,746	2.3
15	FIXTURES	290,987	. 5
/4	FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	463,747	. 9
/5	UTHER PROBLEMS	8,512	. 0
80	IUIAL BUILDING DEFICIENCY	14,968,173	27.5

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA FY 1997 BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SUMMARY BY MAINTENANCE FUND TYPE

MAINT FUND TYPE:	E AG EXPERIMENT STATIONS
GROSS AREA:	1,791,084
REPLACEMENT COST:	123,214,167
BUILDING COUNT:	559

COST REP 10 FOUNDATION 1,757,752 11 CRACKED FOUNDATION 759,922 12 APPARENT SETTLEMENT 821,245	COST 1.4 .6 .7 .1 2.7 1.1
10 FOUNDATION 1,757,752 11 CRACKED FOUNDATION 759,922 12 APPARENT SETTLEMENT 821,245	1.4 .6 .7 .1 2.7 1.1
11CRACKED FOUNDATION759,92212APPARENT SETTLEMENT821,245	.6 .7 .1 2.7 1.1
12 APPARENT SETTLEMENT 821,245	.7 .1 2.7 1.1
	.1 2.7 1.1
13 OTHER PROBLEMS 176,585	2.7 1.1
20 SUPERSTRUCTURE 3,272,844	1.1
21 BROKEN OR CRACKED WALLS 1,300,866	
22 ROOF SAGGING 487,358	. 4
23 FLOOR MOVEMENT EXCESSIVE 505,200	. 4
24 ROOF PONDS 165,690	.1
25 OTHER PROBLEMS 813,730	.7
30 EXTERIOR SKIN 5,007,483	4.1
31 NEEDS NEW ROOF 1,952,784	1.6
32 WINDOWS IN POOR CONDITION 1,677,168	1.4
33 TUCKPOINTING REQUIRED 656,575	. 5
34 OTHER PROBLEMS 720,956	. 6
40 GENERAL 15,067,801	12.2
41 INTERIOR NEEDS PAINTING 1,132,408	. 9
42 NEEDS NEW FLOORING 846,153	.7
43 NEEDS NEW CEILING 512,592	. 4
44 INTERIOR WALLS NEED REALIGN 3,909,617	3.2
45 NEEDS NEW FIXED EQUIPMENT 3,477,900	2.8
46 EXITS AND STAIRWAYS 545,877	. 4
47 ENTRY RAMP 113,093	.1
48 ELEVATOR 187,591	.2
49 OTHER PROBLEMS 3,193,495	2.6
49A ASBESTOS 1,149,075	. 9
50 PLUMBING & FIRE PROTECTION SYS 3,149,617	2.6
51 FIXTURE REPLACEMENT 510,967	. 4
52 NEEDS NEW WASTE AND VENT 796,803	. 6
53 WATER LINE CAPACITY INADEQUATE 439,003	. 4
54 SPRINKLER SYSTEM 900,939	.7
55 HANDICAP ACCESS - TOILETS 351,995	. 3
56 OTHER PROBLEMS 149,910	.1
60 HEATING, VENTILATION & AC SYS 9,273,719	7.5
61 HEATING 2,198,937	1.8
62 VENTILATION 2,378,362	1.9
63 AIR CONDITIONING 3,131,055	2.5
64 TEMPERATURE CONTROL 1,365,663	1.1
65 OTHER PROBLEMS 199,702	.2
70 ELECT, FIRE ALARM & LIGHT SYS 5,933,035	4.8
71 CAPACITY 506,852	. 4
72 DISTRIBUTION 3,841,851	3.1
73 FIXTURES 643,017	. 5
74 FIRE ALARM SYSTEM 692,815	. 6
75 OTHER PROBLEMS 248,500	.2
80 TOTAL BUILDING DEFICIENCY 43,462,242	35.3

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA FY 1997 BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SUMMARY BY MAINTENANCE FUND TYPE

MAINT FUND TYPE:	I MARINE INSTITUTE	
GROSS AREA:	105,204	
REPLACEMENT COST:	9,263,487	
BUILDING COUNT:	48	

		EST CORRECTION	% OF EST
7.0		COST	REP COST
10	FOUNDATION	73,038	. 8
11	CRACKED FOUNDATION	12,375	.1
12	APPARENT SETTLEMENT	57,327	. 6
13	OTHER PROBLEMS	3,336	. 0
20	SUPERSTRUCTURE	339,594	3.7
21	BROKEN OR CRACKED WALLS	96,804	1.0
22	ROOF SAGGING	170,054	1.8
23	FLOOR MOVEMENT EXCESSIVE	60,147	. 6
24	ROOF PONDS	12,445	.1
25	OTHER PROBLEMS	144	. 0
30	EXTERIOR SKIN	664,306	7.2
31	NEEDS NEW ROOF	124,947	1.3
32	WINDOWS IN POOR CONDITION	175,256	1.9
33	TUCKPOINTING REQUIRED	16,501	.2
34	OTHER PROBLEMS	347,602	3.8
40	GENERAL	658,819	7.1
41	INTERIOR NEEDS PAINTING	127,796	1.4
42	NEEDS NEW FLOORING	70,173	.8
43	NEEDS NEW CEILING	37,790	
44	INTERIOR WALLS NEED REALIGN	243.830	2.6
45	NEEDS NEW FIXED EQUIPMENT	103.954	1.1
46	EXITS AND STAIRWAYS	7,829	.1
47	ENTRY RAMP	11.834	1
48	ELEVATOR		
49	OTHER PROBLEMS	8.275	. 0
49A	ASBESTOS	47.338	5
50	PLUMBING & FIRE PROTECTION SYS	260,494	2.8
51	FIXTURE REPLACEMENT	121.421	13
52	NEEDS NEW WASTE AND VENT	70.823	1.5
53	WATER LINE CAPACITY INADEQUATE	36.380	.0
54	SPRINKLER SYSTEM	8,201	
55	HANDICAP ACCESS - TOILETS	23,669	. 1
56	OTHER PROBLEMS	20,007	
60	HEATING, VENTILATION & AC SYS	330.472	. U . Z
61	HEATING	82 082	5.0
62	VENTILATION	117 561	۲. ۲ ۱
63	AIR CONDITIONING	106 165	1.3
64	TEMPERATURE CONTROL	26 686	1.1
65	OTHER PROBLEMS	24,004	
70	ELECT. FIRE ALARM & LIGHT SYS	211 711	. U
71	CAPACITY	Z11,/11 57 666	2.3
72	DISTRIBUTION	37,400	. 6
73	FIXTURES	104,166	1.1
74	FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	45,703	. 5
75	OTHER PROBLEMS	4,124	. 0
80	TOTAL BUILDING DESIGNENCY	252	. 0
00	ISINE BUILDING DEFICIENCY	2,538,431	27.4

"NIVERSITY OF GEORGIA FY 1997 BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SUMMARY BY MAINTENANCE FUND TYPE

M MARINE EXTENSION SERVICE	
65,950	
8,873,243	
7	
	M MARINE EXTENSION SERVICE 65,950 8,873,243 7

		EST CORRECTION	% OF EST
		COST	REP COST
10	FOUNDATION	152,136	1.7
11	CRACKED FOUNDATION	24,402	. 3
12	APPARENT SETTLEMENT	33,881	. 4
13	OTHER PROBLEMS	93,853	1.1
20	SUPERSTRUCTURE	54,461	.6
21	BRUKEN OR CRACKED WALLS	39,039	. 4
27	RUUF SAGGING		. 0
23	FLOUR MOVEMENT EXCESSIVE	15,422	.2
25	ATHER REALEME		. 0
30	EXTEDIOD SKIN		. 0
ט כו	NEEDS NEW POOF	362,615	4.1
32	WINDOWS IN POOD CONDITION	107,100	1.2
33	TUCKPOINTING PEOULEED	42,069	. 5
34	OTHER PROBLEMS		. 0
40	GENERAL	213,446	2.4
41	INTERIOR NEEDS PAINTING	645,364	7.3
42	NEEDS NEW FLOORING	115,048	1.3
43	NEEDS NEW CEILING	100,143	1.1
44	INTERIOR WALLS NEED REALTON	61,120	./
45	NEEDS NEW FIXED FOUTPMENT	216 (27	.9
46	EXITS AND STAIRWAYS	214,023	2.4
47	ENTRY RAMP	11 017	. U
48	ELEVATOR	11,717	1.
49	OTHER PROBLEMS	33 881	. 0
49A	ASBESTOS	28 156	- 4
50	PLUMBING & FIRE PROTECTION SYS	200,126	
51	FIXTURE REPLACEMENT	63.896	2.5
52	NEEDS NEW WASTE AND VENT	35,156	
53	WATER LINE CAPACITY INADEQUATE		. 0
54	SPRINKLER SYSTEM		. 0
55	HANDICAP ACCESS - TOILETS	82,303	. 9
56	OTHER PROBLEMS	18,771	.2
60	HEATING, VENTILATION & AC SYS	432,026	4.9
61	HEATING	163,306	1.8
62	VENTILATION	73,930	. 8
63	AIR CONDITIONING	194,790	2.2
64	TEMPERATURE CONTROL		. 0
65	OTHER PROBLEMS		. 0
70	ELECT, FIRE ALARM & LIGHT SYS	207,606	2.3
71	CAPACITY	12,713	.1
72	DISTRIBUTION	30,015	.3
15	FIXTURES	90,758	1.0
/4	FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	6,357	.1
/5	UTHER PROBLEMS	67,763	. 8
80	IUIAL BUILDING DEFICIENCY	2,054,336	23.2

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA PAGE 7 FY 1997 BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SUMMARY BY MAINTENANCE FUND TYPE

		EST CORRECTION	% OF EST
		COST	REP COST
10	FOUNDATION	2,826,080	. 3
11	CRACKED FOUNDATION	839,935	.1
12	APPARENT SETTLEMENT	1,114,593	.1
13	OTHER PROBLEMS	871,552	.1
20	SUPERSTRUCTURE	8,903,686	. 9
21	BROKEN OR CRACKED WALLS	4,008,536	. 4
22	ROOF SAGGING	366,986	. 0
23	FLOOR MOVEMENT EXCESSIVE	2,449,934	. 3
24	ROOF PONDS	412,265	. 0
25	OTHER PROBLEMS	1,665,965	.2
30	EXTERIOR SKIN	12,677,373	1.3
31	NEEDS NEW ROOF	4,411,921	. 5
32	WINDOWS IN POOR CONDITION	5,055,749	. 5
33	TUCKPOINTING REQUIRED	1,780,074	.2
34	UTHER PROBLEMS	1,429,629	.1
40	GENERAL	79,852,179	8.3
41	INTERIOR NEEDS PAINTING	4,449,898	. 5
42	NEEDS NEW FLOORING	5,792,146	. 6
45	NEEDS NEW CEILING	3,875,982	. 4
44	INTERIOR WALLS NEED REALIGN	18,209,955	1.9
40	NEEDS NEW FIXED EQUIPMENT	22,376,561	2.3
40	EXIIS AND STAIRWAYS	3,226,468	.3
47	ENTRY RAMP	856,246	.1
40	ELEVATOR OTHER BRODIENC	5,838,668	. 6
47	ASPESTOC	2,937,016	.3
77A	ASDESTUS	12,289,239	1.3
50	FLUMBING & FIRE PROTECTION SYS	28,798,948	3.0
52	FIXTURE REPLACEMENT	4,327,221	. 5
52	NEEDS NEW WASTE AND VENT	5,954,051	. 6
56	WATER LINE CAPACITY INADEQUATE	3,733,976	. 4
55	HANDICAD ACCECC TOTLETO	10,278,153	1.1
56	ANDICAF ACCESS - IUILEIS	3,477,913	. 4
60	WEATING VENTLATION & AC OVE	1,027,634	.1
61	HEATING, VENTILATION & AC SYS	54,213,463	5.6
62		11,401,959	1.2
63		16,818,911	1.8
66		16,266,406	1.7
65	OTHER PROPLEMS	6,553,398	.7
70	FLECT FIRE ALARM & LIQUE OVO	3,172,789	. 3
70	CAPACITY	24,020,809	2.5
72		3,960,608	. 4
73	EIVINES DISIKIDUIIUN	12,497,233	1.3
76	ETRE ALARM SVOTEM	3,690,698	. 4
75	THEP PROBLEMS	2,764,216	. 3
80	TOTAL PUTLINING DEFINITION	1,108,054	.1
00	IDIAL BUILDING DEFICIENCY	211,292,520	22.0

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA FY 1997 BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SUMMARY BY MAINTENANCE FUND TYPE

MAINT FUND TYPE:	V VET MED EXP STATIONS
GROSS AREA:	161,149
REPLACEMENT COST:	7,927,172
BUILDING COUNT:	84

		EST CORRECTION	% OF EST
1.0	FOUNDATION	COST	REP COST
10	FUUNDATION	68,184	. 9
11	CRACKED FOUNDATION	26,503	. 3
12	APPAKENT SETTLEMENT	41,681	. 5
15	UTHER PROBLEMS		. 0
20	SUPERSTRUCTURE	180,220	2.3
21	BRUKEN OR CRACKED WALLS	63,041	. 8
22	RUUF SAGGING	29,496	. 4
23	FLOUR MOVEMENT EXCESSIVE	51,244	. 6
24		7,986	.1
20	UTHER PRUBLEMS	28,453	. 4
30	EXTERIOR SKIN	221,144	2.8
31	NEEDS NEW KUUF	102,114	1.3
32	WINDOWS IN POUR CONDITION	58,177	.7
33	OTUER PROPIENC	36,022	.5
60	UTHER PRUBLEMS	24,831	. 3
40	GENERAL	726,531	9.2
41	INTERIOR NEEDS PAINTING	69,300	. 9
42	NEEDS NEW FLUORING	44,403	. 6
43	NEEDS NEW CEILING	29,980	. 4
44	INTERIOR WALLS NEED REALIGN	174,216	2.2
40	NEEDS NEW FIXED EQUIPMENT	155,469	2.0
40	EXITS AND STATRWAYS	5,956	.1
47	ENTRY RAMP	6,304	.1
40	OTHER DRONLENC		. 0
47	ASPESTOS	188,823	2.4
47A	ASDESIUS	52,080	.7
50	EIVING & FIRE PROTECTION SYS	166,852	2.1
52	NEEDS NEW MACTE AND MENT	32,618	. 4
52	NEEDS NEW WASTE AND VENT	48,047	. 6
55	WATER LINE CAPACITY INADEQUATE	38,023	.5
54	HANDICAD ACCECC TOTLETO	9,845	.1
55	ANDICAP ALLESS - TOILETS	14,840	.2
60	UTHER FRUBLEMS	23,479	. 3
60	HEATING, VENTILATION & AC SYS	640,707	8.1
62		177,182	2.2
63		185,605	2.3
60	TEMPEDATURE CONTROL	188,516	2.4
64 4 E	OTHER PROPERTY	63,469	. 8
70	UTHER PRUBLEMS	25,935	. 3
70	CADACITY	212,755	2.7
71		15,062	.2
12	DISIKIROLION	144,608	1.8
13	FIXTURES	29,661	. 4
74	FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	19,719	.2
15	UTHER PRUBLEMS	3,705	. 0
00	IUTAL BUILDING DEFICIENCY	2,216,396	28.0

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA FY 1997 BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SUMMARY BY MAINTENANCE FUND TYPE

MAINT FUND TYPE:	X OTHER
GROSS AREA:	3,443
REPLACEMENT COST:	350,190
BUILDING COUNT:	1

		EST CORRECTION	% OF EST
1.0		COST	REP COST
10	FOUNDATION		. 0
12	CRACKED FOUNDATION		. 0
17	APPARENT SETTLEMENT		. 0
10			. 0
20	SUPERSTRUCTURE	1,751	. 5
22	BROKEN UK CKACKED WALLS	1,751	.5
23	RUOF SAGGING		. 0
24	POOF PONDS		. 0
25			. 0
30			. 0
31	NEEDS NEW POOR	3,502	1.0
32	WINDOWS IN POOP CONDITION		. 0
33	TUCKPOINTING PEOULDED		. 0
34	OTHER PROBLEMS		. 0
40	GENERAL	3,502	1.0
41	INTERIOR NEEDS PAINTING	17,510	5.0
42	NEEDS NEW FLOORING	3,502	1.0
43	NEEDS NEW CETLING	3,502	1.0
44	INTERIOR WALLS NEED REALTON	3,502	1.0
45	NEEDS NEW FIXED FOUTPMENT	3,502	1.0
46	EXITS AND STATEWAYS		. 0
47	ENTRY RAMP		. 0
48	ELEVATOR		. 0
49	OTHER PROBLEMS		. 0
49A	ASBESTOS	7 502	. 0
50	PLUMBING & FIRE PROTECTION SYS	7 006	1.0
51	FIXTURE REPLACEMENT	7,004	2.0
52	NEEDS NEW WASTE AND VENT		. 0
53	WATER LINE CAPACITY INADEQUATE		. 0
54	SPRINKLER SYSTEM	7 004	.0
55	HANDICAP ACCESS - TOILETS	7) 0 0 4	2.0
56	OTHER PROBLEMS		. 0
60	HEATING, VENTILATION & AC SYS	10.506	.0 .0
61	HEATING	3,502	1 0
62	VENTILATION	1,751	5
63	AIR CONDITIONING	3,502	1.0
64	TEMPERATURE CONTROL	1,751	.5
65	OTHER PROBLEMS		. 0
70	ELECT, FIRE ALARM & LIGHT SYS	4,554	1.3
/1	CAPACITY	1,051	.3
72	DISTRIBUTION	1,051	.3
13	FIXTURES	701	. 0
74	FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	1,751	.5
/5	UTHER PROBLEMS	-	. 0
00	IUIAL BUILDING DEFICIENCY	44,825	12.8
BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED BUILDING CORRECTION COSTS

	Number Buildings	Square Feet	Replacement Cost	Correction Cost
Resident Instruction	237	6,981,861	960,193,525	211,292,520
Agricultural Experiment Stations	559	1,791,084	123,214,167	43,462,242
Cooperative Extension Service	216	539,305	54,424,012	14,968,173
Marine Institute	48	105,204	9,263,487	2,538,431
Marine Extension Service	7	65,950	8,873,243	2,054,336
Veterinary Medicine Experiment Stations	84	161,149	7,927,172	2,216,396
Auxiliary, Athletic, Other	92	3,404,637	289,212,827	72,909,582
TOTAL	1,243	13,049,190	1,453,108,433	349,441,680

Ē																			
The University of Georgia	т	е	с	h	n	i	с	а	I	М	е	m	0	r	а	n	d	u	m

Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

MRR (Major Repair and Renovation) Needs Information

 $F:\2\Appendix\MRR.doc$

MAJOR REPAIR AND RENOVATION NEEDS

Our major repair and rehabilitation needs continue to grow each year as our vast physical facilities become older and deferred maintenance takes its toll. The price tag for neglecting the renewal of campus infrastructure increases every year. The University completed a comprehensive evaluation of the condition of its buildings in 1996. This study included all of the buildings throughout the state and included a detailed analysis of deficiencies needing correction such as foundations, superstructure, exterior skin, plumbing, HVAC, electrical, fire alarms, lighting, and other general conditions. The total cost of corrections for all building deficiencies is estimated at \$276 million not including auxiliary and athletic facilities. Our MRR request will pinpoint specific projects totaling around \$60 million. Of these requests at least \$13 million are <u>urgent</u>. While the University's replacement value of buildings is about 26% of the System total, UGA maintains 64% of the buildings which are over 50 years or older in the system. With age factored into the formula, UGA's needs represent 33% of the system total as calculated by the Regents' Formula.

Enclosed are the following reports:

Preliminary Allocation for FY 1999 History of MRR Allocations Building Condition Evaluation Summary Building Condition Report

Received from Bill Chatham - 1/14/98

New MRR Target Allocation Method for FY 1999

Including a \$100,000 Base and an Index Factor Renewal Allowance without 50 Year Age Cap

Allocation of FY '98 Target Allocation plus 3% Inflation to Universities

	Last Year's		
	Target		
	Allocation	1999 Target	FY '98 to FY '99
	(FY '98)	Allocation	Change
Abraham Baldwin Apricultural College	910 099	1 010 010	
Albany State University	010,088	1,016,816	206,728
Armstrong Atlantic State University	500,110	730,221	142,105
Atlanta Metropolitan College	606,900	754,474	147,574
Augusta State University	353,850	427,754	73,904
Bainbridge College	1,110,064	1,404,124	294,060
Clayton College & State University	204,610	235,065	30,455
Coastal Georgia Community College	417,579	510,036	92,457
Columbus State University	366,489	444,073	77,583
Dalton Collogo	721,540	902,489	180,949
Darton College	398,791	485,778	86,987
Dalton College	350,214	423,058	72,845
Decald College	779,757	977,655	197,898
East Georgia College	176,104	198,261	22,156
Floyd College	264,109	311,887	47,777
Colorestille C. II	949,158	1,196,373	247,216
Gainesville College	350,352	423,238	72,885
Georgia College & State University	1,401,032	1,779,802	378,770
Georgia Institute of Technology	2,878,922	2,965,290	86,368
Georgia Southern University	1,815,077	2,314,389	499,311
Georgia Southwestern State University	802,610	1,007,161	204.551
Georgia State University	1,523,898	1,569,615	45.717
Gordon College	356,974	431,786	74.813
Kennesaw State University	490,481	604,162	113.681
Macon College	388,601	472,622	84.021
Medical College of Georgia	1,337,816	1,377,951	40 134
Middle Georgia College	664,920	829.385	164 465
North Georgia College & State University	806,231	1.011.836	205 605
Savannah State College	1,064,177	1.344.878	280 701
Skidaway Institute	171,963	192,914	200,701
South Georgia College	441,964	541 520	20,551
Southern Polytechnic State University	527.048	651,375	124 227
State University of West Georgia	1.166.564	1 477 073	210 500
University of Georgia	7.029.757	7,240,650	210,209
Valdosta State University	1,134.430	1 435 584	201 154
Waycross College	174.258	195 976	301,154
-	,200	195,070	21,619

HISTORY OF MRR ALLOCATIONS

Fiscal Year	System Appropriation	Formula Based on Replacement Value and Age of Building	Formula Based on Replacement Value Alone	UGA Share at <u>26%</u>	UGA Allocation	UGA Percentage
1988	20,650,353	33%	26%	5,369,092	3,930,000	19.03%
1989	21,377,225	33%	26%	5,558,079	5,268,000	24.64%
1990	21,573,277	33%	26%	5,609,052	3,374,548	15.64%
1991	12,762,500	33%	26%	3,318,250	2,554,000	20.01%
1992	24,066,757	33%	26%	6,257,357	5,495,000	22.83%
1993	25,206,426	33%	26%	6,553,671	6,091,500	24.17%
1994	27,756,534	33%	26%	7,216,699	6,347,948	22.87%
1995	29,144,360	33%	26%	7,577,534	6,691,200	22.96%
1996	30,490,155	33%	26%	7,927,440	7,318,700	24.00%
1997	38,924,444	33%	26%	10,120,355	7,972,225	20.48%
1998	42,924,444	33%	26%	11,160,355	8,151,900	18.99%
1999	45,385,712	33%	26%	11,800,285	7,240,650 *	15.95%

* Proposed allocation for FY 1999 - We assume the FY 99 target amount does not include regulatory projects.

UGA share at 33% level	14,977,285
UGA share at 26% level	11,800,285

MRRHIS 01/23/98

INFORMATION REGARDING MRR FORMULAS

	Based on Square Feet	27.0	%	
	Based on Replacement Value	26.0	%	
	Based on Square Feet with Age Factored in (Rewerts Formula tailored after Louisiana System Formula)	33.0	%	*
	Based on Modified Formula Favoring Smaller Institutions (Jones Formula based on 20% utilization factor to adjust Rewerts' Formula)	26.0	%	
	Allocations in FY '98	19.0	%	
	Buildings Over 100 Years Old (37)	63.0	%	

Buildings Over 50 Years Old (229)

64.0 % (Of System)

(Of System)

MRRFOR





The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

College of Environmental Sciences (CAES) Facilities and Land Use Task Force (FLUTF) Report

 $F:\2\Appendix\FLUTF\ Report.doc$

REPORT #2 May 25, 1998 CAES FACILITIES AND LAND USE TASK FORCE (FLUTF)

Background

The College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES) Facilities and Land Use Task Force (FLUTF) was appointed by Dean Gale A. Buchanan in June 1995. The primary purpose of the FLUTF is to review and develop appropriate policies and guidelines to insure that the CAES makes wise and efficient choices in the selection of sites for buildings and the use of land resources.

In response to Dean Buchanan's initial charge in 1995, the FLUTF developed the following items which were presented in Report #1 on August 24, 1995:

1. CAES Facilities and Land Use Policy

2. Recommendations: Main Campus Animal-Related Programs

At the request of Dean Buchanan, the FLUTF reconvened on November 19, 1997 at which time Dean Buchanan reviewed the progress and implementation of the seven recommendations for main campus animal-related programs presented in FLUTP Report #1. He indicated that Recommendations #1 (multipurpose arena), #S (poultry research center), #6 (red barn), and #7 (bioconversion facility) are being or have been implemented. Dean Buchanan indicated that he was now implementing Recommendation #2: "Move the CAES commercial size swine, beef, and sheep research operations from South Milledge Avenue to appropriate lands in an adjacent county." To assist him in implementation of Recommendation #2, Dean Buchanan presented the FLUTF with the following charge and considerations:

- 1. Examine the issue about how much land resources are needed to support a contemporary research-extension experimental unit at the College Station.
- 2. Maintain on main campus animals needed for teaching programs.
- Move swine operations from main campus.
- 4. Move equine operations to South Milledge area.
- 5. Need to develop a new farm in an adjacent county.
- 6. Need to build a new dairy.
- Consider selling the current Athens area units Wilkes Farm, Sams Farm, Horticultural Science Farm, Plant Science Farm and combining these operations on the new farm.
- 8. A potential site for new farm is being explored by others.

Approach to Fulfill the Charge

At its November 19, 1997 meeting, the FLUTF decided that a review of the current status and process used by several other state agricultural experiment stations in their development of "new" agricultural/environmental research and education centers adjacent to their main campuses would provide valuable information in fulfilling the new charge. Several universities were identified as being good candidates for the survey. A list of desired information to be obtained from this survey was developed (see copy attached to this report). A subcommittee of Hook, Jones, Shulstad, and Threadgill was appointed to conduct the survey via telephone inquiries and follow-up site visits if warranted.

A telephone survey was conducted of the following agricultural experiment stations: Colorado State University, Auburn University, Iowa State University, Texas A & M University, University of Illinois, University of Wisconsin, Louisiana State University, and University of Kentucky. Based upon the information obtained through the telephone survey, follow-up site visits were conducted at the University of Kentucky and Louisiana State University by Hook, Jones, and Threadgill. Dr. Ivery Clifton accompanied the subcommittee for these site visits.

The FLUTF met on May 5, 1998 to review the information obtained from the surveys and site visits. The FLUTF then developed the following recommendations.

Recommendations:

Recommendation #1: The CAES purchase a single large farm in a county adjacent to Clarke County and integrate the current dairy, swine, beef, sheep, plant sciences, and horticulture research farms into this new farm over a period of several years.

The colocation of our current dispersed farm units in a single new farm offers several potential advantages as follows:

- A. Increased efficiency in use of resources.
 - 1. Sharing of equipment, supplies, labor and facilities.
 - Transfers of feeds between crop production units and feed consumption units.
 - 3. Utilization of animal byproducts by production units.
- B. New opportunities for cooperative and innovative research.
 - Multidisciplinary approaches to problems will be facilitated and encouraged.
 - Can explore requirements for on-site handling of all wastes and byproduct materials.

- 3. Sustainable farming practices that include nearly complete production/recycling of feed stuffs and outrients.
- Balancing farm output of plant and animal nutrients with input of nutrients purchased.
- 5. Timber production managed as another sustainable farm unit.
- 6. Model for safe and legal handling of pesticides.
- Incorporate the ecological principle of biodiversity, particularly in microbial, arthropod, and soil macroorganism through management of plants and animals.
- C. Opportunity to develop a "Eco-Farm" which will demonstrate that agricultural production can be an environmentally and socially acceptable neighbor to adjacent areas.
- D. Demonstrate integrated systems to students, decision makers, producers, and other CAES clientele.

A suggested name for the new farm is Agricultural/Environmental Research and Education Center. The estimated land required is in the 2,500 - 3,000 acre range and depends on the topography and the information developed in Recommendation #4 herein.

Recommendation #2: Centralize the management of the Agricultural/Environmental Research and Education Center.

A suggested organizational chart is presented on the next page. The proposed central management would be comprised of the following key elements:

- A. A Center Manager
 - 1. Responsible for day-to-day Center operations, maintenance, and plant and animal production.
 - 2. Dedicated to and rewarded for success of research and education activities of Center.
 - 3. Report to the CAES Associate Dean for Research.
- B. A maintenance and general operations (M & O) component.
 - 1. Responsible for maintenance and repair of facilities, general field operations (e.g. land preparation; mowing of boundaries; harvesting and cleanup of plots; and revenue generation operations, if required; etc.) and research operation support to research units per special request.
 - 2. Headed by a General Farm Manager.
 - 3. Have appropriate staff for M & O requirements.

CAES Agricultural/Environmental Research & Education Center Organization and Structure



- 4. If there is a demonstrated need for operations solely for the purpose of generating revenue, then place responsibility for these operations under this M & O unit.
- C. A research operations component.
 - 1. Comprised of a "research unit" for each of the primary research functions (swine, sheep, dairy, beef, horticultural crops, agronomic crops, etc.).
 - a. Responsible for day-to-day Unit operations and research activities.
 - b. Dedicated to and rewarded for success of research and education activities of Unit.
 - 2. Each unit will have the following components:
 - a. Unit Advisory Group comprised of faculty.
 - b. Unit Coordinator a faculty member.
 - c. Unit Manager a staff member.
 - d. Unit Research Staff comprised of staff from the departments using that particular research unit.
- D. Center Advisory/Steering Committee comprised of a representative from each research Unit Advisory Group.
 - 1. Set policy and guiding principles for facility and land use.
 - 2. Handle unusual research/education requests.
 - Plan for orderly and environmentally sound development of facilities, fields and forest.
 - 4. Plan for environmentally sound and community friendly handling of animal and crop production and waste management.
 - Plan for interdisciplinary and innovative approaches to Center management.
 - 6. Review capital and operating budgets of Center.
 - 7. Resolve conflicts between researchers and Center management.

Recommendation #3: Develop a cost accounting system for the Agricultural/Environmental Research and Education Center.

A realistic and accurate cost accounting system will improve the efficiency of space and resource use, introduce accountability for expenditures at the scientist, M & O and research unit levels. and provide a rational basis for requesting additional resources. It will enable determination of whether we actually need to generate some internal income from sales to enable program growth and whether we are actually generating net revenues from any income generation based activities. A proper cost accounting system will enable delineation of the critical mass (e.g., number of animals or plots) needed for each research unit to accommodate it's research goals. A special committee should be appointed to develop a cost accounting system plan. It is recommended that the committee review some existing accounting systems (e.g. Auburn University, Colorado State University) currently being used for similar purposes.

Some recommended characteristics of the cost accounting system are:

- A. Define "research cost centers" for appropriate field "blocks" (e.g., groups of plots, orchards, pastures, and production fields) and appropriate animal "units" (e.g., single animal or groups of animals managed together throughout their life) that are each assigned to one (or more for multiscientist) research projects.
- B. Charge equipment use hours and labor hours as well as supplies, repairs, and utilities against the appropriate research cost center budgets as they are used. Credit to the research cost center those research grants, in-kind donations, and other revenues brought by the researcher(s).
- C. Define "operations cost centers" for individual equipment, structures, and common use areas (e.g., roads, conservation areas, fences, shops, ponds, wells, etc.) as well as production blocks/animal units that generate sales or feed.
- D. Charge capital repair, rental, and upkeep of the equipment, facilities and general areas against the operations cost centers. Credit sales to the operations cost centers.
- E. Prorate M & O operations expenses and revenues back to research operations units according to the equipment used, labor, land area, etc.
- F. Consider renting all major field equipment items.

Recommendation #4: Refine or develop Departmental needs, plans, and rationale for "field" laboratory space and facilities on the main campus and at the proposed new Center to meet their research and education needs into the 21st century.

The Animal and Dairy Science Department has prepared an excellent plan and they have engaged the services of an consultant to further develop the farm layout for meeting their needs and plans. The Horticulture Department and the Crop and Soil Sciences Department, with input from their collaborating colleagues in Plant Pathology and Entomology, need to move rapidly to develop similar plans. The plans from each of these three endeavors need to be integrated into a comprehensive plan for the Center. The Horticulture Department and the Crop and Soil Sciences Department should consider the potential for using some space on South Milledge Avenue to accommodate limited field laboratory needs for instruction as an alternative to frequent transporting of students to the proposed Center. The Animal and Dairy Science Department needs to re-evaluate it's proposed land area requirements for each animal unit with regard to revenue generation optimization for research needs only.

Recommendation #5: Engage stakeholders in discussion of relocation of current research units to the proposed new Center.

The Animal and Dairy Science Department has already engaged stakeholders in it's plans for relocating animal research units. The Horticulture Department and the Crop and Soil Sciences Department need to immediately engage stakeholders in similar discussions.

DESIRED INFORMATION TO BE OBTAINED FROM SURVEY OF AGRICULTURAL/ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION CENTERS

- 1. Office of the College or University which has administrative responsibility for the Center?
- 2. Reason a new or renovated Center was developed. What problems were solved? What problems were created?
- 3. Base of support for initially developing or renovating the Center. Base of support for maintaining facilities and equipment to enable remaining current.
- 4. Sources of funding for the Centers' programs in terms of equipment, facilities maintenance and operations (e.g. personnel, supplies). Is a certain scale of operations required to generate a required sales income budget?
- 5. Organizational/management structure within the Center.
- 6. Proximity of the Center to the main campus in terms of distance and travel time.
- 7. General description of physical facilities at the Center (e.g. dormitories, laboratories, shop, dairy, etc.).
- 8. List of major programs (e.g. dairy production, dairy replacement herd, beef cattle, horticulture-ornamentals, horticulture-fruit, agronomic crops, etc.) conducted at the Center. Indicate acreage, herd size, etc. allocated to each program.
- 9. Management of machinery and equipment. For example, is equipment maintained in a Center pool or "permanently" allocated to specific programs.
- 10. Management of support staff allocated to the Center. For example, do personnel function on a Center-wide basis or are they assigned to specific programs.
- 11. Process by which program priorities are determined and resource allocation decisions are made on both an annual and long-term basis.
- 12. Degree of emphasis upon environmentally responsible and sustainable systems in the Center's research and education programs and across the entire Center. Was an "environmental impact statement" required when you developed your current Center? Do you require that an environmental impact statement be developed for each new plan for the Center?

- 13. Use of Center by students, both those engaged in formal classes and those in serviceoutreach activities. How do they access and utilize the resources and programs at the Center?
- 14. Plan for "recovering" a site (c.g., plot) after a program is completed. For example, a plant nutrient study for which excessively high rates of phosphorous were applied.
- 15. Use of private farmer/cooperators for economic reasons in order to have sufficient acreage or specific equipment for meeting program needs.
- 16. Integration of private sector (i.e., industries) into Center programs through collaborative activities, funding, etc.
- 17. System for managing/utilizing wastes.

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES RESEARCH AND EDUCATION LEARNING CENTER

I. Introduction

- Importance of Agriculture and the Environment to Georgia
- Role of programs in CAES in support of Georgia agriculture and related interests
- Cite comments heard at recent Green Industry and peanut conferences about importance of our programs

II Vision

- Create a modern agricultural and environmental sciences Research and Education Learning Center at the University of Georgia. Such a facility will be designed, constructed and centrally located so as to facilitate integration of all functions in agricultural and environmental sciences. We seek to be nationally recognized for excellence in agricultural and environmental sciences. More importantly, we seek to be ranked among the top two land grant colleges in the South.
- III. Context Why make such an effort? or, What is wrong with our current situation?
 - Importance of agriculture and the environment demands that we provide the human resource base through our student programs; research developed thru new technology and means of dissemination of information thru extension to support Georgia's expanding agriculture industry
 - Current facilities were designed for an earlier era and are unsuitable in supporting modern, high tech research, extension and instruction programs.
 - Current facilities are obsolete and in many cases beyond economical repair.
 - Facilities currently used are widely scattered geographically, thereby decreasing efficiency and economy of scale.
 - Current facilities lie in the path of urbanization leading to increasing limitations from an environmental prospective.
 - Locations of some facilities already makes their use incompatible with the University's and community's needs, growth and development such as handling animal waste from lagoons.

- Current facilities are inadequate to meet acceptable standards of animal care.
- IV. Comparison with comparable land-grant universities
 - We are in the top tier of Colleges of Agriculture in the nation's Land Grant institutions but lag many of our neighbors in terms of quality of education and research facilities.
 - To improve we must compete nationally for the most outstanding faculty available and that requires modern and efficient facilities to teach and conduct research
 - Visited University of Kentucky and LSU. Aware of developments at University of Illinois, Texas A&M, Colorado and Auburn.
 - Mention the history of Auburn development of such a facility. Current agricultural initiative in Alabama - \$52,000,000, Auburn University College of Agriculture - \$15,500,000, and Ft. Valley State University - \$8,000,000.
 - <u>Bottom line</u> we must modernize our teaching, research, and extension facilities if we are to be competitive and meet the expectations of our clientele.
- V. Goal
 - Purchase sufficient land and design, develop, and build centralized facilities that provide for the integration of agricultural and environmental sciences teaching, research, and extension programs in support of learning experiences of both undergraduate and graduate students and to serve the many clientele of the College.

VL Rationale for effort

- Competitiveness in Agriculture requires strong teaching, research, and education program. Industry requires that our students are trained and knowledgeable of the latest in technology, systems, and management.
- Environmental concerns will undoubtably become more important in the future
- Available land resource base is constant and there will undoubtably be greater demands on land in the future
- Research and Education Learning Center concept is supported by college planning that has been underway for the past three years.
- A Research and Education Learning Center as proposed is consistent

with and complements the University's master planning effort

- Urbanization patterns near the University campus continue to raise land use compatibility issues
- Environmental issues and concerns are growing in agriculture, particularly in animal industries.
- Georgia agriculture is demanding greater emphasis on student friendly learning and support systems that delivers society and job ready graduates who support agriculture and agribusiness industries
- A comprehensive learning center has potential to enhance cross college and unit cooperation

VII. Benefits

- A comprehensive research, education and learning center will anchor work in Athens, Griffin and Tifton as well as field research and demonstration conducted at branch stations across Georgia
- Research education learning center will take college teaching research and extension agendas consistently toward the University's master plan and out of the path of urbanization
- Through a comprehensive approach our college can gain efficiencies by operating a single facility instead of scattered small farm demonstration units
- VIII. How do we address this situation?
 - Realize this is a major undertaking that has implications for agriculture programs in the University of Georgia for the next 50-100 years.
 - Careful planning must be done that recognizes the needs of students, faculty and staff as well as the requirements of Georgia's agriculture industry
 - Identify a suitable tract that would facilitate animal programs involving beef, swine, dairy, horses, as well as land for horticultural, agronomic, entomological, and plant pathology research and extension programs
 - Sell scattered parcels as necessary and purchase land whose function would be provided by the new Research and Education Learning Center
 - We envision that the development of such a center could be accomplished by phasing various activities

with and complements the University's master planning effort

- Urbanization patterns near the University campus continue to raise land use compatibility issues
- Environmental issues and concerns are growing in agriculture, particularly in animal industries.
- Georgia agriculture is demanding greater emphasis on student friendly learning and support systems that delivers society and job ready graduates who support agriculture and agribusiness industries
- A comprehensive learning center has potential to enhance cross college and unit cooperation

VII. Benefits

- A comprehensive research, education and learning center will anchor work in Athens, Griffin and Tifton as well as field research and demonstration conducted at branch stations across Georgia
- Research education learning center will take college teaching research and extension agendas consistently toward the University's master plan and out of the path of urbanization
- Through a comprehensive approach our college can gain efficiencies by operating a single facility instead of scattered small farm demonstration units
- VIII. How do we address this situation?
 - Realize this is a major undertaking that has implications for agriculture programs in the University of Georgia for the next 50-100 years.
 - Careful planning must be done that recognizes the needs of students, faculty and staff as well as the requirements of Georgia's agriculture industry
 - Identify a suitable tract that would facilitate animal programs involving beef, swine, dairy, horses, as well as land for horticultural, agronomic, entomological, and plant pathology research and extension programs
 - Sell scattered parcels as necessary and purchase land whose function would be provided by the new Research and Education Learning Center
 - We envision that the development of such a center could be accomplished by phasing various activities

Phase 1

Sell Purchase Wilkes Farm Sufficient Land to combine all Land in Calhoun (sold) functions Attapulgus Farm (part) Multi-purpose Arena (In design stage)

Phase 2

<u>Sell</u>

Purchase Agronomy Farm Facility infrastructure Horticulture Farm **Beef Facility** Swine Facility

Scli Sam's Farm Purchase or Build Dairy Facility Horse Facilities Agronomy, Entomology, & Pathology Facilities

Horticulture Farm

Ē																			
The University of Georgia	т	е	с	h	n	i	с	а	I	М	е	m	0	r	а	n	d	u	m

Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272

Fax 303/832-3380

Historic Resources Documentation

F:\2\Appendix\Historic Resources.doc

 ¹ instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(5) of resource ² Location map with North at top ² Location map with North at top ³ Address/location ³ Address/location ³ Address/location ³ Overner's name and mailing address ⁴ Date of construction (or estimate) ⁴ Addition O Destroyed ⁴ Addition O Destroyed ⁴ Resonance ⁴ Chimey placement & material hip - composition singletaphilat shingle ⁴ Style ⁴ Overname Ame. high syle ⁴ Diriginal Floor Plan over Ame. high syle ⁴ Diriginal Floor Plan over Ame. high syle ⁴ Plan shape over Ame. high agree over Amer. high agre	GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 20 Georgia Department of Natural Resources A	2 RESOURCES 25 Butler Street, Suite 1462 tlanta, Georgia 30334 24/656-2840 Resource No. CA-AH-76 County Clarke
5 @ Building O Structure O Site O Object O Landscape feature 6 6 O Representative example of building type Number represented 7 Use, current Vacani/Not in Use original school; churchreligious structure 8 Date of construction (or estimate) 16 Number of stories CA. 1882 - 1883 9 Major changes & date (explain in No.25) 9 Altered 0 Addition 10 Architect/engineer/designer WW. Thomas 110 Architect/engineer/designer WW. Thomas 12 Style Queen Anne - high style Queen Anne - high style 13 Building type 14 Original Floor Plan origenal 15 Plan shape octagenal 25 Additional physical description The building consists of a large octogen, with a smaller intersecting mean stabled basement. The foru porch is set on a gabled profer tript hung stash (flar-headed, 4/4, rectangular); tripte-hung stash (flar-headed, Cal-4/4, 4/4, rectangular)	 or instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Seney Stovall Chapel/Lucy Cobb Chapel (2617) 3 Address/location NW corner of N. Milledge and Reese Sts. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA 	2 Location map with North at top
8 Date of construction (or estimate) 16 Number of stories 0.4.1882-1885 Ome 9 Major changes & date (explain in No.25) 17 Facade summetry & front door(s) • Altered O Moved • O Addition O Destroyed 10 Architect/engineer/designer 18 Roof type & material <i>WW. Thomas</i> 19 Chimney placement & material Contractor/builder/craftsman 10 Chimney placement & material Unknown 20 Type of construction 12 Style 20 Type of construction Queen Anne - high style 21 Exterior material(s) 13 Building type 22 Foundation material(s) brick commonitous 23 Porch(es) ore room - two rooms deep 23 Porch(es) 15 Plan shape 24 Windows occagonal 24 Windows cocagonal 26 Negatives: roll # frames # 25 Additional physical description 26 Negatives: roll # frames # 76 Negatives: roll # frames # frames #	 5 Ø Building O Structure O Site O Object O Landscape feature 6 O Representative example of building type Number represented 7 Use, current Vacant/Not in Use original school; church/religious structure 	
25 Additional physical description 26 Negatives: roll # frames # The building consists of a large octogon, with a smaller intersecting rear octagon. Raised basement. The front porch is set on a gabled pavilion with a quartefoil vent. Cutwork and brackets on front porch. Corbels. Brackets in cornice. Steeply pitched roof. Triple hung sash are 4/4/4. Larger octogon contains a single large room. Altered - Ca. 1961 - Bell tower removed.	 8 Date of construction (or estimate) CA. 1882 - 1885 9 Major changes & date (explain in No.25) © Altered O Moved O Addition O Destroyed 10 Architect/engineer/designer W.W. Thomas Contractor/builder/craftsman Unknown 12 Style Queen Anne - high style 13 Building type 14 Original Floor Plan one room - two rooms deep 15 Plan shape octagonal 	 16 Number of stories One 17 Facade summetry & front door(s) symmetrical, one door 18 Roof type & material hip - composition shingle/asphalt shingle 19 Chimney placement & material no chimney observed - unknown material 20 Type of construction brick bearing 21 Exterior material(s) brick: common/American, machine-made 22 Foundation material(s) brick continuous 23 Porch(es) stoop (front, 1 story, partial, wood, shed/pent); stoop (rear, 1 story, partial, brick, gable) 24 Windows double-hung sash (flat-headed, 4/4, rectangular); triple-hung sash (flat-headed, unknown, rectangular)
Altered - Ca 1982 Exterior removation	25 Additional physical description The building consists of a large octogon, with a smaller intersecting rear octagon. Raised basement. The front porch is set on a gabled pavilion with a quatrefoil vent. Cutwork and brackets on front porch. Corbels. Brackets in cornice. Steeply pitched roof. Triple hung sash are 4/4/4. Larger octogon contains a single large room. Altered - Ca. 1961 - Bell tower removed. Altered - Ca. 1982. Exterior removed.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

Attach contact prints

	Resource No. CA-AH-76
27 Description of outbuildings (if any)	28 Site plan with North at top
9 Description of landscape features	
yara setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks; terracing/contouring/retaining walls Connected to the main building and Margaret Hall by colormoded walls	
connected to the main building and margaret that by colonnaded walk.	
0 Number of buildings 1 structures 0 outbuildings 0 sites 0	
31 Description of the environment urban - residential (mixed old and new)	
Residential area with significant commercial intrusions.	32 Archaeological potential
History	34 Historical theme(s)
The architect was significant locally. The building was last used c1946.	architecture; religion; education 35 Significance common architectural style (unusual example/illustration) architectural design (outstanding qualities) history - activity (outstanding qualities) history - person (outstanding qualities)
	36 Sources of information PrLArch.Analysis of LCI secondary written 1, 9, 33 Athens, a Pictorial Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33
7 Promoted has former in the test	38 Date of survey 1000
David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail	50 Date of survey 1990 Tesurvey 1992
 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 9 Government preservation activity 	43 Recognition and date
 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decaur, GA 30034 9 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review & Grant O Tax certification O Other 0 SHPO evaluation 	 43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1978 Ø National Register - district
 37 Frepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 39 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review & Grant O Tax certification O Other 30 SHPO evaluation appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria 41 USGS quadrangle name Athens West UTM reference 17 279200 3759700 zone easting northing 	 43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1978 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register O Local designation 1980 Ø HABS/HAER - district O Determination of eligibility O Other

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 205 Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atla 404/	RESOURCESResource No.CA-AH-75Butler Street, Suite 1462CountyClarkeanta, Georgia 303347656-2840Clarke
 or instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Margaret Hall (2001) 3 Address/location W side of N. Milledge Av, between Reese and Hancock Sts. Between the Chapel and the main building. Athens 	2 Location map with North at top
4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
 5 Ø Building O Structure O Site O Object O Landscape feature 6 O Representative example of building type Number represented 7 Use, current collegehaniversity; research facility original school 	
 8 Date of construction (or estimate) <u>CA. 1900</u> 9 Major changes & date (explain in No.25) [®] Altered O Moved O Addition O Destroyed 10 Architect/engineer/designer <u>Unknown</u> 1 Contractor/builder/craftsman <u>Unknown</u> 12 Style No Academic Style 13 Building type 	 16 Number of stories <i>Two</i> 17 Facade summetry & front door(s) <i>symmetrical, one door</i> 18 Roof type & material <i>pyramidal - composition shingle/asphalt shingle</i> 19 Chimney placement & material <i>no chimney observed - unknown material</i> 20 Type of construction <i>mortise-and-tenon/brace frame</i> 21 Exterior material(s) <i>weatherboard/clapboard/beveled siding</i> 22 Foundation material(s)
Georgian house 14 Original Floor Plan central hallway (passage) - two rooms deep 15 Plan shape square	brick continuous 23 Porch(es) 24 Windows double-hung sash (flat-headed, 2/2, rectangular)
25 Additional physical description	26 Negatives: roll # frames #
Altered - Ca. 1989 - Renovated.	Attach contact prints
- 	

	Resource No. CAMPTS
27 Description of outbuildings (if any)	28 Site plan with North at top
29 Description of landscape features	
yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks	
Connected to Chapel and main building by colonnaded walkway.	
30 Number of buildings 1 structures 0 outbuildings 0 sites 0	
landscape features 3	
31 Description of the environment urban - residential (mixed old and new)	
Residential area with significant commercial intrusions.	32 Archaeological potential
33 History	 34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education 35 Significance history - activity (good example/illustration)
33 History	 34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education 35 Significance history - activity (good example/illustration) 36 Sources of information PrLArch_Analysis of LCI secondary written 1, 8 Regents Report secondary written 1
 33 History 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) 	 34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education 35 Significance history - activity (good example/illustration) 36 Sources of information PrLArch-Analysis of LCI secondary written 1, 8 Regents Report secondary written 1 38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey
 33 History 33 History 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 	 34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education 35 Significance history - activity (good example/illustration) 36 Sources of information PrLArch.Analysis of LCI secondary written 1, 8 Regents Report secondary written 1 38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey
 33 History 33 History 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 39 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review 	 34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education 35 Significance history - activity (good example/illustration) 36 Sources of information PrLArch.Analysis of LCI secondary written 1, 8 Regents Report secondary written 1 38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey 43 Recognition and date O National Les double
 33 History 33 History 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 39 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review & Grant O Tax certification O Other 40 SHPO evaluation 	 34 Historical theme(s) architecture: education 35 Significance history - activity (good example/illustration) 36 Sources of information PrLArch.Analysis of LCI secondary written 1, 8 Regents Report secondary written 1 38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey 43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1978 Ø National Register - district O Georria Berjister
 33 History 33 History 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 39 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review S Grant O Tax certification O Other 40 SHPO evaluation appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria 	 34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education 35 Significance history - activity (good example/illustration) 36 Sources of information PrLArch.Analysis of LCI secondary written 1, 8 Regents Report secondary written 1 38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey 43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1978 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register O Local designation
 33 History 33 History 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decaur, GA 30034 39 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review S Grant O Tax certification O Other 40 SHPO evaluation appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria 41 USGS quadrangle name Athens West UTM reference 	 34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education 35 Significance history - activity (good example/illustration) 36 Sources of information PrLArch_Analysis of LCI secondary written 1, 8 Regents Report secondary written 1 38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey 43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1978 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register O Local designation O HABS/HAER O Date of the content of the tribute
 33 History 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 39 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review & Grant O Tax certification O Other 40 SHPO evaluation appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria 41 USGS quadrangle name Athens West UTM reference 17 279200 3759700 zone easting northing	 34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education 35 Significance history - activity (good example/illustration) 36 Sources of information PrLArch_Analysis of LCI secondary written 1, 8 Regents Report secondary written 1 38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey 43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1978 & National Register - district O Georgia Register O Local designation O HABS/HAER O Determination of eligibility O Other

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 205 H Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atlan 404/6	RESOURCES Butler Street, Suite 1462 Nta, Georgia 30334 556-2840
 instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Lucy Cobb Institute/see section 33 (2000, 2003, 2004) 3 Address/location 220 N. Milledge Av. W side of N. Milledge Av, between Reese and Hancock Sts. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA 5 & Building O Structure O Site O Object O Landscape feature 	2 Location map with North at top
 6 O Representative example of building type Number represented 7 Use, current college/university; research facility original school; multiple dwelling; dormitory 	
 8 Date of construction (or estimate) 1858 9 Major changes & date (explain in No.25) Altered O Moved Addition O Destroyed 10 Architect/engineer/designer Unknown Contractor/builder/craftsman Unknown 12 Style Greek Revival - elements 13 Building type 14 Original Floor Plan central hallway (passage) - two rooms deep 15 Plan shape rectangular 	 16 Number of stories <i>Two</i> 17 Facade summetry & front door(s) <i>symmetrical, one door</i> 18 Roof type & material <i>hip - metal - standing seam</i> 19 Chimney placement & material <i>both gable-ends (interior) - stuccoed masonry; three or more chimneys - stuccoed masonry</i> 20 Type of construction <i>brick bearing</i> 21 Exterior material(s) <i>stucco</i> 22 Foundation material(s) <i>brick continuous</i> 23 Porch(es) <i>verandah (front, 1 story, full, metal, hip); verandah (rear, 1 story, partial, metal, shed/pent)</i> 24 Windows <i>double-hung sash (flat-headed, 12/12, rectangular); double-hung sash (flat-headed, 6/6, rectangular); double-hung sash (flat-headed, 9/9, rectangular)</i>
25 Additional physical description Raised basement. Scored stucco. Iron posts and balustrade on porch. Full-height windows open onto the front verandah. Rear verandah is new. Transom and sidelights. Flat entablature over the door. Eleven bay facade with center door. Hoods over windows. Shaped parapet. Brick dentils. "L.C.I. 1858" in center of parapet. Original partial story centered on top was removed.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #
Addition - Ca. 1990 - Addition to center of rear.	
Altered - Ca. 1965 - Top partial floor removed.	Attach contact prints
Altered - Ca. 1990 - Rehabilitated.	

27	Description of outbuildings (if any) kitchen - 2004 On data base as washhouse. Common bond, two interiorchimneys, metal roof, gabled, casements. Now used as boardroom. A later kitchen has been demolished. slave/servant house - 2003 On data base as carriage house, which it may have been atone time. Also called Jennie Smith House or Miss Jennie'sCottage for a teacher who later lived there. Apparently builtas servant's house. Second story is later addition. Brickground floor, weatherboard above. Overhanging second floor.Knee braces and 6/6 sash.	28	Site plan with North at top
29	Description of landscape features		
	yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks; terracing/contouring/retaining walls; streetscape - street trees/landscaping; street furniture (benches,lighting.etc.)		
	Historic lamps, brick walk, stone steps, reaining wall. Colonnaded walk connects this building to Margaret Hall and the Chapel.		
30	Number of buildings 1 structures 0 outbuildings 2 sites 0 landscape features 6		
31	Uescription of the environment urban - residential (mixed old and new)		
	Primarily residential, with significant commercial intrusions.	32	Archaeological potential
	History Originally to be called Athens Female High School. Name changed to Lucy Cobb before it opened. Construction funded by subscription. Became "one of the finest girls' school in the South." Closed in 1931. Property managed by and later acquired by UGA. Served various purposes. Now houses Carl Vinson Institute of Government.	34	Historical theme(s) architecture; education Significance common architectural style (unusual example/illustration) history - development (outstanding qualities) history - activity (outstanding qualities)
		3 6	Sources of information Athens, a Pictorial Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33 PrLArch_Analysis of LCI secondary written 1, 8, 27, 33 Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33
37	Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034	38	Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992
39	Government preservation activity O Section 106 review & Grant	43	Recognition and date O National Landmark
40	SHPO evaluation O Other		1970 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register
41	appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria USGS quadrangle name Athens West UTM reference 17 279200 3759700 zone easting northing		O Local designation 1936 & HABS/HAER - individual O Determination of eligibility O Other
42	Tax map number		

GEOKGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 205 Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atl 404	RESOURCESResource No.CA-AH-70Butler Street, Suite 1462CountyClarkeanta, Georgia 30334656-2840Clarke
 r instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Business Services Building (0110) 3 Address/location 424 E. Broad St. SE corner of Broad and Spring Sts. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA 	2 Location map with North at top
 5 & Building O Structure O Site O Object O Landscape feature 6 O Representative example of building type Number represented 7 Use, current college/university original retail store/shop; business/office 	
 8 Date of construction (or estimate) CA. 1910 9 Major changes & date (explain in No.25) Altered O Moved O Addition O Destroyed 10 Architect/engineer/designer Unknown Contractor/builder/craftsman Unknown 12 Style Neoclassical Revival - elements 13 Building type 	 16 Number of stories Three 17 Facade summetry & front door(s) symmetrical, one door 18 Roof type & material flat - composition shingle/asphalt shingle; built-up/tar & gravel 19 Chimney placement & material lateral interior - brick; three or more chimneys - brick 20 Type of construction brick bearing 21 Exterior material(s) brick: running bond, machine-made 22 Foundation material(s)
 14 Original Floor Plan one room - rectangular - one room deep 15 Plan shape rectangular 	 brick continuous 23 Porch(es) recessed (front, 1 story, partial, brick, gable) 24 Windows double-hung sash (flat-headed, 1/1, rectangular); double-hung sash (round-headed, 1/1, rectangular); double-hung sash (segmental-headed, 1/1, rectangular)
25 Additional physical description Three bay facade. Ground floor front has been stuccoed, leaving blank arches in place of the windows. Metal awning above the first floor. Round arch over top floor center window. Pilasters at corners. Balustrade atop parapet. Corbel work below cornice. Cornice with dentils. Segmental headed windows on the side. Five chimneys interior along the side. Facade and interior have been partially combined with adjacent building CA-AH-71. Altered - Ca. 1980 - Ground floor of front facade stuccoed.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #
-	Trituci Contact prints

	Resource No. CA-AH-70
7 Description of outbuildings (if any)	28 Site plan with North at top
Description of landscape features	
* *	
0 Number of buildings $\frac{1}{2}$ structures $\frac{0}{2}$	
landscape features 0	
1 Description of the environment <i>urban - commercial (mixed old and new)</i>	
``````````````````````````````````````	32 Archaeological potential
	0 1
3 History	34 Historical theme(s)
Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents	architecture; commerce
Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.	<i>architecture; commerce</i> 35 Significance
Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.	<i>architecture; commerce</i> 35 Significance
Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.	<i>architecture; commerce</i> 35 Significance
Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.	<i>architecture; commerce</i> 35 Significance
Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.	<ul> <li><i>architecture; commerce</i></li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information Regents Report secondary written 1</li> </ul>
Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.	<ul> <li>architecture; commerce</li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information Regents Report secondary written 1</li> </ul>
Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District. 7 Prepared by (person, organization and address)	<ul> <li><i>architecture; commerce</i></li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information <i>Regents Report secondary written 1</i></li> <li>38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.</li> <li>7 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Generation True (CHP)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>36 Sources of information Regents Report secondary written 1</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey</li> </ul>
Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District. 7 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decamar GA 30034	<ul> <li><i>architecture; commerce</i></li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information <i>Regents Report secondary written 1</i></li> <li>38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.</li> <li>7 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034</li> </ul>	<ul> <li><i>architecture; commerce</i></li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information <i>Regents Report secondary written 1</i></li> <li>38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.</li> <li>7 Prepared by (person, organization and address)</li> <li>David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034</li> <li>9 Government preservation activity</li> <li>O Section 106 review. O Creat</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>architecture; commerce</li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information Regents Report secondary written 1</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey</li> <li>43 Recognition and date</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.</li> <li>7 Prepared by (person, organization and address)</li> <li>David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 </li> <li>9 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review O Grant O Tax certification O Other</li></ul>	<ul> <li>architecture; commerce</li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information Regents Report secondary written 1</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey</li> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1978 Ø National Register - district</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.</li> <li>77 Prepared by (person, organization and address)</li> <li>David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034</li> <li>89 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review O Grant O Tax certification O Other</li> <li>10 SHPO evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>architecture; commerce</li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information Regents Report secondary written 1</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey</li> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Landmark</li> <li>1978 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.</li> <li>7 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034</li> <li>9 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review O Grant O Tax certification O Other</li> <li>10 SHPO evaluation appears not to meet Nat. Reg. criteria (integrity)</li> <li>11 USGS quadrangle name Athens East</li> </ul>	<ul> <li><i>architecture; commerce</i></li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information <i>Regents Report secondary written 1</i></li> <li>38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey</li> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Landmark</li> <li>1978 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register O Local designation O HABS/HAER</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services building-CA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.</li> <li>7 Prepared by (person, organization and address)</li> <li>David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034</li> <li>9 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review O Grant O Tax certification O Other</li> <li>10 SHPO evaluation appears not to meet Nat. Reg. criteria (integrity) </li> <li>11 USGS quadrangle name Athens East UTM reference</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>architecture; commerce</li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information Regents Report secondary written 1</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey</li> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Landmark</li> <li>1978 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register</li> <li>O Local designation O HABS/HAER O Determination of eligibility</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Three originally seperate buildings have been combined into the Business Services buildingCA-AH-70, 71 and 72. Date of construction on Regents Report (1939) appears to be incorrect. Located in Downtown Athens Historic District.</li> <li>Prepared by (person, organization and address)</li> <li>David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decaur, GA 30034</li> <li>Government preservation activity O Section 106 review O Grant O Tax certification O Other</li> <li>SHPO evaluation appears not to meet Nat. Reg. criteria (integrity) </li> <li>USGS quadrangle name Athens East UTM reference <ol> <li>28 0 7 2 0</li> <li>37 5 9 8 2 0</li> <li>zone easting northing</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li><i>architecture; commerce</i></li> <li>35 Significance</li> <li>36 Sources of information <i>Regents Report secondary written</i> 1</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey</li> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Landmark</li> <li>1978 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register</li> <li>O Local designation O HABS/HAER O Determination of eligibility O Other</li> </ul>

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 205 E Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atlar 404/6	RESOURCES Butler Street, Suite 1462 Nta, Georgia 30334 56-2840
instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Jame(s) of resource Business Services Building (0110) 3 Address/location	2 Location map with North at top
S side of Broad St, second building E of Spring St. AThens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university original retail store/shop; business/office</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) CA. 1910</li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) &amp; Altered O Moved O Addition O Destroyed</li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer Unknown Contractor/builder/craftsman Unknown</li> <li>12 Style Neoclassical Revival - elements</li> <li>13 Building type</li> <li>14 Original Floor Plan one room - rectangular - one room deep</li> <li>15 Plan shape rectangular</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories <i>Three</i></li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) <i>symmetrical</i>,</li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <i>flat - built-up/tar &amp; gravel</i></li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material <i>no chimney observed - unknown material</i></li> <li>20 Type of construction <i>brick bearing</i></li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) <i>brick: running bond, machine-made</i></li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) <i>unknown</i></li> <li>23 Porch(es)</li> <li>24 Windows <i>double-hung sash (flat-headed, 1/1, rectangular); double-hung sash (flat-headed, 2/2, rectangular)</i></li> </ul>
25 Additional physical description Three bay facade. All ground floor openings have been covered with stucco blank arches. Metal awning above the first floor. Heavy cornice with modillions, balustrade. Altered - Ca. 1980 - Ground floor stuccoed and some windows replaced.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

Attach contact prints

	Resource No. CA-AH-71
27 Description of outbuildings (if any)	28 Site plan with North at top
×	
29 Description of landscape features	
<ul> <li>30 Number of buildings 1 structures 0 outbuildings 0 sites 0</li> <li>landscape features 0</li> <li>31 Description of the environment <i>urban - commercial (mixed old and new)</i></li> </ul>	
	32 Archaeological potential
3 History The facade of this building has been combined with that of the building to the right. Appear to be interior connections to the buildings on both sides. All three buildings (CA-AH-70, 71 and 72) have been combined into the Business Services Building. Date of construction on Regents data base is 1939. This appears to be incorrect. In 1923 this building housed the Berenstein Furniture Co. Located in the Downtown Athens Historic District.	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) <i>architecture; commerce</i> </li> <li>35 Significance</li> </ul>
	36 Sources of information Regents Report secondary written 1 Athens Banner 6-24-23 primary written 33
37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034	38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey
<ul> <li>39 Government preservation activity</li> <li>O Section 106 review</li> <li>O Grant</li> <li>O Tax certification</li> <li>O O Other</li> <li>40 SHPO evaluation</li> </ul>	43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1978 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register
appears not to meet Nat. Reg. criteria (integrity) 41 USGS quadrangle name Athens East UTM reference 1 7 2 8 0 7 2 0 3 7 5 9 8 2 0 zone easting northing	O Local designation O HABS/HAER O Determination of eligibility O Other

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 20 Georgia Department of Natural Resources A 40	C RESOURCES D5 Butler Street, Suite 1462 tlanta, Georgia 30334 24/656-2840 Resource No. CA-AH-39 County Clarke
<ul> <li>or instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Arch and Fence</li> <li>3 Address/location Broad St. Arch is facing College St. Fence runs between Jackson andLumpkin Sts and extends a short distance down each. Athens</li> <li>4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top
<ul> <li>5 O Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>© Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current street furniture/object original street furniture/object</li> </ul>	
8 Date of construction (or estimate)	16 Number of stories
<ul> <li>1858</li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25)</li> <li>Ø Altered O Moved</li> <li>O Addition O Destroyed</li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer</li> <li>Unknown</li> <li>1 Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Athens Foundry and Ironworks</li> <li>12 Style</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) symmetrical,</li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material</li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material</li> <li>20 Type of construction metal/steel framing</li> <li>21 Exterior material(s)</li> </ul>
13 Building type	cast iron/pressed tin 22 Foundation material(s)
14 Original Floor Plan	23 Porch(es)
15 Plan shape	24 Windows
25 Additional physical description Arch is modeled after the Georgia state seal. Three Doric columns on piers, connected by a horizontal beam, all under a single arch. Lamps on either side.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #
Auerea - C.a. 1900 - Arch moved slightly back and current brick and concrete entryconstructed.	
Altered - Ca. 1900 - Gates replaced stone stiles.	
	Attach contact prints

	Resource No. CA-AH-39
27 Description of outbuildings (if any)	28 Site plan with North at top
29 Description of landscape features	
<b>30</b> Number of buildings 0 structures outbuildings 0 sites 0 landscape features 1	<i>0</i>
31 Description of the environment <i>urban - commercial (mixed old and new)</i> <i>mixed use (old resources)</i>	32 Archaeological potential
Edge of campus.	
History Erected with funds obtained from the sale of the Universi botanical garder. Replaced and earlier wooden fence. T had first been erected to keep livestock off campus.	34 Historical theme(s) architecture; landscape architecture 35 Significance architectural design (unusual example/illustration) history - activity (well preserved example) Unique feature.
	36 Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33
37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034	38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey
<ul> <li>39 Government preservation activity <ul> <li>O Section 106 review</li> <li>O Grant</li> <li>O Tax certification</li> <li>O Other</li> </ul> </li> <li>40 SHPO evaluation</li> </ul>	<b>43</b> Recognition and date O National Landmark 1970 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register
appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria 41 USGS quadrangle name Athens West UTM reference 1 7 2 8 0 4 8 0 3 7 5 9 8 0 0 zone easting northing	O Local designation O HABS/HAER O Determination of eligibility O Other
42 Tax map number	
GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section Georgia Department of Natural Resources A	C RESOURCES 05 Butler Street, Suite 1462 tlanta, Georgia 30334 04/656-2840 Resource No. <i>CA-AH-38</i> County <i>Clarke</i>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
<ul> <li>The instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Treanor House/John A. Cobb House (1657 and 1656)</li> <li>Address/location <ol> <li>1234 S. Lumpkin St. Just S of Carlton St. Athens</li> </ol> </li> <li>Owner's name and mailing address UGA</li> </ul> 5 & Building O Structure <ul> <li>Site O Object</li> <li>Landscape feature</li> </ul> <li>O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>Use, current college/university; research facility original single dwelling</li>	2 Location map with North at top
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) <u>CA. 1840 - 1849</u></li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) &amp; Altered O Moved &amp; Addition O Destroyed</li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <u>Unknown</u> Contractor/builder/craftsman <u>Unknown</u></li> <li>12 Style <u>Greek Revival - elements</u> Gothic Revival - elements</li> <li>13 Building type <u>Georgian house</u></li> <li>14 Original Floor Plan <u>central hallway (passage) - two rooms deep</u></li> <li>15 Plan shape <u>rectangular</u></li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories Two Type acade summetry &amp; front door(s) symmetrical, one door </li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material hip - metal - standing seam </li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material three or more chimneys - stuccoed masonry; lateral exterior - stuccoed masonry </li> <li>20 Type of construction mortise-and-tenon/brace frame </li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) weatherboard/clapboard/beveled siding; flush board siding </li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) brick pier with infill </li> <li>23 Porch(es) balcony (front, 1 story, partial, wood, gable); verandah (rear, 1 story, partial, wood, shed/pent); portico (front, 2 story, full, wood, hip) </li> <li>24 Windows double-hung sash (flat-headed, 9/9, rectangular); triple-hung sash (flat-headed, unknown, rectangular) </li> </ul>
25 Additional physical description Three bay facade with center door, transom and sidelights. Attenuated Gothic columns. ("Georgia Catalog" considers this type column to be "unique to the Athens-Lexington area.") Square posts and cutwork on veranda on rear ell. Addition - Ca. 1875 - Rear ell added.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

Altered - Ca. 1990 - Rehabilitated.

		Resource No. CA-AH-38
27	Description of outbuildings (if any) guest house - Called "Cobb House" (1656) in Regents Report. Unusual design, hipped roof in center and sheds to either side. Noveltyboard. Built 1938.	28 Site plan with North at top
	reenhouse - C1938. Small, attached to Cobb House. Poor condition.	
29	Description of landscape features yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks; terracing/contouring/retaining walls; artwork/commemorative monument	
	Stone retaining wall. Monument marking this a birthplace of Mildred Lewis Rutherford.	
30 31	Number of buildings 1 structures 0 outbuildings 1 sites 0 landscape features 4 Description of the environment urban - residential (mixed old and new) designed landscape (mixed old and new)	
	Edge of campus.	32 Archaeological potential
	History The date and builder of the house are undocumented. Several sources attribute the house the John Addison Cobb. Birthplace of Mary Lewis Rutherford, prominent locally as headmistress of Lucy Cobb Institute and Historian General of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture</li> <li>35 Significance common architectural style (unusual example/illustration) architectural design (unusual example/illustration) history - person (well preserved example) Unusual Gothic columns on an otherwise typical Greek Revival house.</li> <li>36 Sources of information</li> </ul>
_		Georgia Catalog secondary written 1, 33 Historic Houses of Athens secondary written 1, 8, 33 Regents Report secondary written 1, 8, 27
37	Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034	38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992
39 40 41	<ul> <li>Government preservation activity <ul> <li>O Section 106 review</li> <li>O Grant</li> <li>O Tax certification</li> <li>O Other</li> </ul> </li> <li>SHPO evaluation <ul> <li>appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria</li> </ul> </li> <li>USGS quadrangle name Athens West <ul> <li>UTM reference</li> <li>1 7 2 8 0 0 9 0 3 7 5 8 4 2 0</li> <li>zone easting northing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>43 Recognition and date</li> <li>O National Landmark</li> <li>Ø National Register - individual</li> <li>O Georgia Register</li> <li>O Local designation</li> <li>1935 Ø HABS/HAER - individual</li> <li>O Determination of eligibility</li> <li>O Other</li> </ul>
4	2 Tax map number	

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 205 H Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atlan 404/6	RESOURCES Butler Street, Suite 1462 nta, Georgia 30334 556-2840
r instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource <i>Wilson Lumpkin House/Rock House (1012)</i> 3 Address/location	2 Location map with North at top
South campus, SE corner of Cedar St and Brooks Dr. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university original single dwelling</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) <ul> <li>1842 - 1844</li> </ul> </li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) <ul> <li>Altered</li> <li>Moved</li> <li>Addition</li> <li>Destroyed</li> </ul> </li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <ul> <li>Wilson Lumpkin</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Edward Lilley, Ireland, mason; David Demorist, New Jersey, carpenter</li> </ul> </li> <li>12 Style <ul> <li>Federal - elements</li> <li>Greek Revival - elements</li> </ul> </li> <li>13 Building type <ul> <li>Georgian house</li> </ul> </li> <li>14 Original Floor Plan <ul> <li>central hallway (passage) - two rooms deep</li> </ul> </li> <li>15 Plan shape <ul> <li>rectangular</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories Two </li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) symmetrical, one door </li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material hip - metal - standing seam </li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material lateral interior - brick; three or more chimneys - brick </li> <li>20 Type of construction stone bearing </li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) random coursed stone </li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) stone - continuous </li> <li>23 Porch(es) stoop (front, 1 story, partial, wood, hip); stoop (rear, 1 story, partial, wood, shed/pent) </li> <li>24 Windows double-hung sash (flat-headed, 6/6, rectangular) </li> </ul>
<ul> <li>25 Additional physical description Three bay facade with raised basement. Center door with transom and sidelights. Quoins.</li> <li>Altered - Ca. 1989 - Front and rear porches replaced. Rear enclosed.</li> </ul>	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

Resource No. CA-AH-35

## 27 Description of outbuildings (if any)

29	Description of landscape features		
	designed plantings/planting beds: vard setting - informal/picturesque		
	g pana gere and g cour, fund soming - informatificial esque		
20	Number of huildings 1 starts		
30	outbuildings 0 sites 0		
	landscape features 2		
31	Description of the environment		
	designed landscape (mixed old and new)		
	Campus.	32	Archaeological potential
	*		
	History	34	Historical theme(s)
	Designed by and built for Wilson Lumpkin. Lumpkin served as state representative, congessman, governor, senator, Commissioner to the		architecture
	Cherokee Nation, and state agent for the Western and Atlantic RR.	35	Significance
	built for his retirement. Deeded to the university in 1907 by his		craftsmanship (outstanding qualities)
	daughter. A reversion clause in the deed requires the surrounding		history - person (well preserved example)
	property of retained to the news if the nouse is destroyed.		
		36	Sources of information
			Historic Houses of Athens secondary written 1, 8, 10, 33
			Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33
37	Prenared by (percon organization and address)	20	
57	repared by (person, organization and matterss)	38	Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992
	David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP		
	2846 Alameda Trail		
	Decatur, GA 30034		
30	Covernment processition activity		
55	O Section 106 review O Grant	43	Recognition and date
	O Tax certification O Other	;	0 National Register induit 1
<b>4</b> 0	SHPO evaluation		O Georgia Register
	appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria		O Local designation
41	USGS quadrangle name Athens East		O HABS/HAER
	UTM reference		O Determination of eligibility
_	1 7 2 8 0 7 6 0 3 7 5 8 6 8 0		O Other
10	Tay man number		
4.2	1 ax map number		
		and the second	

F	GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 2 Georgia Department of Natural Resources A 4	CR 205 But Atlanta 204/656	ESOURCES tler Street, Suite 1462 1, Georgia 30334 2840	Resource No. <i>CA-AH-30</i> County <i>Clarke</i>
3	or instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Bishop House/Bishop Cottage (0032) Address/location North campus, E side of Jackson St, third building N of Baldwin St. Athens Owner's name and mailing address UGA	:	2 Location map with Nort	h at top
5 6 7	<ul> <li>Building</li> <li>O Structure</li> <li>O Site</li> <li>O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>Use, current college/university original single dwelling</li> </ul>			
8 9 10 12 13 14	Date of construction (or estimate) 1837 Major changes & date (explain in No.25) O Altered O Moved O Addition O Destroyed Architect/engineer/designer Unknown Contractor/builder/craftsman Unknown Style Greek Revival - high style Building type Georgian cottage Original Floor Plan central hallway (nassage) two pages designed	16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Number of stories</li> <li>One</li> <li>Facade summetry &amp; from symmetrical, one door</li> <li>Roof type &amp; material side-oriented gable - composition</li> <li>Chimney placement &amp; m both gable-ends (interior) - brick</li> <li>Type of construction</li> <li>brick bearing</li> <li>Exterior material(s)</li> <li>brick: continuous</li> <li>Porch (es)</li> <li>portice (front 1 story partial wave</li> </ul>	t door(s) schingle/asphalt shingle aterial made; weatherboard/clapboard/beveled siding:
15	Plan shape rectangular	24	wood, gable) Windows double-hung sash (flat-headed, 6/ 9/6, rectangular)	6, rectangular); double-hung sash (flat-headed,
25	Additional physical description Three bay facade with center door, transom and sidelghts. Pedimented porch supported by two Doric columns. Rear porch enclosed with weatherboard above and plywood on basement level.	26	Negatives: roll #	frames #

Resource No. CA-AH-30

## 27 Description of outbuildings (if any)

29	Description of landscape features yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; terracing/contouring/retaining walls Brick retaining wall.		
30 31	Number of buildings       1       structures       0         outbuildings       0       sites       0         landscape features       2         Description of the environment       designed landscape (mixed old and new)         Campus.	32 Archaeological potential	
33	History Built for Thoms Jefferson Bishop. Most of the gardens described in "Garden History of Georgia" are now gone.	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture</li> <li>35 Significance common architectural type (outstanding qualities) common architectural style (outstanding qualities) architectural design (well preserved example)</li> </ul>	
		<b>36</b> Sources of information Garden History of Georgia secondary written 1, 33 Regents Report secondary written 1, 8	
37	Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034	38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992	
39 40	Government preservation activity O Section 106 review O Grant O Tax certification O Other SHPO evaluation	<ul> <li>43 Recognition and date</li> <li>O National Landmark</li> <li>1970 Ø National Register - individual</li> <li>O Georgia Register</li> </ul>	
41 42	appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria USGS quadrangle name Athens East UTM reference 1 7 2 8 0 7 0 0 3 7 5 9 6 0 0 zone easting northing Tax map number	O Local designation O HABS/HAER O Determination of eligibility O Other	

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 22 Georgia Department of Natural Resources A 40	2 RESOURCES D5 Butler Street, Suite 1462 tlanta, Georgia 30334 04/656-2840	Resource No. <i>CA-AH-15</i> County <i>Clarke</i>
instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Meigs Hall/Old LeConte Hall (0024) 3 Address/location	2 Location map with Nort	h at top
North campus, E of Herty Dr. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA		
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university original college/university</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) <ul> <li>1905</li> </ul> </li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) <ul> <li>O Altered</li> <li>O Moved</li> <li>O Addition</li> <li>O Destroyed</li> </ul> </li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <ul> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> </ul> </li> <li>12 Style <ul> <li>Neoclassical Revival - elements</li> </ul> </li> <li>13 Building type</li> </ul> <li>14 Original Floor Plan <ul> <li>central hallway (passage) - two rooms deep</li> <li>15 Plan shape <ul> <li>rectangular</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories <i>Two</i></li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; from <i>asymmetrical, one door</i></li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <i>flat - built-up/tar &amp; gravel</i></li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; m <i>off-center, within roof surface - b</i></li> <li>20 Type of construction <i>brick bearing</i></li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) <i>brick: common/American, mach</i></li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) <i>brick continuous</i></li> <li>23 Porch(es) <i>portico (front, 1 story, partial, bri</i></li> <li>24 Windows <i>double-hung sash (segmental-heat</i></li> </ul>	nt door(s) naterial prick ine-made ck, shed/pent) paded, 1/1, rectangular)
25 Additional physical description	26 Negatives: roll #	frames #

Four bay facade with paired windows set in segmental arches. Windows on other facades are set singly. Off-center entry with two colonettes set on piers in antis. Transom and sidelights. Heavy cornice with modillions. Basement.

Resource No. CA-AH-15
28 Site plan with North at top
32 Archaeological potential
34 Historical theme(s)
architecture; education 35 Significance history - activity (well preserved example)
<b>36</b> Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8
38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992
43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1970 Ø National Register - district
O Georgia Register O Local designation
O Georgia Register O Local designation O HABS/HAER O Determination of eligibility O Other

GEORGIA HISTORI Historic Preservation Section Georgia Department of Natural Resources	C RESOURCES       Resource No. CA-AH-14         205 Butler Street, Suite 1462       County         Atlanta, Georgia 30334       404/656-2840
<ul> <li>⁵or instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource</li> <li>Moore College (0025)</li> <li>3 Address/location</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top
North campus, E side of Herry Dr. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university original college/university</li> </ul>	
8 Date of construction (or estimate)	16 Number of stories
<ul> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25)</li> <li>O Altered O Moved</li> <li>O Addition O Destroyed</li> </ul>	Two-and-a-half 17 Facade summetry & front door(s) symmetrical, one door
10 Architect/engineer/designer Leon Henri Charbonnier Contractor/builder/craftsman	<ul> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material</li> <li>mansard - composition shingle/asphalt shingle</li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material</li> </ul>
M.B. McGinty 12 Style Second Empire - high style	off-center, within roof surface - brick; three or more chimneys - brick 20 Type of construction brick bearing
13 Building type	21 Exterior material(s) <i>stucco</i> 22 Foundation material(s)
14 Original Floor Plan central hallway (passage) - two rooms deep	<ul> <li>brick continuous</li> <li>23 Porch(es)</li> <li>stoop (front, 1 story, partial, brick, gable): stoop (side, 1 story, partial</li> </ul>
15 Plan shape rectangular	24 Windows double-hung sash (round-headed, 4/4, rectangular)
25 Additional physical description Nine bay facade with three center bays on pavilion. Center double doors with fanlight. Quoins. Hoods connected by a stringcourse. Gabled dormers. Basement.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

28 Site plan with North at top 27 Description of outbuildings (if any) 29 Description of landscape features yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks 0 30 Number of buildings 1 structures 0 0 sites outbuildings 3 landscape features 31 Description of the environment designed landscape (mixed old and new) 32 Archaeological potential Campus. 34 Historical theme(s) 3 History Construction financed by the city of Athens. The designer, Professor architecture; education Charbonnier, was a graduate of the French military school of St. Cyr, **35** Significance and was professor of mathmatics and engineering. Only permanent rare architectural style (outstanding qualities) building constructed on campus between the end of the Civil War and the history - activity (well preserved example) end of the century. Rare style. 36 Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 10, 33 Athens, a Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 10, 33 38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 43 Recognition and date 39 Government preservation activity **Ö** National Landmark O Grant O Section 106 review 1970 & National Register - district O Tax certification O Other O Georgia Register 40 SHPO evaluation O Local designation appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria O HABS/HAER 41 USGS quadrangle name Athens West O Determination of eligibility UTM reference O Other 17280440 3759680 northing zone easting 42 Tax map number

Resource No. CA-AH-14

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 205 Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atl 404	RESOURCES Butler Street, Suite 1462 anta, Georgia 30334 /656-2840
<ul> <li>instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource</li> <li>New College (0030)</li> <li>Address/location</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top
North campus, W side of quadrangle. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university original college-related housing; college/university</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) <ul> <li>1823</li> </ul> </li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) <ul> <li>Altered</li> <li>Moved</li> <li>Addition</li> <li>Destroyed</li> </ul> </li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <ul> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>James Carlton and Ross Crane, 1832</li> </ul> </li> <li>12 Style <ul> <li>Georgian - elements</li> </ul> </li> <li>13 Building type</li> </ul> <li>14 Original Floor Plan <ul> <li>central hallway (passage) - two rooms deep</li> <li>15 Plan shape <ul> <li>rectangular</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories Three</li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) symmetrical, one door</li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material side-oriented gable - metal - standing seam; parapet gable</li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material double gable-end - brick; three or more chimneys - brick</li> <li>20 Type of construction brick bearing</li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) stucco</li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) brick continuous</li> <li>23 Porch(es) stoop (front, 1 story, partial, brick, gable)</li> <li>24 Windows double-hung sash (flat-headed, 6/6, rectangular)</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Additional physical description Eleven bay facade with center door. Entry projects and is rusticated. Originally built with a fourth floor but this was not replaced in the 1832 rebuilding. Said to have closely resembled Old College after 1832. Double gable end chimneys and two more set off center in the slope.</li> </ul>	26 Negatives: roll # frames #
Altered - Ca. 1830 - Heavily damaged by fire, either "gutted" or "burned to theground" depending on the source.	Attach contact prints
Auerea - 1832 - Rebuilt	

	Resource No. CA-AH-13
27 Description of outbuildings (if any)	28 Site plan with North at top
29 Description of landscape features yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks; street furniture (benches,lighting.etc.)	
Opens onto quadrangle.	
30 Number of buildings 1 structures 0	
outbuildings $0$ sites $0$ landscape features $4$	
31 Description of the environment	
designed landscape (mixed old and new)	32 Archaeological potential
History See section 9. Originally primarily a dormitory, now administrative offices.	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education</li> <li>35 Significance rare architectural style (good example/illustration) history - activity (good example/illustration)</li> </ul>
	<b>36</b> Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 9, 33 Athens, a Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 9, 11, 33
37 Prepared by (person, organization and address)	38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992
David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034	
39 Government preservation activity	43 Recognition and date
O Section 106 review O Grant O Tax certification O Other	1970 Ø National Register - district
40 SHPO evaluation	O Georgia Register O Local designation
41 USGS quadrangle name Athens East	O HABS/HAER
UTM reference	O Determination of eligibility O Other
1.1.2.0.0.3.2.0.3.1.3.7.0.4.0	0.000
zone easting northing	

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section Georgia Department of Natural Resources	C RESOURCES 205 Butler Street, Suite 1462 Atlanta, Georgia 30334 404/656-2840
<ul> <li>r instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource</li> <li>Old College/Franklin College (0130)</li> <li>3 Address/location</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top
North campus, S end of the quadrangle. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university original college/university; college-related housing</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) <ul> <li>1803 - 1806</li> </ul> </li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) <ul> <li>Altered</li> <li>O Moved</li> <li>O Addition</li> <li>O Destroyed</li> </ul> </li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <ul> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Unknown</li> </ul> </li> <li>12 Style <ul> <li>Georgian - high style</li> </ul> </li> <li>13 Building type</li> </ul> <li>14 Original Floor Plan <ul> <li>three or more rooms - two pooms data</li> </ul></li>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories Three</li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) symmetrical, two doors</li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material hip - metal - standing seam</li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material off-center, ridgeline - brick; three or more chimneys - brick</li> <li>20 Type of construction brick bearing</li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) brick: Flemish bond, machine-made; stone</li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) brick continuous</li> <li>23 Porch(es)</li> </ul>
15 Plan shape rectangular	<ul> <li>brick, gable); stoop (rear, 1 story, partial, brick, gable); stoop (rear, 1</li> <li>Windows</li> <li>double-hung sash (flat-headed, 6/6 rectangeder)</li> </ul>
25 Additional physical description Fourieen bay facade with doors at fourth bay from each end. Originally two center halls with no interior communication between the two halves of the building. Stone courses between floors. Modillions. Four	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

of the building. Stone courses between floors. Modillions. Four chimneys. Two marrble plaques on the second floor at the front center. A small bronze plaque near the west end on the second floor.

Altered - Ca. 1907 - All exterior brick replaced.

27 Description of outbuildings (if any) 28 Site plan with North at top 29 Description of landscape features yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks; street furniture (benches, lighting, etc.) 30 Number of buildings structures 0 outbuildings 0 sites landscape features 4 **31** Description of the environment designed landscape (mixed old and new) 32 Archaeological potential History 34 Historical theme(s) close relations w/fed. gov't in 1930's & 1940's First permanent building constructed for the University and oldest architecture; education; military standing building in Athens. Called "Summey House" in late nineteenth **35** Significance century. Condemned c1906 but rehabilitated and all exterior brick rare architectural style (outstanding qualities) replaced c1907. Called "Yahoo Hall" in early 20th century and history - development (outstanding qualities) "Yorktown Barracks" during World War II when the University housed a US history - activity (outstanding qualities) Navy preflight training program. Rare style in Georgia. Oldest building on campus. 36 Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33 Athesn, a Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) 38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992 David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 39 Government preservation activity 43 Recognition and date O Section 106 review O Grant O National Landmark O Tax certification O Other 1970 Ø National Register - district 40 SHPO evaluation O Georgia Register O Local designation appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria 41 USGS quadrangle name Athens East O HABS/HAER UTM reference O Determination of eligibility 172805403759600 O Other zone easting northing 42 Tax map number

Resource No. CA-AH-12



GEORGIA HISTORIC RESOURCES Resource No. CA-AH-12

Continuation Sheet

3 story, partial, brick, gable)

.

e

GEOKGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section Georgia Department of Natural Resources	L' RESOURCES 205 Butler Street, Suite 1462 Atlanta, Georgia 30334 404/656-2840
<ul> <li>For instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource George Peabody Hall (0042)</li> <li>3 Address/location North campus, E side of rear quadrangle.</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top
Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university original college/university</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) <ul> <li>1913</li> </ul> </li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) <ul> <li>O Altered</li> <li>O Moved</li> <li>O Addition</li> <li>O Destroyed</li> </ul> </li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <ul> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Unknown</li> </ul> </li> <li>12 Style <ul> <li>Neoclassical Revival - high style</li> </ul> </li> <li>13 Building type</li> </ul> <li>14 Original Floor Plan <ul> <li>three or more rooms - more than two rooms deep</li> </ul> </li>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories <i>Two</i></li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) <i>symmetrical, one door</i></li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <i>hip - metal - standing seam</i></li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material <i>off-center, ridgeline - brick; three or more chimneys - brick</i></li> <li>20 Type of construction <i>brick bearing</i></li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) <i>brick: common/American, machine-made; stone panels</i></li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) <i>brick continuous</i></li> <li>23 Porch(es) <i>stoon (front 1 gen: particl brick - the states)</i></li> </ul>
15 Plan shape rectangular	stoop (front, 1 story, partial, brick, gable) 24 Windows double-hung sash (flat-headed, 1/1, rectangular)
25 Additional physical description Seven bay facade with center door. Pavilions at either end of the facade in front and rear. Ornamental brick on these pavilions, but no windows. Tall transom over double doors, with ornate pediment supported by large brackets. Four Ionic attached columns imitate a portico. Slaighly shaped parapet gives the semblence of a pediment	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

"George Peabody Hall" engraved on stone in frieze. Heavy cornice with dentils. Basement. One story ell in center of rear. Windows are modern replacements.

Resource No. CA-AH-9 28 Site plan with North at top 27 Description of outbuildings (if any) 29 Description of landscape features yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks 0 30 Number of buildings 1 structures 0 sites 0 outbuildings 3 landscape features 31 Description of the environment designed landscape (mixed old and new) 32 Archaeological potential 34 Historical theme(s) History 3 Financed by a grant from the Peabody Education Fund. architecture; education 35 Significance common architectural style (unusual example/illustration) architectural design (outstanding qualities) history - activity (well preserved example) 36 Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33 38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 43 Recognition and date **39** Government preservation activity **O** Grant **Ö** National Landmark O Section 106 review O Other 1970 & National Register - district O Tax certification O Georgia Register 40 SHPO evaluation O Local designation appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria O HABS/HAER 41 USGS quadrangle name Athens East O Determination of eligibility UTM reference O Other 172806403759500 northing zone easting 42 Tax map number

Historic Preservation Section 205 Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atla 404	KESUUKCESResource No.CA-AH-8Butler Street, Suite 1462CountyClarkeanta, Georgia 30334656-2840Clarke
<ul> <li>For instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Waddell Hall/Philosophical Hall/see section 33 (0041)</li> <li>3 Address/location North campus. Rear quadrangle. Athens</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top
4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
<ul> <li>O Site</li> <li>O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) 1821</li> </ul>	16 Number of stories
<ul> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25)</li> <li>O Altered O Moved</li> <li>O Addition O Destroyed</li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) symmetrical, one door</li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material front-oriented gable - composition shingle/asphalt shingle</li> </ul>
1 Contractor/builder/craftsman <u>Unknown</u> 12 Style Federal - elements	<ol> <li>Chimney placement &amp; material no chimney observed - unknown material</li> <li>Type of construction brick bearing</li> <li>Exterior material(s)</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>13 Building type Georgian house</li> <li>14 Original Floor Plan central hallway (passage) - two rooms deep</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>brick: common/American, hand-made</li> <li>22 Foundation material(s)</li> <li>brick continuous</li> <li>23 Porch(es)</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>15 Plan shape rectangular</li> <li>25 Additional physical description</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>stoop (front, 1 story, partial, brick, gable)</li> <li>24 Windows         <ul> <li>double-hung sash (flat-headed, 9/9, other)</li> </ul> </li> <li>26 Nogativogy coll 4</li> </ul>
Three bay facade with center door. Fanlight. Simple boxed eaves.	20 Ivegatives: roll # trames #

		RESOULCE NO. CA-AII-0
27 Descripti	on of outbuildings (if any)	28 Site plan with North at top
9 Descripti	on of landscape features	
yard setting	- informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds;	
usigicu ui	roj#uto	
10 Number	of buildings $\frac{1}{2}$ structures $\frac{0}{2}$	
landso	ape features 3	
31 Descript designed la	ion of the environment ndscape (mixed old and new)	
Campus		32 Archaeological potential
Curripus.		
3 History Other name This is the s at various t faculty hou	zs over the years include Agricultural Hall and Reed House. econd oldest surviving building on campus. It has served imes as a classroom building, gymnasium, boardinghouse, sing, among other uses.	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education</li> <li>35 Significance rare architectural style (well preserved example) history - activity (good example/illustration)</li> </ul>
3 History Other name This is the s at various t faculty hou	es over the years include Agricultural Hall and Reed House. econd oldest surviving building on campus. It has served imes as a classroom building, gymnasium, boardinghouse, sing, among other uses.	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education</li> <li>35 Significance rare architectural style (well preserved example) history - activity (good example/illustration)</li> <li>36 Sources of information Athens, A Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33 Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>History Other name This is the s at various t faculty hou</li> <li>37 Prepare</li> </ul>	es over the years include Agricultural Hall and Reed House. Second oldest surviving building on campus. It has served imes as a classroom building, gymnasium, boardinghouse, sing, among other uses. d by (person, organization and address)	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education</li> <li>35 Significance rare architectural style (well preserved example) history - activity (good example/illustration)</li> <li>36 Sources of information Athens, A Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33 Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3 History Other name This is the s at various t faculty hou</li> <li>37 Prepared David Cull Georgia Tr 2846 Alam Decatur, G</li> </ul>	es over the years include Agricultural Hall and Reed House. econd oldest surviving building on campus. It has served imes as a classroom building, gymnasium, boardinghouse, sing, among other uses. d by (person, organization and address) ison ust/OHP weda Trail A 30034	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education</li> <li>35 Significance rare architectural style (well preserved example) history - activity (good example/illustration)</li> <li>36 Sources of information Athens, A Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33 Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3 History Other name This is the s at various t faculty hou</li> <li>37 Prepared David Cult Georgia Tr 2846 Alarn Decatur, G</li> <li>39 Governu</li> </ul>	ts over the years include Agricultural Hall and Reed House. second oldest surviving building on campus. It has served times as a classroom building, gymnasium, boardinghouse, sing, among other uses. d by (person, organization and address) lison ust/OHP teda Trail A 30034 ment preservation activity	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture: education</li> <li>35 Significance rare architectural style (well preserved example) history - activity (good example/illustration)</li> <li>36 Sources of information Athens, A Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33 Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992</li> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Law docted</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3 History Other name This is the s at various t faculty hou</li> <li>37 Prepared David Cull Georgia Tr 2846 Alar Decatur, G</li> <li>39 Governi O S</li> </ul>	es over the years include Agricultural Hall and Reed House. second oldest surviving building on campus. It has served times as a classroom building gymnasium, boardinghouse, sing, among other uses. d by (person, organization and address) lison ust/OHP teda Trail A 30034 ment preservation activity Section 106 review O Grant Tax certification O Other	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education</li> <li>35 Significance rare architectural style (well preserved example) history - activity (good example/illustration)</li> <li>36 Sources of information Athens, A Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33 Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992</li> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1970 Sources National Register - district</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3 History Other name This is the s at various t faculty hou</li> <li>37 Prepared David Cull Georgia Tr 2846 Alam Decatur, G</li> <li>39 Governi O S</li> <li>40 SHPO e</li> </ul>	ts over the years include Agricultural Hall and Reed House. second oldest surviving building on campus. It has served times as a classroom building, gymnasium, boardinghouse, sing, among other uses. d by (person, organization and address) lison ust/OHP teda Trail A 30034 ment preservation activity Section 106 review O Grant fax certification O Other valuation	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education</li> <li>35 Significance rare architectural style (well preserved example) history - activity (good example/lillustration)</li> <li>36 Sources of information Athens, A Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33 Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992</li> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Landmark</li> <li>1970 &amp; National Register - district O Georgia Register</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3 History Other name This is the s at various t faculty hou</li> <li>37 Prepared David Cull Georgia Tr 2846 Alam Decatur, G</li> <li>39 Governi O S</li> <li>40 SHPO e appears to USGS q UTM re</li> </ul>	ts over the years include Agricultural Hall and Reed House. second oldest surviving building on campus. It has served times as a classroom building gymnasium, boardinghouse, sing, among other uses. d by (person, organization and address) ison ust/OHP teda Trail A 30034 ment preservation activity Section 106 review O Grant fax certification O Other valuation meet Nat. Reg. criteria uadrangle name Athens East ference	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education</li> <li>35 Significance rare architectural style (well preserved example) history - activity (good example/illustration)</li> <li>36 Sources of information Athens, A Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33 Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992</li> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Landmark</li> <li>1970 &amp; National Register - district O Georgia Register</li> <li>O Local designation O HABS/HAER</li> <li>O Determination of eligibility</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3 History Other name This is the s at various t faculty hou</li> <li>37 Prepared David Cull Georgia Tr 2846 Alar Decatur, G</li> <li>39 Governi O S</li> <li>40 SHPO e appears to USGS q UTM re 1 7 2 zone ez</li> </ul>	as over the years include Agricultural Hall and Reed House. Second oldest surviving building on campus. It has served times as a classroom building, gymnasium, boardinghouse, sing, among other uses.	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education</li> <li>35 Significance rare architectural style (well preserved example) history - activity (good example/illustration)</li> <li>36 Sources of information Athens, A Pict Hist secondary written 1, 8, 33 Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33</li> <li>38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992</li> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Landmark</li> <li>1970 &amp; National Register - district O Georgia Register</li> <li>O Local designation O HABS/HAER</li> <li>O Determination of eligibility O Other</li> </ul>

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 205 H Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atlan 404/6	RESOURCES Butler Street, Suite 1462 nta, Georgia 30334 556-2840
<ul> <li>instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Vame(s) of resource</li> <li>Georgia Museum of Art/Peabody Library (0631)</li> <li>3 Address/location</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top
North campus, E side of quadrangle. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university; museum/art original college/university; library</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) 1903 - 1904</li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) O Altered O Moved O Addition O Destroyed</li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer Haralson Bleckley Contractor/builder/craftsman Unknown</li> <li>12 Style Neoclassical Revival - high style</li> <li>13 Building type</li> <li>14 Original Floor Plan three or more rooms - more than two rooms deep T-shaped</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories <ul> <li>One</li> </ul> </li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) <ul> <li>symmetrical, one door</li> </ul> </li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <ul> <li>hip - metal - standing seam</li> </ul> </li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material <ul> <li>no chimney observed - unknown material</li> </ul> </li> <li>20 Type of construction <ul> <li>brick bearing</li> </ul> </li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) <ul> <li>brick running bond, machine-made; stone; stone panels; steel/copper/tin/brass/bronze/aluminum; stucco</li> </ul> </li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) <ul> <li>brick continuous</li> </ul> </li> <li>23 Porch(es) <ul> <li>recessed (front, 1 story, partial, brick, gable)</li> </ul> </li> <li>24 Windows <ul> <li>double-hung sash (flat-headed, 1/1, rectangular)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
25 Additional physical description Seven bay facade with center pavilion. Two Ionic columns in antis. Heavy metal cornice inscribed with names of famous authors. Windows in the front section have been blocked and covered with stucco. Segmental topped windows flank porch. Parapet. Full basement. Stone water table. Entry has been infilled with stone panels and modern metal doors.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

	Resource No. CA-AH-6
27 Description of outbuildings (if any)	28 Site plan with North at top
9 Description of landscape features	
yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks; street furniture (benches,lighting,etc.)	
Opens onto quadrangle.	
0 Number of buildings 1 structures 0 outbuildings 0 sites 0 landscape features 4	
designed landscape (mixed old and new)	32 Archaeological potential
History	34 Historical theme(s)
Built as a library and served as such until 1953. Construction financed by a donation from George Foster Peabody. Regents report gives date of construction as 1907, Walking Tour gives 1905 and Pict Hist of Athens gives 1903-04.	architecture; education 35 Significance history - activity (well preserved example)
	<b>36</b> Sources of information Athens, a pictorial hist secondary written 1, 8, 10, 33. Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 33 Regents Report secondary written 33
7 Prepared by (person, organization and address)	38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992
Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034	
9 Government preservation activity O Section 106 review O Grant	43 Recognition and date O National Landmark
0 SHPO evaluation 0 Other	1970 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register
appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria 1 USGS quadrangle name Athens East UTM reference	O Local designation O HABS/HAER O Determination of eligibility
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	O Other



GEORGIA HISTORIC RESOURCES Resource No. CA-AH-6

Continuation Sheet

gallery/exhibition hall

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 21 Georgia Department of Natural Resources A 44	C RESOURCES       Resource No. CA-AH-5         05 Butler Street, Suite 1462       County         Atlanta, Georgia 30334       Clarke         04/656-2840       County
<ul> <li>r instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Terrell Hall (0023)</li> <li>3 Address/location North campus, E side of quadrangle. Athens</li> <li>4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university original college/university</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) <ol> <li>1904</li> </ol> </li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) <ol> <li>O Altered</li> <li>O Moved</li> <li>O Addition</li> <li>O Destroyed</li> </ol> </li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <ul> <li>Charles Morion Strahan</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Unknown</li> </ul> </li> <li>12 Style <ul> <li>Italian Renaissance Revival - high style</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories <i>Two</i></li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) <i>symmetrical, one door</i></li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <i>flat - composition shingle/asphalt shingle; built-up/tar &amp; gravel</i></li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material <i>no chimney observed - unknown material</i></li> <li>20 Type of construction <i>brick bearing</i></li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) <i>brick number of machines of machines of a solution</i></li> </ul>
<ul> <li>13 Building type</li> <li>14 Original Floor Plan three or more rooms - more than two rooms deep</li> <li>15 Plan shape rectangular</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>22 Foundation material(s)</li> <li>23 Porch(es)</li> <li>24 Windows double-hung sash (flat-headed, 1/1, rectangular); double-hung sash (segmental-headed, 1/1, rectangular); double-hung sash</li> </ul>
25 Additional physical description Seven bay facade with centered porch. Porch on stepped pavilion. Windows paired and set in two-story round arches. Transoms over windows. Two bay porch with brick piers and terracotta bases and	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

Windows paired and set in two-story round arches. Transoms over windows, Two bay porch with brick piers and terracotta bases and Corinthian capitals. Terracotta moulding and other ornaments in the various arches of the facade. Sidelights and transom around double doors. "Terrell Hall" in bronze above the entry. Built on foundation of earlier building. Wide cornice with dnetils and modillions. Vents in frieze. Parapet.

27 Description of outbuildings (if any) 28 Site plan with North at top 29 Description of landscape features yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks; street furniture (benches, lighting, etc.) Opens onto quadrangle. 30 Number of buildings 0 structures 0 outbuildings sites 0 landscape features 4 31 Description of the environment designed landscape (mixed old and new) 32 Archaeological potential History 34 Historical theme(s) Built on foundations of earlier Science Hall (1897) which burned in architecture; education 1903. The designer, C.M. Strahan, was professor of civil engineering 35 Significance and mathmatics, and was a locally prominent architect. rare architectural style (well preserved example) history - activity (good example/illustration) history - person (well preserved example) Unusual style in the area. 36 Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 10, 33 Pict Hist of Athens secondary written 10, 33 37 Prepared by (person, organization and address) 38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992 David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034 39 Government preservation activity 43 Recognition and date O Section 106 review Ó Grant **O** National Landmark O Tax certification O Other 1970 & National Register - district 40 SHPO evaluation O Georgia Register O Local designation appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria 41 USGS quadrangle name Athens East O HABS/HAER UTM reference O Determination of eligibility 1 7 2 8 0 5 8 0 3 7 5 9 7 0 0 O Other zone easting northing 42 Tax map number

Resource No. CA-AH-5

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atla 404/	RESOURCES Butler Street, Suite 1462 nta, Georgia 30334 556-2840
<ul> <li>instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Chapel (0022)</li> <li>3 Address/location</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top
A Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university original college/university; church/religious structure</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) <ul> <li>1832</li> </ul> </li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) <ul> <li>Altered</li> <li>O Moved</li> <li>O Addition</li> <li>O Destroyed</li> </ul> </li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <ul> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> </ul> </li> <li>12 Style <ul> <li>Greek Revival - high style</li> </ul> </li> <li>13 Building type</li> </ul> <li>14 Original Floor Plan <ul> <li>one room - rectangular - two rooms deep</li> <li>15 Plan shape <ul> <li>rectangular</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories <ul> <li><i>Two</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) <ul> <li><i>symmetrical, three or more doors</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <ul> <li><i>front-oriented gable - composition shingle/asphalt shingle</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material <ul> <li><i>no chimney observed - unknown material</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>20 Type of construction <ul> <li><i>brick bearing</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) <ul> <li><i>stucco</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) <ul> <li><i>brick continuous</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>23 Porch(es) <ul> <li><i>portico (front, 2 story, full, brick, gable)</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>24 Windows <ul> <li><i>triple-hung sash (flat-headed, unknown, rectangular)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul> <li>25 Additional physical description Three bay facade, double doors in each bay. Six Doric columns. Tall 6/6/6 sash on the sides. Dentils. Scored stucco in pediment. Inside is a large painting of the interior of St. Peter's in Rome by George Cooke, donated by Daniel Pratt in 1867.</li> <li>Altered - 1913 - Bell tower removed.</li> <li>Altered - 1990 - Renovation.</li> </ul>	26 Negatives: roll # frames # Attach contact prints

			Resource No. CA-AH-4	
27 [ b a	Description of outbuildings (if any) vell tower - Open-frame wooden bell tower in rear, ercted between 1913 and 1935.	28	Site plan with North at top	
29 L ya di	Description of landscape features ard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; lesigned drives/walks; street furniture (benches,lighting.etc.)			
0	Dpens onto quadrangle.			
30 Ñ	Number of buildings $1$ structures $1$ outbuildings $0$ sites $0$			
	landscape features 4			
31 L de	Description of the environment esigned landscape (mixed old and new)			
С	Tampus.	32	Archaeological potential	
	*		in meerogram potential	
			×	
: H	listory	34	Historical theme(s)	
TI su oj	he interior and Cooke painting were damaged by fire in 1955, isequently restored. Chapel attendence was mandatory in the early days f the school.	35	architecture; religion; education Significance common architectural style (outstanding qualities) history - activity (well preserved example)	
		36	Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 9, 25, 33 Pictorial Hist of Athens secondary written 1, 8, 25, 33 Georgia Catalog secondary written 1, 8, 25, 27, 33	
<b>37</b> P	repared by (person, organization and address)	38	Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992	
D G 28 D	David Cullison Jeorgia Trust/OHP 846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034		- -	
<b>39</b> G	Sovernment preservation activity	43	Recognition and date	
	O Section 106 review O Grant O Tax certification O Other		O National Landmark	
<b>4</b> 0 S	HPO evaluation		O Georgia Register	
ap An TI	ppears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria		O Local designation	
41 U	JTM reference		1935 & HABS/HAER - individual	
1	7 2 8 0 5 0 0 3 7 5 9 6 4 0		O Other	
Z(	one easting northing			
<b>4</b> Ζ 1	ax map number			
		COLUMN STREET, STORE		

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atl 404	RESOURCES Butler Street, Suite 1462 anta, Georgia 30334 /656-2840
<ul> <li>instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Demosthenian Hall (0021)</li> <li>3 Address/location North Campus. W side of quadrangle. Athens</li> <li>4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA</li> <li>5 &amp; Building O Structure</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top
<ul> <li>O Structure</li> <li>O Site</li> <li>O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university; club (common interest) original college/university; club (common interest)</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) <ul> <li>1824</li> </ul> </li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) <ul> <li>Ø Altered</li> <li>O Moved</li> <li>O Addition</li> <li>O Destroyed</li> </ul> </li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <ul> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Unknown</li> </ul> </li> <li>12 Style <ul> <li>Federal - high style</li> </ul> </li> <li>13 Building type <ul> <li>Georgian house</li> </ul> </li> <li>14 Original Floor Plan <ul> <li>central hallway (passage) - two rooms deep</li> </ul> </li> <li>15 Plan shape <ul> <li>rectangular</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories <i>Two</i></li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) <i>symmetrical, one door</i></li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <i>hip - composition shingle/asphalt shingle</i></li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material <i>lateral exterior - brick</i></li> <li>20 Type of construction <i>brick bearing</i></li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) <i>stucco</i></li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) <i>brick continuous</i></li> <li>23 Porch(es) <i>stoop (front, 1 story, partial, brick, gable); stoop (rear, 1 story, partial, brick, gable)</i></li> <li>24 Windows <i>double-hung sash (flat-headed, 9/9, rectangular)</i></li> </ul>
<ul> <li>25 Additional physical description Three bay facade with cneter door. Fanlight and sidelights. Palladian window in center front on upper floor. Stone steps. Chimneys cut-off. Stairs at rear of the house. Meeting room upstairs is little changed and has ornate Adam plaster ceiling.</li> <li>Altered - Ca. 1980 - Lower floor restored.</li> </ul>	26 Negatives: roll # frames # Attach contact prints

27 Description of outbuildings (if any)

Resource No. CA-AH-3

29	Description of landscape features designed plantings/planting beds; yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed drives/walks; street furniture (benches,lighting.etc.)	
	Opens onto quadrangle.	
30	Number of buildings <u>1</u> structures <u>0</u> outbuildings <u>0</u> sites <u>0</u> landscape features <u>4</u>	
31	designed landscape (mixed old and new)	
	Campus.	32 Archaeological potential
	History	34 Historical theme(s)
	Buill for and still used by the Demosthenian Lierary Society.	architecture; education; social/cultural development; arts/letters 35 Significance rare architectural style (outstanding qualities) history - activity (well preserved example)
		36 Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33 Georgia Catalog secondary written 1, 8, 33
37	Prepared by (person, organization and address)	38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992
	David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034	
39	Government preservation activity	43 Recognition and date
40	O Tax certification O Other SHPO evaluation	1970 Ø National Register - district O Georgia Register
41	appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria USGS quadrangle name Athens West UTM reference	O Local designation 1934 & HABS/HAER - individual O Determination of eligibility
~	zone easting northing	Other
42	Tax map number	

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 205 Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atla 404	RESOURCESResource No.CA-AH-2Butler Street, Suite 1462CountyClarkeanta, Georgia 30334656-2840Clarke
r instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Phi Kappa Hall (0020) 3 Address/location	2 Location map with North at top
North campus, E side of quadrangle.	
4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
5 & Building O Structure O Site O Object O Landscape feature	
6 O Representative example of building type Number represented	
7 Use, current college/university original college/university; club (common interest)	
<ul> <li>1836</li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25)</li> <li> <ul> <li>Ø Altered</li> <li>Ø Moved</li> <li>Ø Addition</li> <li>Ø Destroyed</li> </ul> </li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <ul> <li>Unknown</li> <li>1 Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> <li>Unknown</li> </ul> </li> <li>12 Style <ul> <li>Greek Revival - elements</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>18 Founder of stories <ul> <li><i>Two</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) <ul> <li><i>symmetrical, one door</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <ul> <li><i>front-oriented gable - metal - standing seam</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material <ul> <li><i>outside add-on - brick</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>20 Type of construction <ul> <li><i>brick bearing</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
13 Building type	<ul> <li>21 Exterior material(s) brick: common/American, hand-made</li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) brick continuous</li> </ul>
14 Original Floor Plan	23 Porch(es)
one room - rectangular - more than two rooms deep 15 Plan shape	portico (front, 2 story, full, brick, gable)
rectangular	double-hung sash (flat-headed, 9/9, rectangular)
25 Additional physical description Only opening on the ground floor of the facade is the centered door. Four Doric columns support pediment. Upstairs interior is well-preserved late nineteenth century. Interior stairs lead up both sides in vestibule. Chimney is a later replacement. Altered - Ca. 1970 - Front porch floor replaced with concrete slab.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

27 Description of outbuildings (if any)

Resource No. CA-AH-2

29	Description of landscape features yard setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; designed drives/walks Opens onto the quadrangle.	
30 31	Number of buildings <u>1</u> structures <u>0</u> outbuildings <u>0</u> sites <u>0</u> landscape features <u>3</u> Description of the environment	
	designed landscape (mixed old and new) Campus.	32 Archaeological potential
,	History Built for the Phi Kappa Literary Society. The upstairs is little used and usually locked. The downstairs is a computer center.	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education; social/cultural development; arts/letters</li> <li>35 Significance history - activity (well preserved example) common architectural style (unusual example/illustration)</li> </ul>
		<b>36</b> Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8, 33 Georgia Catalog secondary written 1, 8, 33
37	Prepared by (person, organization and address) David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034	38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992
39	Government preservation activity O Section 106 review O Grant O Tax certification O Other	43 Recognition and date O National Landmark 1970 Ø National Register - district
40	SHPO evaluation	O Georgia Register
41	appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria USGS quadrangle name Athens East UTM reference 17 280580 3759740 zone easting northing	O Local designation 1936 & HABS/HAER - individual O Determination of eligibility O Other
-14		

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section 205 H Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atlan 404/0	RESOURCES Butler Street, Suite 1462 nta, Georgia 30334 656-2840
instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Academic Building (0120) 3 Address/location	2 Location map with North at top
North Campus. SE corner of Broad and College Sts. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address University of Georgia	
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university original college/university</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) 1905</li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) &amp; Altered O Moved O Addition O Destroyed</li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer Charles Morton Strahan Contractor/builder/craftsman Unknown</li> <li>12 Style Neoclassical Revival - high style</li> <li>13 Building type</li> <li>14 Original Floor Plan three or more rooms - more than two rooms deep</li> <li>15 Plan shape rectangular</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories <i>Three</i> <ul> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) <i>symmetrical, two doors</i></li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <i>front-oriented gable - composition shingle/asphalt shingle</i></li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material <i>no chimney observed - unknown material</i></li> <li>20 Type of construction <i>brick bearing</i> </li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) <i>stucco</i> </li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) <i>brick continuous</i> </li> <li>23 Porch(es) <i>portico (front, 3 + storeis, partial, wood, shed/pent)</i> </li></ul> </li> <li>24 Windows <i>double-hung sash (flat-headed, 1/1, rectangular)</i></li> </ul>
25 Additional physical description Rusticated ground floor. Scored stucco. Portico consists of six three-story Corinthian columns with floors on each level and double stairways. Thirteen bay facade with the three center being the portico. Door centered in each of the wings. Swags and garlands, dentils, balustrade on the roof. Modern doors and windows in the infilled area behind the porch. Hoods over older windows.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #

Altered - Ca. 1950 - Area behind the portico was infilled.

Resource No. CA-AH-1

## 27 Description of outbuildings (if any)

29 Descrip designed p designed d artwork/co Median wi opens onto of yews bro quad date	tion of landscape features lantings/planting beds; yard setting - informal/picturesque; rives/walks; median; street furniture (benches,lighting.etc.); mmemorative monument th monuments on the street just north of the building. Front to the campus quadrangle. Yew tree on north side is a descendent ought from England by Oglethorpe. Some streetlights on the to the early twentieth century. Others are replicas.	
30 Number lands 31 Descrip <i>urban - co</i> <i>designed la</i> <i>Edge of ca</i>	r of buildings <u>1</u> structures <u>0</u> outbuildings <u>0</u> sites <u>0</u> cape features <u>6</u> tion of the environment mmercial (mixed old and new) mdscape (old resources)	32 Archaeological potential
2450 07 04		
3 History In 1905 Pr portico to portico wa	ofessor Strahan expanded the Ivy Building (1831) and built the connect it to the old Library (1862). The area behind the s added later.	<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; education</li> <li>35 Significance common architectural style (outstanding qualities) architectural design (unusual example/illustration) history - person (outstanding qualities) Good example of Strahan's work.</li> <li>36 Sources of information Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 8, 10, 33</li> </ul>
37 Prepare David Cul Georgia T 2846 Alan Decatur, C	d by (person, organization and address) lison rust/OHP neda Trail GA 30034	38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992
39 Govern O 40 SHPO e appears to 41 USGS q UTM re 1 7 2 zone ea 42 Tax map	ment preservation activity Section 106 review O Grant Tax certification O Other evaluation <i>meet Nat. Reg. criteria</i> uadrangle name <i>Athens West</i> ference 8 0 4 6 0 3 7 5 9 7 6 0 asting northing	<ul> <li>43 Recognition and date <ul> <li>O National Landmark</li> </ul> </li> <li>1970 Ø National Register - district <ul> <li>O Georgia Register</li> <li>O Local designation</li> <li>O HABS/HAER</li> <li>O Determination of eligibility</li> <li>O Other</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

27	Description of outbuildings (if any) wellhouse - 2502 Dated 1890 on Regents data base, but appears to be amodern reproduction.	28 Site pl	lan with No	orth at top		
				,		
<b>29</b> Î	Description of landscape features					
	yara setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds					
	Grape arbor. Modern brick retaining wall.					
30	Number of buildings $1$ structures $0$					
	landscape features 2					
31	Description of the environment					
	rural - agricultural (mixed old and new) rural - forested/wooded (mixed old and new)					
	rural - nonagricultural (mixed old and new)	32 Archa	eological p	otential		
3	History Built for for John B. White owner of the Georgia Mfr. Co. Joannal	34 Histor	rical theme	(s)		
	nearby at Whitehall. Built on the site of an earlier White Hall. Generally attributed to architect W.W. Thomas, but attributed by some to Charles M. Strahan, both of Athens. Acquired by UGA in 1936. Regents Report gives the incorrect date of 1873 for date of construction.	architecture 35 Significance common architectural style (unusual example/illustration) architectural design (outstanding qualities)			 	
		36 Sourc Athens, Nat Reg Walking	es of inforr a Pictorial His nomination s Tour of UGA	nation at secondary written secondary written secondary writter	n 1, 33 1, 8, 9, 33 1, 8, 33	 
37	Prepared by (person, organization and address)	38 Date of	of survey 1	992 re	survey	
	David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034					
39	Government preservation activity	43 Recog	mition and	date		
	O Section 106 review O Grant	Ŏ	National I	Landmark		
40	SHPO evaluation		National I Georgia R	Kegister <i>- indiv</i> egister	idual	
	appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria	0	Local desi	gnation		
41	USGS quadrangle name Athens East	0	HABS/HA	ER		
		0	1.1.3			
	1 7 2 8 4 1 0 0 3 7 5 3 0 2 0	0	) Determina ) Other	ation of eligib	ility	
-	1     7     2     8     4     1     0     3     7     5     3     0     2     0       zone     easting     northing	0	) Determina ) Other	ation of eligib	ility	



GEORGIA HISTORIC RESOURCES Resource No. CA-1

Continuation Sheet

- 3 (front, 1 story, partial, wood, gable)
- 36 Regents Report secondary written 1

4

GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section Georgia Department of Natural Resources A	C RESOURCES Resource No. CA-AH-23 D5 Butler Street, Suite 1462 County Clarke tlanta, Georgia 30334 04/656-2840
For instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource Military Hall/Military Science/Army ROTC (0061) 3 Address/location	2 Location map with North at top
Nort campus, SW corner of Baldwin St and Sanford Dr. Athens 4 Owner's name and mailing address UGA	
<ul> <li>5 Ø Building O Structure</li> <li>O Site O Object</li> <li>O Landscape feature</li> <li>6 O Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>7 Use, current college/university; army facility original college/university; army facility</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) <ul> <li>1931</li> </ul> </li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) <ul> <li>O Altered</li> <li>O Moved</li> <li>O Addition</li> <li>O Destroyed</li> </ul> </li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer <ul> <li>Unknown</li> <li>Contractor/builder/craftsman</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories <i>Two</i></li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) <i>symmetrical, one door</i></li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <i>hip - composition shingle/asphalt shingle</i></li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material</li> </ul>
Unknown 12 Style Colonial Revival - elements	20 Type of construction <i>concrete frame</i> 21 Exterior material(s)
<ul> <li>13 Building type New South cottage</li> <li>14 Original Floor Plan central hallway (passage) - more than two rooms deep</li> <li>15 Plan shape T-shaped</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>brick: running bond, machine-made</li> <li>22 Foundation material(s)</li> <li>stone - continuous</li> <li>23 Porch(es)</li> <li>portico (front, 1 story, partial, wood, gable)</li> <li>24 Windows</li> <li>double-hung sash (flat-headed, 6/6 rectoreduce)</li> </ul>
25 Additional physical description Five bay facade with center door. Square columns on porch with concrete slab floor. Double doors with transom. Most windows paired. Rear section has full basement.	26 Negatives: roll # frames # Attach contact prints

		Resource No. CA-AH-23
27	Description of outbuildings (if any)	28 Site plan with North at top
_		
29	Description of landscape features	
	yara setting - informal/picturesque; designed plantings/planting beds; terracing/contouring/retaining walls	
30	Number of buildings <i>1</i> structures <i>0</i>	
	outbuildings $0$ sites $0$ landscape features $3$	
31	Description of the environment	
	acsigned lanascape (mixed old and new)	32 Archaeological notantial
	Cumpus.	52 Archaeological potential
	History	34 Historical theme(s)
		architecture; education; military 35 Significance history - activity (well preserved example)
		Good example of early Depression era construction.
		36 Sources of information Regents Report secondary written 1, 8 Walking Tour of UGA secondary written 1, 8
37	Prepared by (person, organization and address)	38 Date of survey 1990 resurvey 1992
	David Cullison Georgia Trust/OHP 2846 Alameda Trail Decatur, GA 30034	
39	Government preservation activity	43 Recognition and date
	O Tax certification O Other	O National Landmark O National Register
40	SHPO evaluation	O Georgia Register
41	appears to meet Nat. Reg. criteria USGS quadrangle name Athens West	O Local designation O HABS/HAER
	UTM reference	O Determination of eligibility
_	zone easting northing	O Other
42	Tax map number	
GEORGIA HISTORIC Historic Preservation Section Georgia Department of Natural Resources Atla 404/	RESOURCESResource No. CA-AH-77Butler Street, Suite 1462CountyInta, Georgia 30334656-2840	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	
<ul> <li>The instructions, see the Georgia Historic Resources Survey Manual Name(s) of resource President's House/Grant-Hill-White-Bradshaw House (2251)</li> <li>Address/location 570 Prince Ave. N side of Prince Av, second building W of Pope St and Second E of Grady. Athens</li> <li>Owner's name and mailing address UGA</li> <li>We building O Structure O Site O Object</li> <li>Landscape feature</li> <li>Representative example of building type Number represented</li> <li>Use, current single dwelling college-related housing original single dwelling</li> </ul>	2 Location map with North at top	
<ul> <li>8 Date of construction (or estimate) 1857 - 1858</li> <li>9 Major changes &amp; date (explain in No.25) O Altered O Moved &amp; Addition O Destroyed</li> <li>10 Architect/engineer/designer Unknown Contractor/builder/craftsman Unknown</li> <li>12 Style Greek Revival - high style</li> <li>13 Building type Georgian house</li> <li>14 Original Floor Plan central hallway (passage) - two rooms deep</li> <li>15 Plan shape rectangular</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16 Number of stories <i>Two</i></li> <li>17 Facade summetry &amp; front door(s) <i>symmetrical, one door</i></li> <li>18 Roof type &amp; material <i>metal - standing seam</i></li> <li>19 Chimney placement &amp; material <i>lateral interior - stuccoed masonry; three or more chimneys - stuccoed masonry</i></li> <li>20 Type of construction <i>mortise-and-tenon/brace frame</i></li> <li>21 Exterior material(s) <i>weatherboard/clapboard/beveled siding; flush board siding</i></li> <li>22 Foundation material(s) <i>brick continuous</i></li> <li>23 Porch(es) <i>wrap-around (front, 2 story, full, wood, hip); recessed (rear, 2 story, partial, wood, gable); balcony (front, 1 story, partial, wood, gable)</i></li> <li>24 Windows <i>double-hung sash (flat-headed, 6/6, rectangular); double-hung sash (flat-headed, 6/9, rectangular); doubl</i></li></ul>	
25 Additional physical description Raised basement. Five bay facade with center door. Sidelights and transom under flat entablature. Similar entablatures over windows. Porch covers the front and wraps around both sides. Corinthian columns. Wide entablature with dentils. "Welcoming arms" stairs in front added in 1949 as were rear porch and wings.	26 Negatives: roll # frames #	

Addition - 1949 - Rear wings and two-story porch designed by the firm Cooper,Bond, and Cooper.

#### Attach contact prints

Resource No. CA-AH-77								
28 Site plan with North at top								
32 Archaeological potential								
<ul> <li>34 Historical theme(s) architecture; landscape architecture</li> <li>35 Significance history - person (outstanding qualities) common architectural type (outstanding qualities) common architectural style (outstanding qualities) architectural design (outstanding qualities)</li> </ul>								
36 Sources of information Georgia Catalog secondary written 1, 8, 9, 27, 30, 33 Historic Houses of Athens secondary written 33 Garden History of Ga secondary written 1, 27, 30								
38 Date of survey 1992 resurvey								
<ul> <li>43 Recognition and date O National Landmark</li> <li>1970 Ø National Register - individual O Georgia Register O Local designation</li> <li>1934 Ø HABS/HAER - individual O Determination of eligibility O Other</li> </ul>								



Continuation Sheet

) dry-laid wall. Gazebo. Streetlamps in rear added c1949. Much of rear gardens dates to that year. Oak grove at exareme rear of lot.

36 Athens, a Pictorial Hist secondary written 33

, Dec. 193	900 - UNITED STATES 8) - NAT	COCPARTMENT OF T GONAL PARK SERVIC			Cao2	olia <u>gia</u>	<u>1</u> 27 8 111 /	
	NATIONAL REG NATIONAL REG	ISTER OF MISTO Y - NOMINATIO	DRIC PLACE NY FORM	5	CIC:		•	
	(Type all entries	- complete applie	cable sections)		En T	TURK		
1. NAL								
Con	NON-	······································	• •	~		-		1
	ULA NOPTA LA	TIDAZ - AUTA	OPSLUY CE	Georgi	C			1
AND	OH HISTOFIC:							
12 100	LTION .							1
STI	CET AND NUMBER:							
	Corner of Lu	mpkin and B	road Stre	ອດີຮ				
CIT	Y OR TOWN:		. n					
	Athens							
51 A	Coordina.	-	CODE CO	UNTY:		inaritainina m	CCU	2
	Georgia		12	Clarke			_05.0	
3. CL2.	SIFICATION	Î.			-			
	CATEGORY (Chuck Ope)	01	NERSHIP		STATUS		'IELE	
		Public MI	Dublin Annu Interne				U 3LI	
Site	Structure	Private	In Process		Occupied	E Tes.	tricted	
		Both	Being Consider		Ereservation work		restricted	
	Object _				in progress	C No:		
PRE	SENT USE (Check One of )	ore as Appropriate)		~				
Apri	cultural Governm	ent Deelr						
*		L Fair		1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	sportation	7 Com	nents	
I Cam	mercial - Inquistru	I Priva	ta Dogidanaa					
Educ	cotional XI Military	nI - 🗌 Priva	te Residence	Othe	r (Specify)-	]		_
Educ Educ	nercial 🗌 - Industria cotional 🕅 Military ertsinment 🗍 Museum	al Priva	te Residence ious tific	Othe	r (Specify)-			
Com Educ Ente	entioned I - Industria cotioned I Military relationment Museum	nI	te Residence ious tific	Othe	r (Specify)-			
Com Educ Ente 4. O'YNI	erional I - Industria mercial I Military ritainment I Museum ER OF PROPERTY TERS NAME:	al Priva	te Residence ious tific		r (Specify)-			
Com Educ Ente 4. OYNI F	EROF PROPERTY RESS NAME: Regents of the	University	te Residence ious tific System of?	Ceorgi	r (Specity)- [		1	
Cam Edu Ente 4. O'YN F	R OF PROPERTY Reas NAME: Cogents Of the EET AND NUMBER:	Il Priva Relig Scien	te Residence ious tific System off	Ceorgi	r (Specity)-			
Cam Edui Ente 4. O'YN F STR 2	ER OF PROPERTY REAS NAME: Regents of the EET AND NUMBER: Det Washington	Driversity	te Residence ious tific System off W.	Ceorgi	2			
	Reference in australization in Military A contract in Museum ER OF PROPERTY A contract in Museum ER OF PROPERTY A contract in Museum Contract in Museum Contrac	Driversity	te Residence ious tific System of W.	Creorgi	2		CODE	
Cam Edui Ente STR CITI	ROF PROPERTY Regents Of the EET AND NUMBER: DET AND	Driversity	te Residence ious tific System off W.	Georgi STATE: Georg	2 i 2 3033 ¹ ;		CODE 13	
4. OYNI STR 5. LOC	ATION OF LEGAL DESC	Priva Priva Relig Scien University Street, S.	te Residence ious tific System off W.	Georgi Georgi	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		CODE 13	Georg
Cam Edui Ente City STR City STR City STR City STR City City City City City City City City	ATION OF LEGAL DESC ATTON OF	Priva Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION RELOS, ETC: COURTBOULSE.	te Residence ious tific System of W.	Georgi Georgi	2 <u>12</u> 3033 ¹ <u>12</u> 3033 ¹		CODE 13	Georgia
Cam Edui Ente Sate STR CIT S. LOC	Rectain Military A Military Museum ER OF PROPERTY MERS NAME: Regents of the EET AND NUMBER: ATION OF LEGAL DESC RTHOUSE, REGISTRY OF C Clarke: County C EET AND NUMBER:	I Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION REEDS. ETC: Ourthouse,	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Book	Georgi Georgi Late: Georgi	2 <u>i a 3033</u> <u>es 83 an</u> c		CODE 13	Georgia
Cam Edui Ente STR Z CIT STR Z CIT STR CIT STR CIT STR	ATION OF LEGAL DESC BETAND NUMBER:	Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION REDUCTION COURTNOUSE,	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Book	Georgi Georgi L. pag	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	<u>-</u>	CODE 13	Georgia
Cam Edui Ente Sate STR CIT S. LOC CUT	ATION OF LEGAL DESC ATION OF LEGAL DESC BET AND NUMBER: Clanke: Clanke: County C EET AND NUMBER: COR TOWN:	Il Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION DEEDS. ETC: Ourthouse,	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Book	Georgi D. Dag	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 0 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	<u></u>	CODE 13	Georgia
Cam Edui Ente Sate Sate CIT STR CIT STR CIT	Athens	Il Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION RELOS, ETC: COURTHOUSE,	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Book	Georgi State Georgi State Georg	i e	<u> </u>	CODE 13 CODE	Georgia C1
Cam Edui Ente STR CIT STR CIT CUT CUT	Athens	Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION REEDS. ETC: OURTHOUSE,	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Boold	Georgi STATE: Georgi STATE: Georg	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	E 87	соре 13 соре 13	Georgia Clark
Cam Edui Ente Sate STR CIT S. LOC COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU C	ATION OF LEGAL DESC BET AND NUMBER: COR TOWN: CLANCE: COUNTY OF COR TOWN: CLANCE: COUNTY OF COR TOWN: CLANCE: COUNTY OF COR TOWN: ATION OF LEGAL DESC BITHOUSE, REGISTRY OF C COR TOWN: ATION OF LEGAL DESC BITHOUSE, REGISTRY OF C CONTONNE ATION OF LEGAL DESC ATION OF LEGAL DESC BITHOUSE, REGISTRY OF C CONTONNE ATION OF LEGAL DESC BITHOUSE, REGISTRY OF C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION REDS. ETC: OURTHOUSE, NOMINATED PROPER	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Boold	Ceorgi STATE: Georgi D. Dag	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 0 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	<u> </u>	CODE 13 CODE 13	Georgin Clarke
Cam Edui Ente STR CIT STR CIT S. LOC COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU C	ATION OF LEGAL DESC ATION OF	Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION DEEDS. ETC: COURTNOUSE, NOMINATED PROPER ING SURVEYS	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Book	Georgi STATE Georgi STATE Georg	<pre>spontation [] r (Specify)- [] 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3</pre>	<u> </u>	CODE 13 CODE 13	Georgin Clarke
Cam Edui Ente STR CIT STR CIT STR CIT CUT CUT COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU	Athens RESENTATION IN BLAST RESENTATION IN BLAST	Priva Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION DEEDS. ETC: COURTNOUSE, NOMINATED PROPER ING SURVEYS Can Buildin	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Book TY: SEVE g Survey	Ceorgi STATE Georgi STATE Georg STATE Georg	<pre> ing two </pre>	5 87	CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE	Georgia Clarke
Cam Edui Ente Sate CITA STR CITA STR CITA CITA COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU	ATION OF LEGAL DESC BET AND NUMBER: ATION OF LEGAL DESC BET AND NUMBER: ATION OF LEGAL DESC BETHOUSE, REGISTRY OF C DIATION OF LEGAL DESC BETHOUSE DESC BETHOUSE	Decos. erc: Ourthouse, NOAINATEC PROPER ING SURVEYS Can Buildin	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Boold TY: SEVE g Survey Federal M	Ceorgi STATE: Georgi STATE: Georgi State Ceorgi	<b>E E E E E E E E E E</b>	E 87	code 13 code 13 code 13 cures)	Georgin Clarke
Cam Edui Ente Sate CIT STR CIT S. LOC COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU C	ATION OF LEGAL DESC BET AND NUMBER: COR TOWN: ATION OF LEGAL DESC BITHOUSE, REGISTRY OF C COR TOWN: ATION OF LEGAL DESC BITHOUSE, REGISTRY OF C ATION OF LEGAL DESC ATION OF LEGAL DESC AT	Priva Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION DECOS. ETC: OURTHOUSE, NOMINATED PROPER ING SURVEYS Can Buildin 1930 COMDS:	te Residence ious tific System of Wo Deed Book TY: SEVE E SURVey Federal 21	COVET	<b>E E E E E E E E E E</b>	E 87	CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE	Georgin Clarke
Cam Edui Ente Sate CIT STR CIT S. LOC COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU C	ATION OF LEGAL DESC ATION OF LEGAL DESC BETAND NUMBER: COR TOWN: COR TOWN: COR TOWN: COR TOWN: COR TOWN: COR TOWN: COR TOWN: ATION OF LEGAL DESC BTHOUSE, REGISTRY OF C COR TOWN: ATHONS, REGISTRY OF C ESENTATION IN SAIST E OF SURVEY: 1934- OSITORY FOR SURVEY RE LIDRATY OF CC	Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION Street, S. RIPTION Street, S. Curthouse, NOMINATED PROPER ING SURVEYS Can Euildin 1935	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Book TY: SEVE g Survey Federal M	Ceorgi STATE: Georgi D. Dag STATE: Georgi State Cover State	<pre> i a 3033¹;  es 83 and  i a:  ing two a  County [] </pre>	2 87 2 87	CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE	Georgin Clarke
Cam Edui Edui Ente STR CIT STR CIT STR CIT CUT COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU	ATION OF LEGAL DESC ATION OF	Priva Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION DEEDS. ETC: COUNTROUSE, NOMINATED PROPER ING SURVEYS Can Buildin 1935 COMDS: DEFOSS	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Book TY: SEVE <u>E Survey</u> Federal M	Ceorgi STATE: Georgi STATE: Georgi STATE: Georgi State Cover State	<pre> ing two County </pre>	2 87 	CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE	Georgia Clarke
Cam Edui Ente Sate CIT STR CIT STR CIT STR CIT COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU COU	Athens Resentation in Ender Athens Resentation in Ender Athens Resentation in Ender Athens Resentation in Ender Athens Resentation in Ender Historic Amori Story for Survey at Library of Co Ender And Number: Athens Resentation in Ender Historic Amori Athens Resentation in Ender Contown Athens Resentation in Ender Contown Contown Contown Athens Resentation in Ender Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Contown Conto	Priva Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION DEEDS. ETC: OURTHOUSE, NOMINATED PROPER ING SURVEYS Can Euildin 1935 CO405: NGTOSS	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Book TY: SEVE g Survey Federal M	Creorgi Georgi State: Georgi State: Georgi State Georg	i a 30334 i a 3034 i a 3044 i a 3044	5 87	CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE	Georgia Clarke
Cam Edui Ente Sate CIT CIT CIT CIT CIT CIT CIT CIT CIT CIT	Athens RESENTATION IN EAST RESENTATION IN EAST RESENTATION IN EAST RESENTATION IN EAST RESENTATION IN EAST BISTOPIC ADDIS RESENTATION IN EAST RESENTATION IN EAST RESENT	Priva Relig Scien University Street, S. RIPTION Street, S. Curthouse, NOMINATEC PROPER ING SURVEYS Can Buildin 1936 CORDS: ngress	te Residence ious tific System of W. Deed Boold TY: SEVE g Survey Federal 21	COVER STATE	<b>2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3</b>	E 87	CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CODE 13 CO	Georgin Clarke

C	1	٠
0		,

•

	PENOD COULD One or	More on Appen	(Intr)				
•	Pre Columbian		16th Century	( )			
	15th Century		17th Century		18th Centur	y [_]	20th Century
			in Century		19th Centur	Y LXI	•
	SPECIFIC DATES (11,	Applicable and	Known) C.	1801 -	1903		
	AREAS OF SIGNIFICANO	CE (Check On	or store as A	ppropriate)			
	Aboriginal	Ed.	cation (	TX I	Political	· ·	
•	Prehistoric	Eng	incering [		Religion/Phi-		Uiban Planning
	Historic	Ind	ustry f	· ·	losonhy		Uther (Specify)
	_* Agriculture	. Invi	ention	7 -	Science		Angleit
-	• · · · · Art : · · · ·	- Lor	idscope .	- · ·	Sculpture		Arenitecture
	Commerce		Architecture [	Y	Social/W		
	Communications			- <u>~</u> . '	Sociol/ Human-		
	Conservation	- Mili			ITORION		
		Mus	ic [		heater .		
			L		Ironsportation		
	STATENENT DE SIGNIE	テトンウテチ (4454)	Personne	s. Dates, E	vents, Etc.)		
	act creating	the Imi	Ulg UII	e Geor	grs regi	slatur	e passed an
	first station	hontone	Versity	OI GO	orgia, r	aking :	it Americals
	not mtil 16	Tertere	u unive	TEL UT.	Due to	troub	Led times it was
S	five merihone	Jears 1	ater the	atian	actual s	ite was	5 selected by
Z	Daniel Faclor	or the	Denatus	Acade	micus an	d purch	lised from
0	of the non-	· Lue t	o a sho:	rtage	of state	funds.	one neither
Que10	and donated +	bo man	illedge	, purc	hased 63	3 acres	5 from Easler
<u> </u>	and donated l	ne prop	erty to	the U	niversit	y's Boa	rd of Trusteas
*	to become Com	electin	g the p	ropert	y with M	illedge	Nuo vas lator
0	Vo become Gov	ernor o	r Georgi	ia, we	re forme	r Gover	nor George
⊃ .	Rolding a Sig	ner of	the Dec.	larati	on of In	devende	ace. Abraham
Ω:	basama il a	_ ilrst	presider	nt of	the Univ	ersity	and laton to
5-	Decome U. D.	Denator	, John 1	lwiggs	, and Hu	sh Laws	The contine
	Ment unen proc	eeded to	o lay ou	at lot	s for a	town to	the north and
01	west of the a	rea sel	ected fo	or a II	square o	f the r	niversitull and
Z .	commissioned	the con	structio	on of	Old Coll	ere. +1	o first rame
	nent building	• In D	cember	1805.	the Uni	Vorci +u	Te LISC Derman
	corporated th	e town,	naming	it At	hens in	bonon o	f the endine
LL I	classical cen	ter in (	lreece.				the anclent
ш	By 1830, A	thens, a	as the h	iome o	? the Th	izoncił	
S	acknowledged	cultural	center	of G	enrain a		y, was the
1	tinguished Ge	orgians	both as	s tead	lere and		acted mony dis-
	the years, th	e Üniver	sity co	ntrih	itod loo	TRATCE	nus. Inrough
	the nation;	Alexande	er Stenh	inne .	Man Pina	Lers to	the state and
	eracy, and Cr	awford V	Tong	di co	ATCG-LLG	slaent	of the Confed-
	roommates in (	Old Coll	ere: Bo	hent l	Jver or a	mesthe	sia, vere
	of State of t	le Confr	devo m	UST.C.		J.S. Se	nator and Sec.
	Senator respon	asible f	or the	and a	Den Jamm	Harvey	Hill, U.S.
	Georgia, proc	ticed or		earry	end of 1	rederal	occupation of
	Stephens Vas		ho fam	11 L/GEI(	Ostheniar	1 Hall;	Alexander
	and campaigned			laers (	DI Phi Ka	ippa Li	terary Society
	Hall. Other		ure in	10.5 101	the cor	istruct	ion of Phi Kappa
	kin finct on		incers o	n Phi	RSDDS Me	ere Jos	peh Henry Lunp-
	R P Cabb	Lei just	ice of	the Ge	orgia Su	lpreme	Court. Gon. T.
	R Pressing at	ia Henry	Gra Gra	dy. 1	Iumi su	ich as	the late Richard
	Do AUSSOLL, IC	prmon Go	Vornor	and U.	S. Senat	tor hav	e continual to
	ninuë uonor fo	o the Un	iversit	y's no	ine.		
	Uld Korth (	Janpus r	emained	the d	enter of	the T	niversity until
1	voll into the			1.7 7 -			a mach Jonson
			the stan				
1	Contraction of the		مرد عام المراجع المراجعة من المراجعة م مراجعة من المراجعة من المراج	• • • • • •			
C	ni changing taste	s anudst	a peanti	ful al		7.0	
L					carry det	ined firm	trict.
				Statistic Laboration Statistics	and the second se		

5

22 1 v

•

Z

DUNCRIPTION	
1	(Check One)
CONDITION	Excellent 🖸 Good 🗍 Fair 🗋 Deteriorated 🗍 Ruins 🗍 Unexposed []
INTEODITY	(Check One) (Check One)
INTEORITI	Aitered [] Unaltered [] Moved [] Original Site 21
DESCHIDE THE P	HESENT AND ORIGINAL (IL KNOWN) PHYSICAL APPEARANCE
Th	e location of the university of Georgia gave birth to
the C	Sty of Athens. Symbolic of this "partnership" is the
locat	ion of the University of Georgia's Old Morth Compas at
the s	outhern terminus of College ivenue, major thoroughlane [
OI II	hens' contral business districts Located at the terminal
of Co	llege Avenue is the Arch, symbolic gate to the wilverblue
South	na: The Arch, cast in iron and crected in 1090, is a
repli	.ca of the Great Seal of Georgia and is supported by
three	columns which symbolize, " iscom, Justice, and Decorde
tion	" the State Nottoy The Arch 15 Tianked on elthor Elde
by an	1 ornata iron fance, also erected in 1090, which serves
asti	he boundary of Old North Campus. Fassing through the
Arch	, the observer notes a Georgia Elstorical Commission
marka	er regarding the founding of the University on the left
and,	on the right, ancient years which are scions of those at
Gene	ral Uglethorpe's ancestral estate in England. Michael
the 1	property, buildings are arranged to form two quadrangies.
The I	aorth quadrangle is """ snaped with its northern eid
open	to the city beyond. The southern boundary is formed by
010 (	College, constructed as the lirst permanent structure
betw	een 1801-05. The south quadrangle is located interlated
beni	nd Uld College and 15 Completely enclosed with stratted
some	OI WAICH are OI ALSUDILE SIGNITUANCES I UMILE ENDED
01a	NOTTH CAMPUS. IS located at the intersection of support
and	Broad Directs, within this area and the Burdood of Corrects
raue	a trom broad burdet by a greensward, incov uncer alter,
ohan	retering of the envesion tovering oaks, magnolias, and elms
Diar	and walks or secross the quadrangles and the greens-
DIAS	to provide predestrian circulation pathways.
Stan	to provide peces aller all sales flemish bond brickwork
0010	it a lintels, sills, and stringcourses, characterize this
gr cui	e-story structure placed over a half basement. Granite
sten	is ascend to twin entrances from both quadrangles. With
175	low-pitched gable roof and decorative cornices, this
buil	ding is of the Federal style. (2) Waddel Hall, 1820. This
sim	le two-story whitewashed brick structure features six-
over	-six windows and a recessed doorway behind an arched
open	ling. Federal. (3) New College, 1822-23, 1832. Burned and
re-c	constructed, this structure is similar in scale to Old
Coll	lege with three stories and a gable roof. While the
sinc	the entrance and the window sashes have been modified,
this	building manages to retain its Federal feeling. (+) De-
most	thenich Hall, 1824. Two-story studio over brick with a
Pai	ladion window on the second floor above an archel cool day
com	plete with fan and sidelights. Nine-over-nine windows.
Cei	ling of upstairs meeting room features decorative molding
rnd.	modallion, Federal, Recorded by HAES, 1934-36. (5)
The	Changel, 1832, A six-columned Doric portico with pediment
1110	ve represents the traditional temple form of the Greak
ELU Bat	ivel. The rain freede is relieved only the large (COLL.)

-(July 1/07)	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE	Georgia	
	NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PEACES	COUNTY	
	INVESTORY - NORMATERIA FOR A	Clarke .	
		FOR NIS USE CALY	
	(Continuation Sirect)	ENTRY NUMBER DI	ATC
(NJEDOF all critic	2.)		

#### 7. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

double-doored entrance balanced with two lesser doors on either side. The focal point of the interior is a 17 by 23 1/2 foot one-point perspective painting of the interior of St. Peter's Cathedral, painted by George Cook (1783-1857) and given to the University in 1867 by Daniel Pratt, an architect noted for his works in the Milledgeville area. (6) Phi Kappa Hall, 1836. Brick, two-story Greek Revival structure with a four-columned Doric portico complete with pediment. Recorded by HABS, 1936. (7) Lustrat House, 1847. Two-story, red brick with stone lintels and sills. Hipped rcof. One-story pedimented portico with square columns. Entrance way tabeated with traditional lights above and on the sides. Central hallway separating two rooms on each side, first and second floor. The lower floor houses a portion of the Ilah Dunlap Little collection of family paintings and 18th and 19th century furnishings which include a rosewood set in the style of John Belter and a pair of antique French crystal-and-bronze chandeliers. (8) Moore College, 1874. A gift to the University from the City of Athens, this structure is of the Second Empire style exhibiting quoins, arched windows, and a mansard roof complete with dormer windows. This stucco over brick structure has a high basement with two stories above topped with the mansard roof. The arched double-door entrance-way is especially fine. (9) Academic Building, 1903. Formed by the joining of two older buildings - the Ivy Building (1832) and the Library (1859) - the major feature of this structure is a portico with Corinthian columns which soar upward for three stories to climax with an entablature whose frieze is decorated with garlands and other decorative motifs of the Neo-Classical style. An open stairway connects porches at each floor level. Stucco over brick has a rusticated pattern relieved by pilasters featuring Corinthian capitals. Windows have single pane sashes and are ornamented with entablatures.

MAJOR BINLIGORAPHICAL REPERENCES S.

> Manyon, Mary Bondunont, Withensy His Danliest Mistory, W Rom on the its tens Mistorneel Socia iv. Athene: Athene Histoirad Lociety, 1964.

 Hull, Augustus Longstreet, <u>A Misteriari Statch of the Uni</u> sity of Georgia. Atlanta: the Foote and Favles Company, Hull, Augustus Longstreet, <u>Scores</u> of Athana, Coperio 1901 Athans: Banner Job Office, 1905.
 Nichels, Frederick Doveton, <u>Fauly Architecture of Georgia</u> シンシー

Nichols, Frederick Doveton, <u>Faily Architectune of Georgic</u> Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1927.

#### 10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE COORDINATES LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE COORDINATES C DEFINING THE CENTER POINT OF A PROPERTY DEFINING A RECTANGLE LOCATING THE PROPERTY - OF LESS THAN ONE ACRE 2 CORNER LATITUCE LONGITUDE LATITUDE LONGITUDE Degreus Minutes Seconds Degrees Minutes Seconds Degrees Minutes Seconds Dagrees Minutes Seconds 57 · 26 · 57 · 28 · 83° 22' 33' 83° 22' 29' 33° 0 NW . 0 83° 22. 33° NE 57. 18 -83. 22. 25----33° SE 83. 15 SW 30 22. 33 -LIST ALL STATES AND COUNTIES FOR PROPERTIES OVERLAPPING STATE OR COUNTY BOUNDARIES STATE: CODE COUNTY CODE STATE: CODE COUNTY: CODE STATE: CODE COUNTY: CODE STATE: CODE COUNTY: CODE

11. FORM PREPARED BY

NAME AND TITLE: John C. Waters, President

ORGANIZATION DATE Athens-Clarke Heritage Foundation June 2, 1971 ÷ STREET AND NUMBER: P. 0. Box 5671

Georgia 30601: CITY OF TOWN: Athens

#### 12. STATE LIAISON OFFICER CERTIFICATION NATIONAL REGISTER VERIFICATION

As the designated State Liaison Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665). I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the National Park Service. The recommended level of significance of this nomination is:

National State Local Date ATTEST: State Liaison Officer Title June 23, 1971 Date Date

I hereby certify that this property is included in the 'National Register.

ĩ

CODE

Chief, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation

Keeper of The Kational Register



The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

# School of Environmental Design Class Project (D.W. Brooks Drive Pedestrian Promenade)

F:\2\Appendix\School of Environmental Design Class Project.doc



Not to Scale 10/9/98

The University of Georgia School of Environmental Design Summer 1998 Class Project Faculty Advisor: Leonardo Alvarez

### D.W. Brooks Drive Pedestrian Promenade

**The University of Georgia Physical Master Plan** Appendix Figure

#### **Executive Summary**

This report details the development of a design for the conversion of D. W. Brooks Drive into a pedestrian promenade. A group of seven University of Georgia School of Environmental Design (SED) students undertook this project under the direction of SED professor Leonardo Alvarez. After weeks of research, analysis, and design, the finished product is a design that meets the goals of the University of Georgia's campus master plan and would be a valuable improvement to the campus.

The project team began the design process by taking an inventory of the existing site conditions. We used existing information sources, such as maps of the campus, and also visited the site to gather information. We also took note of the goals stated by the University in its master plan and the vision for the D.W. Brooks Drive area, as developed by the campus planning team.

Based upon the knowledge gained from the inventory, we analyzed the existing site conditions, determining what opportunities and constraints the site offered.

We then developed a list of goals for the design of the D. W. Brooks Drive area. These goals grew from the goals in the University's campus master plan. An important decision was that D. W. Brooks Drive should have the urban feel of a pedestrian promenade, while incorporating as much green space as possible. The rest of our goals are listed below, following the University's goal with which the correlate.

- Create the optimal student environment.
  - Make walking through the D. W. Brooks Pedestrian Promenade an educational experience by including features that show that University faculty and students do inside the buildings surrounding D. W. Brooks Drive.
  - Provide areas for students to socialize and study.
  - Celebrate the accomplishments of University of Georgia faculty and students.
  - Integrate art with the landscape.
  - Encourage pedestrians to get off the main path and appreciate the landscape around them.
- Extend the characteristics of North Campus.
  - Blend the traditional aesthetic of North Campus with the contemporary aesthetic of South Campus.
  - Create carefully proportioned spaces that please the eye.

- Use traditional materials that are common on North Campus.
- Develop a connected campus.
  - Eliminate automobile, bus, and bicycle traffic from D.
     W. Brooks Drive, creating a safe walking environment.
  - Emphasize the connections to the rest of campus.
- Define and provide for the current and future facility needs.
  - Provide space for outdoor classes, lectures, presentations and performances.
- Develop comprehensive solutions to traffic, parking, and infrastructure.
  - Keep pedestrians separated from automobiles and bicycles.
  - Provide access to D. W. Brooks Drive for emergency vehicles.
  - Design the pedestrian promenade to be handicapped accessible.
  - Provide sufficient lighting for safe passage through the area at night.
  - Provide access for service vehicles to all buildings.
  - Provide limited parking, accessed from streets other than D. W. Brooks Drive, near the buildings in the area.
  - Provide the opportunity for alumni to continue to use D.
     W. Brooks Drive for tailgate parties on football game days.
- Protect and enhance natural resources.
  - Use permeable paving materials to increase storm water infiltration.
  - Use plants native to this region.

Other goals formulated by the project team were to recall the history of the D. W. Brooks Drive area in the design for the pedestrian promenade and to use native plants and hardscape materials to emphasize the regional context of the pedestrian promenade.

After deciding upon the goals for the design, we proceeded to design the D. W. Brooks Drive Pedestrian Promenade. The walk down the D. W. Brooks Drive Pedestrian Promenade that we created provides a variety of experiences while maintaining visual and thematic unity.

Entering the promenade from the south side, where it intersects with Carlton Street, one sees large granite spheres and cubes marking

the entrance. Concrete sidewalks are on both sides of a wide central path paved with Eco-Stone pavers. Planters flush to the pavement line both sides of that central path. They are filled with trees that shade the path and help frame the space. Benches at the ends of the planters provide places to sit and study or converse with a friend. This combination of Eco-Stone pavers, concrete sidewalks, tree filled planters, and benches is the typical scene along the promenade.

A short distance up the path is the student union plaza. A clock tower and a new student union building sit on the left. Concrete bands crisscrossing brick pavers mark this plaza as one of the special places along the promenade. Students can sit in the shade of a tree in the plaza and enjoy the lunch they bought inside the student union building. On the right, near the Miller Plant Sciences Building, is a granite outcrop surrounding a planter. A stage connected to the outcrop provides a space for public presentations.

The next special place is in front of the Physical Education Building. An amphitheater featuring a granite outcrop behind the stage, granite retaining walls, and grass seating areas turns the minds of alumni back to the days when another amphitheater provided a place for outdoor performances and lectures on South Campus. Trees provide shade for the spectators in the amphitheater and help enclose the space.

After returning to more of the typical promenade for a few hundred feet, one notices the brick pavers again. This is the Boyd Science Plaza. Opposite the Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, it is a monument to the great scientists who have been affiliated with the University of Georgia. Here, people can walk along the granite wall and read about Dr. Eugene Odum, the father of modern ecology, plus numerous others who have made major contributions to the sciences.

After leaving the Boyd Science Plaza, the promenade continues to its terminus. This ending point is Conner Hall. Once fronted by a parking lot, it now rests within a large lawn where people may find a spot in the grass to lie down and read a book or get a few minutes of sun between classes.

We feel this proposal, if implemented, would significantly enhance the quality of life on South Campus. It would make this part of campus a place where people want to spend time—a place as memorable and enjoyable as North Campus.

(fi) The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

B.

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

## School of Veterinary Medicine

- Request for consideration of a Major Academic A. **Capital Project** 
  - "White Paper" concerning Veterinary Teaching Hospital space issues

F:\2\Appendix\School of Veterinary Medicine.doc



Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance

May 21, 1998

JUN 1 1998 AYERS / SAINT / GROSS, INC.

Dean Keith W. Prasse College of Veterinary Medicine Veterinary Medicine

Dear Dean Prasse:

I thought that we had a very productive meeting yesterday and focused on some specific steps to develop with a plan for the facility needs for the College of Veterinary Medicine.

We discussed the 1996 College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences FLU Task Force as a model for you to consider as a way to develop a facility master plan for the college. Your memorandum dated March 17, 1998, to me includes a lot of good information which supports the need for a major study. Up to the present, the University has been placing at great cost new facilities on the current site and it would seem to me that the movement of the entire college to a new off-campus site is probably out of question at this time for the reasons we discussed.

Your paper makes the point that there seems to be no question but that if the College of Veterinary Medicine is to continue on an equal footing with its peers, there is going to have to be a movement of some part of the college to another location; there simply is not room at the current location for the kind of expansion that is needed. I suggest that there is a need for specific discussion about this point as opposed to general statements of need in a facility plan for the College of Veterinary Medicine.

I am sending a copy of your memorandum dated March 17 along with a copy of this letter to Mr. Adam Gross for his information and reference.

Sincerely,

Allan W. Barber Vice President for Business and Finance

CC: Mr. Robert E. Bugbee Mr. Daniel Sniff Mr. Adam Gross



Office of the Dean

College of Veterinary Medicine

Athens, Georgia 30602-7371 (706) 542-3461 Fax (706) 542-8254

March 17, 1998

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Allan Barber Vice President for Business & Finance

FROM: Keith W. Prasse K Dean

RE: Request for consideration of a Major Academic Capital Project

The College of Veterinary Medicine requests consideration of a major facility need, the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital. Our purpose for this memorandum is to bring this need to the attention of the University Administration. A complete plan is not in place, and we ask your advice regarding steps to take in further planning. We propose that a new Teaching Hospital be added to the University list of requests for Major Capital Projects, but an estimate of probable cost will require more planning.

A "white paper," attached, describes the current status of hospital space and use. We have outgrown the current Teaching Hospital.

A location for a proposed new hospital isn't determined. College faculty must be involved in determination of location, but University officials and planners are sought to assist in this discussion. Consideration must be given to client access from the Athens By-Pass, client traffic and access around the building itself, availability of adjacent outdoor space for animal holding or handling, and access to the University transit system. Consideration must be given to the ties with other College and University facilities and programs.

The College invested in an engineering study to determine the feasibility of adding floors above the existing hospital. Whereas the original construction was based on a design that would accommodate such additions, changes in state regulations governing construction now make this addition more difficult and costly. Adding floors also would solve few of the problems implied in the white paper. The final report of the engineering firm has just been received and is under study.

A - E ---- I O------ /A E ---- A --

Page 2

The Master Planning group may have an awareness of this issue, but we have not had a specific discussion with them about the hospital need.

jo

Enclosure

cy: Vice President William F. Prokasy Mr. Daniel E. Sniff

# Veterinary Teaching Hospital Space Issues

The Veterinary Teaching Hospital is the public center of our College of Veterinary Medicine. It is the principal clinical teaching laboratory for veterinary students, interns, and residents. It is a laboratory for clinical investigation of naturally occurring diseases and the testing place for new diagnostic and therapeutic approaches. University-based veterinary teaching hospitals are the top of the pyramid for veterinary health care systems. Just as the teaching hospitals at the Medical College of Georgia and Emory University are viewed by Georgia citizens as providing them access to the newest and best in medicine, animal owners and practicing veterinarians expect the Veterinary Teaching Hospital to provide expertise and advancing technology that are unavailable in the private sector.

Specialization

Increasingly, our Veterinary Teaching Hospital is compromised by inadequate facilities. Advances in the practice of veterinary medicine and expectation for services exceed the capacity of our hospital building. The current Teaching Hospital building, completed in 1979, absorbed tremendous advances in the biomedical sciences, which necessitated the development of additional clinical specialties: clinical oncology, specialized small animal and equine surgery (including laparoscopy, arthroscopy, and laser surgery), veterinary dentistry, cardiology, and exotic animal medicine. The increase in number and expansion of disciplines continues. The animal owning public expects and demands these changes.

Faculty, Staff, and Students Since 1979, clinical faculty and staff have increased by fifty percent, largely as a consequence of increased specialization. In some parts of the hospital, students, staff, and faculty are literally elbow to elbow as they attempt to deliver healthcare efficiently while maintaining a learning environment for the students. It is likely that the number of enrolled veterinary students will increase as the College attempts to meet burgeoning societal demands for veterinary services. By almost every measure of activity, workload in the Teaching Hospital is expanding.

Technology

The change that has placed the greatest strain on the physical facilities of the hospital is the explosive growth of technology. Since 1979, ultrasonography, nuclear scintigraphy, and cobalt cancer therapy, all of which require substantial dedicated space, have been introduced into the Teaching Hospital. Today, computed tomography (CT scanning), and nuclear magnetic resonance imaging are expected and can only be provided in mobile trailers in the parking lot or unsatisfactory locations in other buildings. Because some of the new diagnostic and therapeutic tools had to be installed in a separate building, faculty and students frequently must place an anesthetized horse weighing over one thousand pounds on a cart, push it out of the hospital, across a parking lot, and into that building for treatment.

Accessibility

Another change that has compromised the function of the Teaching Hospital is the restriction of available space around the perimeter of the building. Traffic patterns and parking areas for clients and service vehicles were designed at the time of construction of the current hospital. Client traffic has greatly increased, the size and length of large animal vans have increased, and current construction has complicated traffic and parking. The large animal parking lot often approaches gridlock as animal owners attempt to unload their animals for medical treatment or pick them up to return home. Expansion of equine case load and greater emphasis on recuperative techniques that utilize paddocks are added stresses to the space needs around the perimeter of the hospital.

Impact on recruiting

Search for solutions

An emerging effect of the inadequate hospital facility is its impact on our ability to recruit and retain clinical faculty. A well-designed hospital with the latest in diagnostic and therapeutic technology is a powerful recruiting tool; a hospital that is viewed as crowded with outdated equipment has the opposite effect.

We are taking several steps to assess our current situation and future facilities needs. We are surveying all colleges of veterinary medicine in the United States regarding their teaching hospitals. Although we have received responses from only one-third of the U.S. colleges thus far, the teaching hospitals in all of the responding colleges are larger than ours; the median size of those hospitals exceeds that of our current hospital by one hundred fifty-four percent. We have also authorized an engineering study to evaluate the potential for adding additional floors to the existing hospital building as a stopgap measure. Lastly, we have begun internal discussions regarding the advantages and disadvantages of relocating the Teaching Hospital to a site on or near campus.

The last two decades have seen dramatic changes in the sophistication of veterinary medicine and consumer expectations for veterinary healthcare. The Veterinary Teaching Hospital has adapted to meet these challenges. Increasingly, we are encountering limits to the adaptations that the physical facilities will allow. For the Teaching Hospital to remain the leader in delivery of basic and advanced veterinary care, to prepare professional students to serve society, and to expand the knowledge base in veterinary medicine, the physical facility must change to accommodate these challenges.

The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

#### P0/23/98

Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming

Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

# College of Environmental Sciences (CAES) Information on Proposed Agricultural Land Consolidation

This proposal is a result of Recommendation #1 of the CAES FLUTF Report of 5/98, in an effort to increase efficiency in the use of CAES resources.

#### Additional Notes:

Ideally, the new farm would consist of 2,500 to 2,700 contiguous acres and a potential location has been found in Oconee County just to the Southwest of Bishop, Georgia. This potential site consists of parcels varying in size and ownership. The two largest parcels are 1100 acres and 800 acres, each separately owned. A remaining 900 acres is split into eight various sized parcels, each separately owned. Dr. Clifton emphasized the fact that, although they are pursuing this agreement, there is no certainty that the purchase will happen. Funding for the purchase and for new facilities are not fixed, but a number of different options have been outlined in the attached document. It is also of some concern that any public knowledge of this proposal will inflate prices in the area, due to land speculation, and that the information contained herein be treated sensitively.

F:\2\Appendix\AG Land Consolidation.doc

#### CAES Main Campus Master Plan Development Research and Education Learning Center July 1, 1998

Mr. Chatham's suggestions for presentation:

- 1) Presentation needs additional background. State what is wrong with facilities from the teaching and research perspective, such as environmental (waste) and social (urbanization).
- 2) The Four Options With the College being the primary institution, state the best option and then outline your goals. Be flexible. Once statement Mr. Chatham used and recommended was "Consolidate for efficiency and economy."
- Research where the College rates in relation to other colleges of agriculture "benchmarking" – What are our current operations like in comparison to other colleges? Know what your competition is/has.
- 4) Remember industry. Reinforce why the College is still needed, as well as why improved facilities are needed. Not everyone understands the importance of strong teaching and research facilities 0 reinforce what you already know.
- 5) Prepare to propose a partnership with the community/local government that you wish to deal with. Keep in mind zoning issues, local land use control, and what will happen in two years once new leadership takes over. Will your land still be "safe" in twenty years?
- 6) Take out "state-of-the-art".... replace with "modern" or other adjective.

- Research and Education Learning Center
  - ➤ Vision
    - Creation of a modern agricultural and environmental sciences learning center at The University of Georgia.
  - ➤ Context
    - Colleges of Agriculture nationally are revamping facilities to take advantage of new technology and advanced learning capabilities.

The College's Statewide Experiment Station & Extension Network
Mountain Station
Northwest Georgia Branch Station
Administrative Headquarters 🕥 College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences Athens
Rock Eagle Center Central Georgia Branch Station Georgia Station, Criffin
Southeest Georgia Branch Station, Midwile
Southwest Georgia Branch
•
Attapulgus Research Farm
🖈 Main Experiment Station 🔺 Branch Station 🔹 Extension Center

- Current Situation
  - College facilities used in support of research and extension are scattered in Clarke, Oconee, and surrounding counties

- Current facilities lie in the path of urbanization.
- The Wilkes Farm in Oglethorpe County is far too distant to be used effectively in supporting an integrated learning center.
- Animal research at the College's South Milledge sites is incompatible with University and community growth and development.



- > Goal
  - Create an integrated agricultural and environmental sciences teaching, research and extension unit to support learning experiences of both undergraduates and graduates.
- Rationale
  - Competitiveness in agriculture and environmental sciences demands that agricultural higher education must continue to develop effective, integrated and technically strong facilities for the 21st Century.
  - The learning center concept as proposed is consistent with and complements the University Master Plan.
  - Urbanization patterns near the University campus continue to raise land use compatibility issues.
  - Environmental issues and concerns are growing in agriculture, and certainly for teaching, research, and outreach programs.

- Georgia agriculture is demanding an emphasis on student-friendly learning and support systems that deliver society-and-job-ready graduates to support the industry.
- A comprehensive learning center has potential to enhance cross-college and unit cooperation.
- ➢ Benefits
  - A comprehensive learning center will anchor work going on in Athens, Tifton, and Griffin, as well as field research and demonstrations conducted at the nine branch stations across Georgia.
  - Through a comprehensive approach, the College can gain economic efficiencies operating a single center facility instead of multiple units.
- ➢ Scope
  - With prospects for increased real estate prices growing more complex in the Athens area, this is the best time to address these needs.
  - The College envisions that it can create a learning center by phasing-in along one of four options.
- > The Four Options Are:
  - Sell the Wilkes Farm, Sam's Farm, part of the Attapulgus Unit, Horticulture Farm, Agronomy Farm and Calhoun land (sold) and purchase sufficient land to combine all functions into a College Research and Education Learning Center.
  - Sell the Wilkes Farm, Sam's Farm, part of the Attapulgus Unit and Calhoun land (sold) and purchase sufficient land to develop a learning center for animal programs exclusively.
  - Purchase adequate land for all components, but do not sell the Horticulture and Agronomy farms or develop new components at present. Delay development to some time in the future.
  - Use current funds from the Calhoun land sale to purchase one tract to relocate the Swine Operation from South Milledge Avenue.

#### Action Plan

- Phase I
  - Under Phase I, the Wilkes Farm and a portion of the Attapulgus Unit would be sold. Funds from these sales, along with the money on hand from the sale of land in Calhoun, would be used toward the purchase of new lands. These dollars, along with a small capital appropriation, would be used to purchase 2,500 contiguous acres in the near vicinity of the campus.
    - Sell: Wilkes Farm, Attapulgus Unit, Calhoun Land
    - Purchase: Sufficient land to combine all functions.
- Phase II
  - Under Phase II, major efforts will be undertaken toward developing infrastructure for the Research and Education Learning Center. Also, beef and swine facilities will be constructed.
    - Sell: Wilkes Farm, Sam's Farm, Attapulgus Unit (partial), Calhoun land

- Purchase/Build: Infrastructure, Beef and Swine facilities, Horticulture and Agronomy facilities
- ➢ Phase III
  - Under Phase III, additional lands will be sold, leased lands released, and facilities completed.
    - Purchase/Build: Horse Facilities, Swine Facilities

Ē																			
The University of Georgia	т	е	с	h	n	i	с	а	I	М	е	m	0	r	а	n	d	u	m

Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

# University of Georgia Sign System Guidelines

 $F:\2\Appendix\Sign\ Guidelines.doc$ 



Sign System Guidelines

#### Foreword

In 1967 Professor Ron Arnholm of the Department of Art designed a sign system for the University of Georgia campus. The system, based on Prof. Arnholm's newly released typeface, "Aquarius #5", won the Silvet Award from the University and College Designers Association in 1975. Both contemporary and classical, the system provided a distinct, functional, yet unobtrusive information system for a complex campus spanning nearly 200 years of development.

In 1997 Dexter Adams and Bernard Brantley of UGA Physical Plant, realizing that the original guidelines for governing the system were in danger of becoming obsolete due to the size and increasing complexity of the modern campus, asked Prof. Ken Williams of the Lamar Dodd School of Art to assess the original system and reformulate the guidelines governing the expanded system. The following guidelines will hopefully retain the essence of the original system while providing guidance to present and future architects, campus planners and sign designers.

Prof. Williams was assisted by Scott Hodges, a senior graphic design major, in this project, especially in the assessment stage.

#### <u>Section 1.</u> General Description

The directional and informational sign system in place at The University of Georgia consists of painted dimensional metal signs supported by vertical metal standards which are either imbedded in the ground or are attached to a wall. The signs can be either one or twosided. The graphics consist primarily of type and arrows. The major color scheme of the system is maroon with a black accent panel at the bottom of the sign. Typography and arrows are white. The layout format is a justified left margin with a ragged right margin.

The signs are organized by stacking one or more units. In each individual unit letter sizes <u>cannot</u> be mixed. Signs with different sizes of letters are achieved by stacking various units of different sized letters. With the exception of the color difference between the colored panel and the black accent panel there is no visible distinction between the stacked units; it serves only as an organizational scheme.

These units are described by <u>vertical height in inches</u> x <u>horizontal length in inches or feet</u> with <u>number of lines of type</u> of <u>type size in inches</u>. For instance, the unit below in Fig. 1 would be described as 9" x 30" with 2 lines of 2.5" type.



Entire signs are described by listing the topmost unit and then the second from the top, etc. Hence the sign in Fig. 2 would be described as a 9" x 30" unit with one line of 4" letters above two 9" x 30" units with two lines of 2.5" letters each. The top unit would be maroon and the bottom units would be black. The various sizes of units and the arrangement of type and arrows in the units are discussed in Sections 3 and 4.



Fig. 2

Section 2 Typography and Arrows

# ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz.,'--;: 0123456789/ ↑↗→>↓↓∠← \ AQUARIUS 5

Fig. 3

The type chosen for the system is Aquarius #5. Words are to be set in capitals and lower case and all lower case where appropriate. All capital words should not be used.

Permitted letter sizes are 1", 1.5", 2.5", 4", 6" and 8". These measurements describe the height of the capital letters.

When directional arrows are necessary they may only be used on the left margin of the sign and must justify on that margin. The eight orientations of arrows are shown in the examples below in Figure 4.

# ↑ Abcdef ↓ Ghijklm > Nopqrs ∠ Tuvwxy ~ Zabcde ↓ Fghijkl → Mnopqr ← Stuvwx

#### Figs. 4

When using vertical or diagonal arrows the distance from the common left margin to the first letter of the following word is as follows: 1" letters - 1.5", 1.5" letters - 2.25", 2.5" letters - 3.75", 4" letters - 6", 6.5" letters - 9.75" and 8" letters - 12". For horizontal arrows the distances should be: 1" letters - 1.75", 1.5" letters - 2.5", 2.5" letters - 4.3", 4" letters - 6.9", 6" letters - 11.2" and 8" letters - 13.8".

#### SECTION 3

#### UNIT HEIGHTS

Vertical unit heights permissible in the system are 6", 9", 12", 18", 21", and 30". The only exceptions to these measurements would be some special signs (i.e. Handicap Parking). These exceptions will be discussed later in Section 12.

Sizes of letters and number of lines of type which may be placed on units are shown in

the following examples. Placement of the baseline (the line the letters sit on) is indicated in the examples. In units which permit more than one line of letters it is not necessary to place lines of type on all the permitted baselines. For instance, in Fig. 5 while it is permissible to use up to three lines of type, it is also permissible to use two or only one (and in the case of the black accent panels there may be no) lines of type and any of the three permitted baselines may be used.





Section 4 Unit lengths

Permissible unit horizontal lengths are 18", 30", 4', 5', 6', 7', and 8'. Any exceptions to these standard lengths will be discussed in Section 10, Special Signs.

As mentioned before, type or arrows justify on the left margin, not the right margin or centered. While some units can have alternate left margin placement, a sign composed of stacked units must have a common left margin. Left margin placement and maximum line length for the various lengths are shown in the following examples.

Fig. 33 - 3 lines of 6.5" letters

#### Section 5 Separating Word Groups

Many buildings on campus contain several departments which need to be identified on the sign. For instance, in the example below in Fig. 51 the building is identified by the top line of type while the departments are listed below. As long as the departments are not more than one line long there is no problem.

# Candler Hall

Gerontology Center International Development Institute of Higher Education

Fig. 51

When one department is more than one line long a slash mark (/) may be used to separate them.

# Bocock St.

Health Services/ School of Environmental Design

Fig. 52

It is also possible to differentiate between departments by using alternate baseline measurements. For instance, the sign in Fig. 52 could be composed as is shown in Fig. 53 below..



The use of alternate baselines or slashes to differentiate departments or other word groups should preclude the need to indent. Indentation is not allowed in the sign system.

#### <u>Section 6</u> Use of "The University of Georgia"

The distinctive graphics and colors of the system should be enough to identify a sign as part of the system. It shouldn't be necessary to use "The University of Georgia" at the top of a sign unless the sign is on the periphery of the campus or is identifying an outlying building, research or agriculture station, etc.
#### Section 7 Colors

The original colors chosen for the system are maroon and black for signs which identify buildings, complexes, etc. and blue and black for signs which are more informational in nature. Unfortunately the UGA Parking Services requested additional colors to be used on parking lot signs to match parking decals. While the dark green has an affinity for the original colors, the gray and gold do not nor do they have a deep enough value (light to dark scale) to adequately contrast with the white letters. It would be advisable, in the future, to darken these colors so that there is enough contrast with letters and arrows for legibility. If additional colors are added to the system it should only be done in consultation with Profs. Ron Arnholm or Ken Williams instead of dictated by Parking Services. Suggested colors to be used on the gold and grey signs are shown below in Fig. 54





Fig. 54

### Section 8 Letter and Word Spacing

Correct spacing between letters and words is critical for legibility and appearance. Optimum letter spacing relies more on the eye than a ruler. It is the equal amount of <u>space</u> (area = width x height) rather than equal amounts of linear measurement on the baseline which denotes proper letter spacing. As a general rule, curved letters such as an "oc" combination will fit tighter than straight letter such as "ll". Open letters such as C's, diagonal letters such as A's, and over or underhanging letters such as T's and L's further complicate spacing. The goal is to avoid gaps or bunching of letters. The sign designer must temporarily lay out the letters, step back and critically view the line of letters for any gaps or bunches, adjust, step back again, etc. When a typeface is designed the designer assigns optimal spacing notations (side-bearings) to each individual letter so that it will fit correctly with any neighboring letter. The side-bearings for Aquarius #5 can be seen in Fig. 55. When using a computer (or other typesetting equipment) the side-bearings will automatically be utilized in setting the letters. It would be advisable to use computer hardware and appropriate software in designing sign layouts.



Fig. 55

Wordspacing also requires a critical eye or automatic typesetting equipment to assure proper spacing. As a general rule, 1/3rd of the letter height should be used between words. Fine adjustments for open, diagonal, and over or underhanging letters can then be made.When only two, three or four words exist on a line, wordspacing should be slightly tighter than when lines are a sentence or more in length.

### <u>Section 9</u> Overall Sign Design

With the increased complexity of university buildings and centers, more and more information seems to be necessary on the signs. The result has been a crowded look on recent signs. The original design imagined areas of each sign without letters or other graphics. It was for this reason that very generous left margins were permitted. Larger sign formats and/or smaller letters should be considered. The maximum line length allowed should not always be used: two lines instead of one long line may be more appealing and legible. The use of the generous left margins and more space at the top and bottom (especially black accent panels with no type) will give the sign more room to breathe. Computers with appropriate software will allow each sign to be designed by exploring several design options before final decisions are made. Perhaps the best solution to effective sign design is less information on the signs. (See following paragraphs.)

The UGA sign system is an identifying system rather than a true wayfinding system. The campus is far too large for a signage system to direct a visitor to a specific building from another part of the campus. Street addresses, maps, directories and written and spoken directions must be utilized for this purpose. The large signs with 16 or more lines of type recently installed a key intersections are examples of non-functional signs. These signs have too much information in too small a size of type to be read from an automobile yet they are placed at intersections of major traffic arteries. It would be more effective to install signs directing visitors to size a

to install signs directing visitors to sites where campus maps and directories are available. The sign system was designed to identify specific buildings, not each and every sub-unit in those buildings. For instance, the newly renovated Tanner Building houses the School of Art's areas of Graphic Design, Scientific Illustration and Digital Imaging. Those searching for one of these areas must through other means ascertain that the area is in the Tanner Building. The sign for the building should only state "Tanner Building -School of Art Annex".

Unless the wording on individual signs is restricted to pertinent information the campus will become crowded with overly large and complicated signs. Our campus is an aesthetic entity and must not be marred with unnecessary signage.

## Section 10

#### Special Signs

Some signs regularly provided by the UGA Sign Shop do not fit into the sign system as described in the previous sections. Examples of such signs would be "Handicap" and bus stop signs. As much as possible these signs should be designed to work with the UGA system while conforming to other systems (i.e., "Handicap" signs) or using graphics or diagrams to provide special information. When necessary Professors Arnholm or Williams may be consulted to solve particular sign design problems.

Street identification signs are 6" x 30" maroon units with 1 line of 2.5" inch letters with a 4" baseline and a 1.75" left margin. There is no black accent panel.

The UGA sign system does not include normal pedestrian and traffic signs.

(fff) The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	10/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia

Architects and Campus Planners Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

Architecture and Engineering Heery International 999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan 1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

Traffic Engineering LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

Academic Programming Paulien & Associates 899 Logan Street, Suite 508 Denver, CO 80203-3156 303/832-3272 Fax 303/832-3380

## Housing Policy Information

Information included:

Copy of a memorandum to the Presidents of the University System of Georgia from Lindsay A. Desrochers dated October 20, 1997 concerning housing policy.

Copy of a letter from the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration referencing a Memorandum from the Board of Regents Office

Copy of a memorandum dated September 10, 1998 to President Adams from the Regents staff regarding plans to house all freshmen and sophomores on campus at UGA.

Copy of a memorandum sent to the Associate Vice President for Business and Finance from the Director of University Housing concerning Project Proposals for Capital Funding

Copy of The University of Georgia Student Housing Comprehensive Plan, prepared by the Department of University Housing, Division of Student Affairs, January, 1999.

F:\2\Appendix\housing policy.doc

## The University of Georgia

# Student Housing Comprehensive Plan

Department of University Housing Division of Student Affairs

January, 1999

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executi	ve Summary
Busines	ss Plan
	Mission
	Goals and Objectives
	Strengthen Linkages Between Campus Residential Living and the Academic
·	Enterprise
	Improve the Quality of Existing Campus Housing Facilities
	Expand and Diversify Campus Housing Stock
1	Description of Services
1	Fee Strategy
]	Financial Projections
	Cash Flow Schedule for Renovation and Redevelopment Program
	Ten Year Financial Projection
	Financial Considerations for New Construction
Facility	Evaluation
I	Residence Hall Inventory and Condition Assessment
H	Family Housing Inventory and Condition Assessment
H	Fraternity and Sorority House Inventory and Condition Assessment
Market 1	Needs Assessment
Housing	Facilities Component of Physical Master Plan
Ν	Map of Current Housing Stock and
P	Possible Locations for Additional Campus Housing
Ν	Map of Possible Locations for Additional Campus Housing

### University of Georgia Division of Student Affairs Department of University Housing

-1-

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### STUDENT HOUSING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The mission of the Department of University Housing is to provide comfortable, affordable, and secure on campus housing options in residential communities where the academic success and personal growth of residents are encouraged and supported. In addition to meeting the needs of students and student families, the department provides housing for visiting scholars, summer conferences, sports camps, and other special groups as space permits. These purposes are consistent with and supportive of the missions of the Division of Student Affairs and the University of Georgia.

In conjunction with the renovation of Reed Hall, the University of Georgia presented a plan, "Preparing for the 21st Century", to the Board of Regents for renovating and redeveloping existing residence halls resulting in a small decrease in capacity. The goal of the plan was to provide adequate, modernly-equipped campus residence hall space to meet the requirements of market demand. The University of Georgia provided on campus housing for 32% of enrollment in 1980, but during recent years that level has dropped to 22% as enrollment has grown to 30,000. No new residence halls have been built at UGA since 1967 and the average age of current facilities after accounting for major renovations is 34 years old. The renovation and redevelopment plan, which will cost an estimated \$60 million over the next 10-12 years, continues to be useful and has been incorporated into the Student Housing Comprehensive Plan and the University's Facilities Master Plan.

President Michael F. Adams has called for development of the campus as a student centered environment. In accordance with that direction and the principles set forth in the campus Facilities Master Plan the Student Housing Comprehensive Plan has a larger concept and scope than renovation and replacement of existing facilities. Expansion of on-campus housing offerings and augmentation of the residence life program with residentially based educational activities are envisioned in the Student Housing Comprehensive Plan to enrich the university experience for students living on campus. The campus Facilities Master Plan also includes consideration for expanding campus housing by gradually adding housing facilities to achieve a capacity for approximately 12,000 students.

The primary goals of the student housing comprehensive plan are to:

Strengthen linkages between campus residential living and the academic enterprise, developing a student centered campus community and improving the quality of the educational program for campus residents. The living/learning experience will focus on intellectual growth, academic achievement, and personal development in a structured group living environment featuring skilled staff and supportive physical resources. **Improve the quality of existing campus housing facilities** through renovation or replacement of nine residence halls during the coming 10-12 years. This program is expected to cost \$60 million and will be funded by surpluses from operations of existing housing facilities. Upon completion of that program, further renovation or replacement projects will be necessary for four halls that will have reached the end of their life cycles. There will be a net reduction of capacity as a result of the renovation and redevelopment program.

**Expand and diversify campus housing stock** by construction of 6,200 beds in apartment style facilities over twenty years to increase total capacity to nearly 12,000 beds. Achieving the ambitious goals of the Student Housing Comprehensive Plan and the campus Facilities Master Plan for expansion of housing will present numerous challenges and opportunities. Two major issues to be resolved are developing (1) methods for financing new construction and (2) alternatives for project delivery that respond to price, quality, and timeliness requirements.

The time is right to expand UGA campus housing with apartment style accommodations which offer the amenities expected by continuing students and which feature a direct connection to the campus intellectual and cultural life supportive of the institutional mission. The prospect of high quality campus housing which meets expressed desires for additional space, single occupancy bedrooms, bathroom privacy, computer connectivity, and other amenities is very popular among students. Entwining student living and learning in the residential communities will more fully realize the potential of the university experience.

Several of the guiding principles which underpin the Physical Master Plan are related to the Student Housing Comprehensive Plan:

-Create the optimal student environment

-Develop a connected campus

- -Define and provide for current and future facility needs
- -Provide for academic and student needs on contiguous lands
- -Develop comprehensive solutions to parking and infrastructure
- -Participation in regional coordination

The Physical Master Plan calls for coordinated development of new housing, parking, and student activity facilities on the edges of the campus. The Physical Master Plan is supported by and is compatible with the ongoing planning by the local government.

compplan.11 12/28/98

#### **BUSINESS PLAN**

#### Mission

The mission of the Department of University Housing is to provide comfortable, affordable, and secure on-campus housing options in residential communities where the academic success and personal growth of residents are encouraged and supported. In addition to meeting the needs of students and student families, the department provides housing for visiting scholars, summer conferences, sports camps, and other special groups as space permits. These purposes are consistent with and supportive of the missions of the Division of Student Affairs and the University of Georgia.

The departmental mission is realized by effectively integrating housing services and studentoriented educational/developmental programs through sound management of financial, facilities, and personnel resources. Operating schedules, policies, procedures, and practices are tailored to student and institutional needs. The Department of University Housing is an auxiliary enterprise and generates all operating funds from user fees.

The seventeen UGA residence halls offer a guided group living experience with multiple functions and benefits for nearly 6,000 residents. The residence halls are the preferred living arrangement for 80-85% of traditional entering freshmen. Self-reports from these students bolster research findings that the structured group living experience is effective in easing the transition to college. Although more than half of residence hall occupants are classified as freshmen, living on campus is also popular with returning residents, new transfer students, students who do not own automobiles, physically challenged students, those from other countries, individuals seeking a high level of safety and security, and those who want active, convenient, and meaningful connections to campus academic resources, an excellent dining program, and co-curricular options. An association between campus residence and higher GPA has been noted for undergraduates during each term of the past three years.

The 579 on-campus apartments for families and graduate students offer a reasonably priced housing alternative within a community of scholars and families. Approximately 70% of student apartment residents are enrolled in graduate study, and nearly 60% hail from countries other than the United States. Activities in the apartment community are tailored to the needs and interests of the residents.

The Housing Department acts as "landlord" to serve the interests of the institution by striving to insure that life safety standards are met in the on-campus social fraternity and sorority houses. The basic posture with respect to University management of the on-campus chapter houses is that the land is state owned and under control of the University, with the exception of two ground leases. The improvements are University buildings unless there is a lease arrangement stipulating otherwise (the case for Sigma Nu fraternity). In lieu of rent all maintenance, repair, upkeep, and operational expenses have been the responsibility of the respective fraternity/sorority House Corporations.

President Michael F. Adams indicated soon after his arrival on campus that steps would be taken to enhance the educational experience for students and that the improvement and expansion of residential life would be explored as a part of that initiative. The subsequent development of the campus Physical Master Plan has included consideration of expanding the campus housing stock by adding as many as 6,200 beds over the next 20 or more years to strengthen the campus community and the quality of the educational program. The President also convened a Greek Housing Summit to initiate improved relationships between the University and campus fraternities and sororities.

-5-

## Vision for the Future

The number and quality of campus housing accommodations will be sufficient and the preferred living option for:

- 85% or more of the new freshman class each year and those new transfer students who desire campus housing
- approximately 45% of residents continuing from one year to the next
- □ 30-35% of the total enrollment, with capacity to house the freshman and sophomore classes
- students who want a structured group living experience during the transition from high school to college life, with ample activities to meet social, recreational, academic, and adjustment needs.
- students who prefer to reside in a **living-learning community** with an emphasis on intellectual growth, academic achievement, cultural enrichment, and personal development
- students who want active and meaningful involvement in community service, self governance, leadership development, and civic responsibility in a diverse environment shared by their peers
- students who want the most convenient connection to campus academic and co-curricular resources
- groups of students who desire to participate in special interest housing options
- students who want a very high level of safety and security
- individuals who want a choice of single and double occupancy rooms
- students who do not have automobiles
- physically challenged and disabled students
- students **from other countries** than the U.S.
- students who need housing that is **open during academic recesses and between terms**
- students who want a variety of **dining** options
- students with families

w:\director\myk\wp\vision.myk 12/02/98

## University of Georgia

## Division of Student Affairs

## DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY HOUSING

## GPA Comparison

Term	All Undergrads	Res Hall Undergrads	Res Hall New Frosh*	Off Campus New Frosh*
Fall, 1995	2.81	2.83	-	-
Winter, 1996	2.84	2.88	-	-
Spring, 1996	2.85	2.95	-	-
Fall, 1996	2.84	2.92	2.94	2.78
Winter, 1997	2.85	2.93	2.97	2.83
Spring, 1997	2.90	3.05	3.13	3.02
Fall, 1997	2.74	2.85	2.91	2.81
Winter, 1998	2.88	2.95	2.95	2.88
Spring, 1998	2.91	3.03	3.07	2.97

*New frosh are those who first enrolled in Fall term.

compari.gpa 12/03/98

#### Goals and Objectives

**Strengthen linkages between campus residential living and the academic enterprise**, developing a student centered campus community and improving the quality of the educational program for campus residents. The living/learning experience will focus on intellectual growth, academic achievement, and personal development in a structured group living environment featuring skilled staff and physical resources supportive of program goals.

As evidenced by GPA attainment, there is a positive association between campus living and that measure of academic success. Local studies will determine the extent to which the UGA experience parallels national findings that living on campus is also associated with higher retention to graduation rates. Student residents themselves report that living on campus has added to their educational experience (91%) and recommend living on campus to aid in personal and academic growth (86%). There is a strong base of success upon which to build.

Campus residences can be places where personal interaction, design features, activities, technology, and operating procedures serve to extend engagement in the learning community into the out-of-class lives of residents. Interaction with faculty, facilitated group study sessions, tutoring, special interest living units, residential colleges, academic and personal advising, computer labs and in-room connectivity, spaces for lectures and performances - these features and more are found in the best college residential living and learning programs. The UGA housing program can, through the residence hall redevelopment program, construction of new housing facilities, and the appropriate staffing arrangement, provide the venue for this enhanced learning community. New partnerships with academic and service units supported by joint funding will be sought to fully realize this goal.

## **UGA Residence Halls**

A guided group living experience with multiple functions and benefits:

- □ for traditional freshmen, the preferred transition living arrangement between living with parents and more independent options,
- staffing patterns based on knowledge of students' developmental needs and practical aspects of academic and campus life,
- activities and programs by staff, focused on the academic success and personal growth needs of residents,
- easy social connections in a system designed for participation,
- entryway to involvement in community service and leadership,
- significant experience with a diverse peer group,
- individualized attention by well trained and dedicated staff,
- high relative level of safety and security for persons and property,
- connected to campus learning technology (CATV system, computer labs, incipient in-room computer connections)
- convenience to the wide variety of co-curricular options in the campus community,
- structured and informal contact with "peer superiors" UGA students who have made a successful adjustment to college life,
- employment opportunities in a supportive organization,
- comfortable but not luxurious accommodations,
- affordable and responsive to both the academic calendar and varied accommodations needs of students.

w:\director\myk\wp\benefits.myk 12/02/98 **Improve the quality of existing campus housing facilities**. The UGA residence halls (like most around the country) are in need of expensive renovation, repairs, refurnishing, and improvements. The average residence hall room is more than 34 years old. Continuing the modernization of the campus housing stock must remain a high priority in order to respond to the reasonable expectations of residents. The apartment buildings are in better condition overall than the residence halls, but the older apartments need new interior finishes and fixtures.

A long range plan was developed in 1993 for renovation or replacement of ten residence halls with funds coming from reserves and surplus generated by operating budgets. The attached brochure entitled "Building on the Past to Preserve the Future" provides details about the plan as revised in 1997. Reed Hall, the first residence hall to be renovated under the plan, reopened for Fall Semester, 1998 for 288 residents. A 10 year cash flow projection for subsequent projects in the plan is included as Schedule A (page ). This program is expected to cost \$60 million. Upon completion of the program, further renovation or replacement will be necessary for four halls that will have reached the end of their life cycles. There will be a net reduction of capacity as a result of the renovation and redevelopment program.

A concept study for a building by building renovation program in the apartment community has been completed. A detailed plan and implementation schedule for apartment renovation will be prepared in FY2000.

Concurrent with the renovation program, major improvement and upgrade projects are planned for four high rise halls built in the 1960s; addition of fire sprinklers, renovation of elevator systems, adding or replacing emergency generators, electrical safety improvements, HVAC system upgrades, and furniture replacement or refinishing is needed to extend the useful lives of these halls until they can be renovated or redeveloped in 2012 or beyond. Extending computer connectivity to all residence halls is a pressing need and cable modem technology has been identified as a rapid and cost effective solution. Code compliance, ADA improvements, building systems maintenance, and renewal of worn out finishes, equipment, and furnishings are ongoing expenses.

The improvement of existing campus housing facilities will consume all available selfgenerated financial resources, and the improvement program will be paced by the rate of contribution to reserve funds of each year's operating margin.

The eleven on-campus fraternity houses are typically in poor condition, and two of them (both with ground leases to House Corporations) are closed pending major and expensive renovations. The three sorority houses on-campus have been maintained in good or excellent condition. A program to formalize the relationship with these groups and the University is needed.

-9-

**Expand and diversify campus housing stock**. The campus Physical Master Plan identifies the potential for expanding campus housing to a capacity of approximately 12,000 beds, enough to accommodate all freshmen and sophomores on campus. The facilities master plan looks out 30 years, and takes the 10 - 12 year residence hall redevelopment plan into account. Renovation or replacement of the three large high rise halls which hold half of our current capacity, envisioned to occur after 2012 and not included in the campus facilities master plan housing numbers, may reduce total potential capacity below 12,000.

The current residence hall inventory is heavily dominated by small double occupancy rooms on double loaded corridors with community bath accommodations. The renovation plan will follow the model of Reed Hall, offering more space, increased bathroom privacy, and additional amenities in a group living experience. New construction must diversify our offerings with more single occupancy rooms in apartment-like floorplans.

A plan for constructing additional campus housing for 2,000 students is proposed for implementation over the next ten years. The first project of 200 beds would be constructed adjacent to Oglethorpe House in FY2001. Subsequent projects of 600 beds each would be built in FY2003, FY2005, and FY2008. Locations of those projects would be coordinated with parking, food service, and activity projects. Responding to the current inadequacy of maintenance and storage facilities to support campus housing operations, a maintenance facility would be built in conjunction with construction of a new parking deck or in the vicinity of the West Campus Parking deck in FY2002. Continued expansion of apartment residences through FY2018 could reach the goal of the campus Physical Master Plan and the Student Housing Comprehensive Plan. The pace of construction could be accelerated if adequate funding and rapid planning/project delivery methods become available.

The construction projects outlined above should provide enough additional housing on campus to meet planned growth in freshman enrollment while also serving a gradually increasing demand from returning students. It is expected that most if not all freshmen would be assigned to more traditional residence hall accommodations while returning students and perhaps transfer students would select apartments and newly renovated residence halls.

Combining the effects of the residence hall redevelopment plan and the construction plan outlined above, campus housing capacity will be approximately 8,860 in FY2010 including the existing capacity of Family and Graduate Housing apartments and oncampus fraternities and sororities. That capacity will be reduced if envisioned but yet unplanned renovations of existing apartments are accomplished. Additional construction will be required from FY2012 on to replace 1,000 beds or more that will be lost during renovation or replacement of Creswell, Russell, and Brumby Halls. Achieving the ambitious goals of the Student Housing Comprehensive Plan and the campus Physical Master Plan for expansion of housing will present numerous challenges and opportunities. Two major issues to be resolved are developing (1) feasible methods for financing new construction and (2) alternatives for project delivery that respond to price, quality, and timeliness requirements.

Proformas for the planned projects based on traditional financing and project management/construction methods require very high rents to break even. The cost of the residence hall redevelopment plan precludes contributions from that revenue stream to assist in debt service for new construction projects.

Private sector developers assert that they can develop campus housing projects of acceptable quality on a fee basis with savings of 30% on total project costs when compared to typical design-bid-build state managed projects. This type of project delivery method coupled with innovative financing methods may be the best and perhaps the only way to accomplish the goals of our expansion plan. This expansion strategy maintains control of the entire process and operation in the hands of the institution where it can be most sensitive and responsive to University needs. The alternative of long term ground leases to private entities to finance, construct, and perhaps manage housing facilities may be effective in situations where there is a general housing shortage that limits planned enrollment growth, but does not appear to offer significant advantages that are congruent with the institutional goal of strengthening the quality of intellectual and cultural life in the campus living community.

## University of Georgia Division of Student Affairs Department of University Housing

## Campus Housing Growth Chart - 20 Year Building Schedule Revised 12/13/98

Fiscal Year	Activity	Current Halls	Current Apartments	On-campus Frats/Sorors	New Apartments	Total Capacity
1999		5,950	700	300		6,950
2000		5,950	700	300		6,950
2001	build 200 new apts.	5,950	700	300	200	7,150
2002	renovate Myers (-475)	5,475	700	300	200	6,675
2003	reopen Myers (+330) build 600 new apts.	5,805	700	300	800	7,605
2004	renovate Payne (-200)	5,605	700	300	800	7,405
2005	reopen Payne (+135) renovate Rutherford (-150) build 600 new apts.	5,590	700	300	1,400	7,990
2006	reopen Rutherford (+110) renovate Morris (- 140)	5,560	700	300	1,400	7,960
2007	reopen Morris (+100)	5,660	700	300	1,400	8,060
2008	remove Mell & Lipscomb (-320) build 600 new apts.	5,340	700	300	2,000	8,340

Fiscal Year	Activity	Current Halls	Current Apartments	On-campus Frats/Sorors	New Apartments	Total Capacity
2009	Mell & Lipscomb replacements open (+520)	5,860	700	300	2,000	8,860
2010		5,860	700	300	2,000	8,860
2011	remove Boggs, Church, Hill (-490) build 600 new apts.	5,370	700	300	2,600	8,970
2012	Boggs, Church, Hill replacements open (+590) remove Creswell (-1,000)	4,960	700	300	2,600	8,560
2013	open Creswell replacement (+600) renovate Mary Lyndon (-130)	5,430	700	300	2,600	9,030
2014	reopen Mary Lyndon (+100) renovate Russell (-970) build 600 new apts.	4,560	700	300	3,200	8,760
2015	reopen Russell (+580) build 600 new apts.	5,140	700	300	3,800	9,940
2016	renovate Brumby (-960) build 800 new apts.	4,180	700	300	4,600	9,780

Fiscal Year	Activity	Current Halls	Current Apartments	On-campus Frats/Sorors	New Apartments	Total Capacity
2017	reopen Brumby (+600) build 1,000 new apts.	4,780	700	300	5,600	11,380
2018	build 600 new apts.	4,780	700	300	6,200	11,980

compplan.8 12/13/98

## **Realizing the Mission:**

## **Most Pressing Challenges**

- □ Funding and developing an alternative project delivery method for construction of 2,000 new beds in apartment style accommodations during the next ten years.
- Funding for renovation/redevelopment of the oldest halls in the existing housing stock - \$60 million needed over the next ten to twelve years to renovate or replace nine halls.
- Funding needed for fire sprinkler, elevator renovation, and ADA compliance projects.
- □ Funding to expand in-room computer connections to campus and worldwide networks.
- Developing a plan for renovation of University Village and Rogers Road Apartments.
- □ Increasing the percentage of current residents who return to campus housing each fall.
- □ Increasing the popularity of campus housing with new transfer students.
- Developing and implementing a new system for rent charges and collections under the semester system.
- Planning for the eventual redevelopment of the three high-rise halls that currently house approximately 50% of campus residents.

#### Description of Services

Residence hall services include provision of furnished rooms with all utilities except long distance telephone service included in the rent. Non-student room areas are cleaned daily, and maintenance staff are on hand sixteen hours a day Monday - Friday with late night and weekend emergency service also available. Seven service desks are available on a 24 hour a day basis when the halls are open, and six community offices provide weekday administrative services close to residents. Live-in staff of peer advisors, graduate assistants, and full time professional staff are available and on duty at all times to provide personal advice and emergency assistance. A wide ranging program including nearly 2,000 educational, social, cultural, recreational, personal growth, and academic success oriented activities is presented by these staff each year. Student involvement in community self government activities is encouraged and proceeds with advice of staff.

Accommodations are offered in the summer months to summer school students and participants in sports camps, workshops and conferences affiliated with the university. These groups receive a variety of services to support their program goals.

Furnished and unfurnished units are offered in the apartment area, with tenants paying their own electricity and basic telephone service charges. The campus cable television service is included in the rent. Office and maintenance staff are available during normal weekday working hours, and live-in resident managers provide after hours and weekend duty coverage serving as a link to on-call maintenance staff for emergencies. A variety of social, cultural, educational, and child/family oriented activities are offered by the staff. A small number of fully furnished apartments are provided for short term rental to visiting international scholars.

The large majority of services associated with operating the campus housing program are selfperformed. A partial listing of outsourced services includes night security guards, pest control, apartment turnover cleaning, security and access control system maintenance, and fire alarm system maintenance. Custodial and maintenance staff employed by the housing department are charged back to housing operating accounts through Physical Plant as an indirect expense using a clearing rate formula that is adjusted to actual cost at the end of each fiscal year. Physical Plant also provides specialized maintenance services on a charge back basis and manages the campuswide elevator maintenance contract which is also charged back to the housing department where appropriate. Utility costs for campus housing are fully charged back to operating accounts using meters where possible and square foot formulas where necessary.

#### Fee Strategy

The strategy for establishing housing rents since FY94 has been to cover operating costs, fund program improvements, and gradually increase reserve and surplus contributions to an annual amount of approximately \$5.3 million to support the residence hall renovation and redevelopment program. The \$5.3 million amount was derived in 1993 by applying a NACUBO model for facilities renewal reserves to the replacement values of campus housing units and furnishings. Rent increases in the 7-8.6% range were implemented in FY95 through FY98 to build reserve and surplus funds. As the reserve and surplus contribution target is nearly realized, the rent increase was scaled back in FY99 to approximately 6%, and to 5.4% for FY2000. Fees will be adjusted in future years to meet ongoing program requirements, respond to new initiatives, deal with occupancy fluctuations, and continue to fund the renovation and redevelopment program.

The budget development approach used by housing department staff is a conservative one; revenues are underestimated to guard against unpredictable and uncontrollable factors, expenses are estimated to provide adequate resources in the event of emergencies or new requirements. The long lead time in the budget development process and the variability of factors influencing both revenue and expense components suggest that this conservative budget development method is appropriate. As a byproduct of the conservative budgeting, modest bottom line results typically appear in proforma projections, often significantly less than actual experience.

#### **Financial Projections**

**Ten Year Cash Flow Schedule for Renovation and Redevelopment Program (Schedule A)**. The cash flow projection for the renovation and redevelopment plan includes the following planning assumptions:

- Plant fund expenses for major repair, replacement, and improvement projects will increase at a 4% annual rate.
- Renovation costs are expected to increase at an annual 4% rate.

This schedule is based on operation of current campus housing facilities. The renovation and redevelopment program will consume all surplus income. The Hill Area Phase I project, scheduled for FY2008, is envisioned to include the demolition of Mell and Lipscomb Halls and their replacement with new residences. The Hill Area Phase II project, demolition and replacement of Boggs, Church, and Hill Halls, will probably take place in FY2011.

#### DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY HOUSING DIVISION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS AUXILIARY SERVICES - GROUP B - HOUSING CASH FLOW SCHEDULE FOR RENOVATION AND REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

SITY OF GEORGIA

	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99 :	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10
RESERVES AND SURPLUS: AVAILABLE AT JULY 1	\$3,324,343	\$6,392,908	\$10,557,095	\$2,614,229	\$2,617,163	\$6,112,215	\$9,747,068	\$101,824	\$4,033,281	\$2,058,743	\$1,100,549	\$1,014,597	\$5,613,846	(\$613,492)	\$4,361,055
DEDUCT FUNDING:				:											
PLANT FUND PROJECTS *	(\$2,412,459)	(\$276,550)	(\$12,711,970)	(\$4,800,000) :	(\$1,500,000)	(\$1,560,000)	(\$1,622,400)	(\$1,687,296)	(\$1,754,788)	(\$1,824,979)	(\$1,897,979)	(\$1,973,898)	(\$2,052,854)	(\$2,134,968)	(\$2,220,366)
REED RENOVATION				:									T		
MYERS RENOVATION **				:			(\$13,425,492)								
PAYNE RENOVATION **				:					(\$6,063,254)						
RUTHERFORD RENOVATION **				:				-		(\$5,210,458)					
MORRIS RENOVATION **				:							(\$4,508,307)				
HILL AREA PHASE 1 (MELL, LIPSO	OMB) **												(\$11,010,558)		1.000
HILL AREA PHASE 2 (BOGGS, CH	JRCH, HILL) **			:											
AVAILABLE AFTER FUNDING	\$911,884	\$6,116,358	(\$2,154,875)	: (\$2,185,771) :	\$1,117,163	\$4,552,215	(\$5,300,824)	(\$1,585,472)	(\$3,784,761)	(\$4,976,694)	(\$5,305,736)	(\$959,300)	(\$7,449,565)	(\$2,748,460)	\$2,140,689
ADD CONTRIBUTIONS FROM OPERA	TIONS:			:											
RESERVES	\$794,951	\$755,505	\$782,622	\$839,457 :		RATE STR	UCTURE WI	L BE ADJU	STED TO M	AKE REQUI	RED CONTI	RIBUTION			
SURPLUS	\$4,686,073	\$3,685,232	\$3,986,482	\$3,963,477 :											
TOTAL CONTRIBUTION *	\$5,481,024	\$4,440,737	\$4,769,104	\$4,802,934 :	\$4,995,051	\$5,194,853	\$5,402,648	\$5,618,753	\$5,843,504	\$6,077,244	\$6,320,333	\$6,573,147	\$6,836,073	\$7,109,516	\$7,393,896
ENDING BALANCE AT JUNE 30	\$6,392,908	\$10,557,095	\$2,614,229	\$2,617,163 :	\$6,112,215	\$9,747,068	\$101,824	\$4,033,281	\$2,058,743	\$1,100,549	\$1,014,597	\$5,613,846	(\$613,492)	\$4,361,055	\$9,534,585
Est. Residence Hall Capacity	6,071	5,636	5,681	5947	5,947	5,947	5,475	5,805	5,605	5,588	5,552	5,654	5,333	5,850	5,850

*4% inflation index beginning FY 00

**Renovation/replacement costs based on Reed Hall actual square foot project costs with a 4% annual inflation index

NOTE: For purposes of this plan Family and Graduate Housing capacity is projected to remain constant with 579 units. There may be some adjustment to this capacity as a result of smaller scale renovations for which a plan has not yet been developed.

12/03/98

SCHEDULE A

Ten Year Financial Projections (Schedule B). Ten year financial projections for the operations of existing housing facilities are attached as Schedule B in the required format. The following assumptions have been made in developing the ten year financial plan:

- Revenue is projected to increase at a 4% annual rate driven primarily by rent increases.
- Expenses are projected to increase at an annual rate of 3%.

Actual results are expected to be more favorable due to conservative budgeting.

#### UNI DEPARTME F UNIVERSITY HOUSING DIVISION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS AUXILIARY SERVICES - GROUP B - HOUSING TEN YEAR PROJECTION

	FY 2000 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2001 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2002 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2003 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2004 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2005 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2006 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2007 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2008 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2009 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2010 PROPOSED BUDGET
Fee Revenue Non-Fee Revenue: (list individually)	\$16,056,925	\$16,699,202	\$17,367,170	\$18,061,857	\$18,784,331	\$19,535,704	\$20,317,133	\$21,129,818	\$21,975,011	\$22,854,011	\$23,768,171
Laundry	\$191,647	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$220.000	\$220.000	\$220.000	\$220.000
Key Replacement and Damages	\$28,388	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
Conferences	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000
Telephone Commission .	\$95,309	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Application Fee	\$5,995 \$123,650	\$124,000	\$0 \$124,000	\$0 \$124,000	\$0 \$124,000	\$0 \$124,000	\$0 \$124,000	\$0 \$124,000	\$0 \$124,000	\$0 \$124,000	\$0 \$124,000
Total Revenue	\$16,876,914	\$17,443,202	\$18,111,170	\$18,805,857	\$19,528,331	\$20,279,704	\$21,061,133	\$21,873,818	\$22,719,011	\$23,598,011	\$24,512,171
Cost of Goods Sold											
NET REVENUE	\$16,876,914	\$17,443,202	\$18,111,170	\$18,805,857	\$19,528,331	\$20,279,704	\$21,061,133	\$21,873,818	\$22,719,011	\$23,598,011	\$24,512,171
Expenditures:											· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Personal Services (Including Fringes)	\$2,407,901	\$2,480,138	\$2,554,542	\$2,631,178	\$2,710,114	\$2,791,417	\$2,875,160	\$2,961,415	\$3,050,257	\$3,141,765	\$3,236,018
Direct Operating Exp. (Except Contracted Services	)										
Supplies and Materials	\$1,506,262	\$1,551,450	\$1,597,993	\$1,645,933	\$1,695,311	\$1,746,170	\$1 798 556	\$1 852 512	\$1 008 088	\$1.065.220	£2 024 200
Renairs and Maintenance						41,740,170	\$1,798,550	\$1,032,312	\$1,908,088	\$1,965,330	\$2,024,290
Telesommunications	e1 364 967	A1 305 515									
Telecommunications	\$1,354,907	\$1,395,010	\$1,437,484	\$1,480,609	\$1,525,027	\$1,570,778	\$1,617,901	\$1,666,439	\$1,716,432	\$1,767,925	\$1,820,962
Travel	\$41,250	\$42,488	\$43,762	\$45,075	\$46,427	\$47,820	\$49,255	\$50,732	\$52,254	\$53,822	\$55,437
Contracted Services *											
Indirect Operating Expenses											
Auxiliary Services Administration	\$2,185,798	\$2,251,372	\$2,318,913	\$2,388,480	\$2,460,135	\$2,533,939	\$2,609,957	\$2,688,256	\$2 768 904	\$2 851 971	\$2 937 530
Operations and Maintenance of Facilities	\$7,408,597	\$7,630,855	\$7,859,781	\$8,095,574	\$8,338,441	\$8,588,594	\$8,846,252	\$9,111,640	\$9,384,989	\$9,666,539	\$9,956,535
Other Expenses and Transfers											
Scholarships (Athletics Only)											
Debt Service							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Renewal and Repl. Reserve (5% of Revenue)	\$843,846	\$869,161	\$895,236	\$922,093	\$949,756	\$978,249	\$1,007,596	\$1,037,824	\$1,068,959	\$1,101,028	\$1,134,058
Other (Student Affairs Adminstration Fee)	\$337,538	\$347,664	\$358,094	\$368,837	\$379,902	\$391,299	\$403,038	\$415,129	\$427,583	\$440,411	\$453,623
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$16,086,159	\$16,568,744	\$17,065,806	\$17,577,780	\$18,105,114	\$18,648,267	\$19,207,715	\$19,783,947	\$20,377,465	\$20,988,789	\$21,618,453
NET OPERATING GAIN (LOSS)	\$790,755	\$874,458	\$1,045,364	\$1,228,077	\$1,423,217	\$1,631,437	\$1,853,417	\$2,089,871	\$2,341,546	\$2,609,222	\$2,893,719

*Contracted Services - Accounting system does not separately account for contracted services. A partial list of contracted services would include pest control, engineering services, private security, trash chute maintenance, apartment cleaning and fire alarm system maintenance.

SCHEDULE B

-21-

**Financial Considerations for New Construction (Schedule C-1, C-2)**. Two sets of financial projections are presented for new construction.

- New construction projection C-1 is based on traditional pay-back bond financing with 20 year bonds at 4.5% interest and state managed design-build-bid project delivery with base costs of \$40,000 per bed in 1999 indexed at 4% for inflation.
- New construction projection C-2 is based on alternative tax-exempt bond financing through a 501(c)(3) corporation with 20 year bonds at 5% interest and private developer for fee project delivery with base costs of \$28,000 per bed in 1999 indexed at 4% for inflation.
- Both projections estimate operating costs based on an average of UGA residence hall per bed costs and GSU apartment per bed costs indexed for inflation at 3%.
- Occupancy rates are computed at 100% during the academic year in both scenarios, but with no summer income.
- Rents are calculated as the minimum necessary to cover debt service, operating expenses, and mandatory reserves (5% of revenue).

The building program presented in these projections totals 2,000 new beds constructed according to the following schedule:

FY2001 200 Apartment-style beds constructed adjacent to Oglethorpe House

FY2003 600 Apartment-style beds constructed

FY2005 600 Apartment-style beds constructed

FY2008 600 Apartment-style beds constructed

The replacement of Boggs, Church, Hill, Lipscomb, and Mell Halls is not included in this schedule but is represented in Schedule A, the Cash Flow Schedule for Renovation and Redevelopment Program.

#### UNIVI Y OF GEORGIA DEPARTMENT UNIVERSITY HOUSING DIVISION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

#### TRADITIONAL "PAYBACK" BOND FINANCING, 25 YEARS @ 4.5% DESIGN/BUILD PROJECT DELIVERY METHOD

Schedule C-1

23

	FY 2001 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2002 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2003 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2004 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2005 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2006 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2007 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2008 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2009 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2010 PROPOSED BUDGET
Fee Revenue	\$1,062,810	\$1,076,512	\$4,510,266	\$4,568,404	\$8,296,778	\$8,404,708	\$8,515,872	\$12,707,738	\$12,876,208	\$13,049,740
TOTAL REVENUE	\$1,062,810	\$1,076,512	\$4,510,266	\$4,568,404	\$8,296,778	\$8,404,708	\$8,515,872	\$12,707,738	\$12,876,208	\$13 049 740
Expenditures:								2010 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C		
Debt Service Operating Costs Renewal and Repl. Reserve	\$577,200 \$435,000 \$50,610	\$577,200 \$448,050 \$51,262	\$2,449,800 \$1,845,692 \$214,774	\$2,449,800 \$1,901,062 \$217,542	\$4,475,400 \$3,426,296 \$395,082	\$4,475,400 \$3,529,082 \$400,226	\$4,475,400 \$3,634,954 \$405,518	\$6,754,200 \$5,348,406 \$605,132	\$6,754,200 \$5,508,856 \$613,152	\$6,754,200 \$5,674,122 \$621,418
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$1,062,810	\$1,076,512	\$4,510,266	\$4,568,404	\$8,296,778	\$8,404,708	\$8,515,872	\$12,707,738	\$12,876,208	\$13,049,740
NEROPERATING CAIN (1805)				S0 50						and the second state of the second
Apartment Capacity	200 \$5,314	200 \$5,383	800 \$5,638	800 \$5,711	1,400 \$5,926	1,400 \$6,003	1,400 \$6,083	2,000 \$6,354	2,000 \$6,438	2,000 \$6,525
Assumptions and Indexing: These are pre- Operating costs are estimates based on UGA res	liminary estimates based on sir idence hall actual costs per bed ave	ngle occupancy bedroon eraged with GSU actual ag	m apartment construction partment costs per bed them	on using state constructi indexed for inflation at 39	on standards, \$40,000 p %. Rents were computed t	per bed project cost in 1 to balance revenues with es	999 indexed at 4% for i timated expenditures at 10	inflation 0% occupancy.		
			ALTERNATIVE FINANC AND PROJEC	CING WITH 20 YEAR 5% CT DELIVERY METHOD	TAX EXEMPT BONDS BY PRIVATE DEVELO	THROUGH 501 (C)(3) C OPERS ON A FEE BASIS	ORPORATION			Schedule C-2
	FY 2001 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2002 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2003 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2004 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2005 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2006 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2007 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2008 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2009 PROPOSED BUDGET	FY 2010 PROPOSED BUDGET
Fee Revenue	\$960,330	\$974,032	\$4,075,776	\$4,133,914	\$7,503,188	\$7,611,118	\$7,722,282	\$11,509,688	\$11,678,158	\$11,851,690
TOTAL REVENUE	\$960,330	\$974,032	\$4,075,776	\$4,133,914	\$7,503,188	\$7,611,118	\$7,722,282	\$11,509,688	\$11,678,158	\$11.851.690
Expenditures:										
Debt Service Operating Costs Renewal and Repl. Reserve	\$479,600 \$435,000 \$45,730	\$479,600 \$448,050 \$46,382	\$2,036,000 \$1,845,692 \$194,084	\$2,036,000 \$1,901,062 \$196,852	\$3,719,600 \$3,426,296 \$357,292	\$3,719,600 \$3,529,082 \$362,436	\$3,719,600 \$3,634,954 \$367,728	\$5,613,200 \$5,348,406 \$548,082	\$5,613,200 \$5,508,856 \$556,102	\$5,613,200 \$5,674,122 \$564,368

TOTAL EXPENDITURES \$960,330 \$974,032 \$4,075,776 \$4,133,914 \$7,503,188 \$7,611,118 \$7,722,282 \$11,509,688 \$11,678,158 \$11,851,690

NET OF RATING CAIN (LOSS)	50	100 million (1995)	\$0		S0	SO	50 J.	\$0 K	SO MARK	
Apartment Capacity	200	200	800	800	1,400	1,400	1,400	2,000	2,000	2,000
	\$4,802	\$4,870	\$5,095	\$5,167	\$5,359	\$5,437	\$5,516	\$5,755	\$5,839	\$5,926

Assumptions and Indexing: These are preliminary estimates based on single occupancy bedroom apartment construction using state construction standards, \$28,000 per bed project cost in 1999 indexed at 4% for inflation Operating costs are estimates based on UGA residence hall actual costs per bed averaged with GSU actual apartment costs per bed then indexed for inflation at 3%. Rents were computed to balance revenues with estimated expenditures at 100% occupancy.

### Facility Evaluation

**Residence Hall Inventory and Condition Assessment**. The attached residence halls data sheet provides inventory information about the seventeen UGA residence halls. The average age of the seventeen residence halls, adjusted for major renovations, is over 34 years. There is a large backlog of deferred maintenance, refurbishing, and modernization projects in addition to the fact that many major building systems have outlived their usefulness. The redevelopment plan brochure more fully explains the situation.

### THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY HOUSING

## **RESIDENCE HALLS DATA**

HALL	DATE OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE	CAPACITY	INSURED VALUE
Boggs	1961	32,638	161	3,590,000
Brumby	1966	207,162	966	24,859,000
Church	1961	32,913	160	3,620,000
Creswell	1963	188,149	998	22,578,000
Hill	1961	33,155	165	3,647,000
Lipscomb	1961	32,913	160	3,620,000
Mary Lyndon	1937	36,590	121	4,025,000
McWhorter	1967	69,620*	229	7.658.000
Mell	1961	32,913	161	3,620,000
Morris	1957	29,152	146	3,207,000
Myers	1953	101,559	476	11,171,000
Oglethorpe	1979**	93,431	498	11 212 000
Payne	1939	42,406	198	4 665 000
Reed	1953***	95,555	296	11 944 000
Russell	1967	221,606	972	26 593 000
Rutherford	1938	35,040	157	3 854 000
Soule	1920****	30,555	95	3 361 000
TOTAL		1,315,357	5,959	\$153,224,000

*Housing GSF. Total GSF 81,910

**Purchased by UGA in 1979. Operated as private residence 1965 - 78.

***Major Renovation Completed 1998

****Major Renovation Completed 1990

insured.tbl

11/18/98

**Family and Graduate Housing Apartment Inventory and Condition Assessment**. The 579 apartments consist of three developments, University Village, Rogers Road, and Brandon Oaks apartments. The majority of the older apartments are one bedroom units, not the preferred accommodation for families. While the buildings themselves are in very good structural condition, finishes and fixtures are outdated and worn out. The Brandon Oaks units are two bedroom, two bath units comparable with contemporary private housing stock in the community.

### THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY HOUSING

## FAMILY and GRADUATE HOUSING DATA

BUILDING	DATE OCCUPIED	GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE	#1 BEDROOM	#2 BEDROOM	INSURED
Univ. Village					VALUE
A	1964	23,757	28		2,613,000
В	1964	20,741	24		2,282,000
C	1964	25,966		24	2,856,000
D	1964	32,971		29	3,627,000
E	1966	23,719	28		2,609,000
F	1966	- 20,768	24		2 284 000
G	1966	29,362		24	3 230 000
Н	1966	25,874		24	2 846 000
1	1966	30,910	36		3 400 000
К	1966	30,910	34		3,400,000
L	1966	25,243	30		3,400,000
Office & Shop	1966	11 904	50		2,777,000
Rogers Road M	1973	39 501			1,309,000
N	1973	39 501			4,345,000
Р	1973	36 007	12	36	4,345,000
0	1973	36,007	42		3,961,000
R	1973	26.007	42		3,961,000
S	1973	36,007	42		3,961,000
Brandon Oaka	1973	36,007	42		3,961,000
T	1994	13,200	0	12	1,467,000
U	1994	13,200	0	12	1 467 000
v	1994	11,000	0	10	1 225 000
TOTAL		562,555	372	207	61 036 000

:\director\myk\wp\aptsdata.tbl 11/18/98 **Fraternity and Sorority House Inventory and Condition Assessment**. Two of the eleven fraternity houses (both under long term ground leases) are closed and will require costly renovations before opening again. The remaining fraternity houses are in various conditions, but most are in poor shape and need extensive renovation and upgrades. The three sorority houses are in good to excellent condition.

### THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY HOUSING

## UNIVERSITY-OWNED FRATERNITY AND SORORITY HOUSES

ORGANIZATION	GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE	CAPACITY	FALL '98 OCCUPANCY	INSURED VALUE
SORORITIES				
Alpha Chi Omega	21,542	66	60	2,370,000
Delta Phi Epsilon	12,586	50	30	1,384,000
Sigma Delta Tau	10,056	40	35	1,106,000
SUBTOTAL	44,184	156	125	4,860,000
FRATERNITIES				
Alpha Epsilon Pi	9,988	25	23	1,099,000
Alpha Tau Omega	12,715	30	15	1,399,000
Chi Phi	13,810	18	3	1,519,000
Chi Psi	10,911	20	20	1,200,000
Kappa Alpha	15,688	30	13	1,726,000
Kappa Sigma	14,392	52	35	1,583,000
Phi Delta Theta	12,045	20	19	1,325,000
Pi Kappa Alpha	18,863	34	27	2,075,000
Sigma Chi	12,252	21	Closed	1,348,000
Sigma Nu	N/A	20	Closed	N/A
Tau Epsilon Phi	8,664	30	19	953,000
SUBTOTAL	129,328	300	174	14,227,000
TOTAL	173,512	456	299	19,087,000

Capacity of Off-Campus Sororities 864; Fraternities 362 fratsor.tbl 11/18/98 -29-
#### Market Needs Assessment

A great majority of new freshmen traditionally choose to live on campus at UGA each year. Continuing and transfer students have been more likely to live off campus to satisfy their desires for more bathroom and bedroom privacy, greater independence from regulation of social behavior, and more convenient parking.

The local apartment rental market is presently in a slightly over built condition, resulting from a tremendous building boom when 6,397 apartment and condominium bedrooms were added in Clarke County between 1990 and October, 1997. The apartment complexes which cater specifically to students with upscale facilities and bedroom leases have maintained full or nearly full occupancies. The older and more remote complexes appear to have higher vacancy rates.

UGA enrollment has grown moderately during the time that apartment construction boomed, with fewer than 2,000 additional students. While census data are not available at this writing, the popular press has recently reported that Athens-Clarke County leads the state in job growth and low unemployment. Enrollment projections call for growth through the next decade to 35,000.

It is believed that there is an opportunity to successfully expand campus housing stock with apartment style accommodations which offer the space, privacy, and amenities desired by continuing students and which have a direct connection to the campus intellectual and cultural life supportive of the institutional mission. The prospect of high quality campus housing which meets expressed desires for additional space, single occupancy bedrooms, bathroom privacy, computer connectivity, and other amenities is popular with these returning students. A good number of them will evidently accept the tradeoff of high quality housing on campus for less convenient parking.

The notion of gradually increasing the capacity of campus housing and thereby decreasing the number of off campus students commuting to class each day is supported by the local government and is compatible with ongoing planning in the community.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY HOUSING CLASSIFICATION REPORT SUMMARY- FALL SEMESTER 1998 (09/15/98)

### **ALL RESIDENCE HALLS**

Fresh.	3765	66.8%
Soph.	1050	18.6%
Junior	368	6.5%
Senior	227	4.0%
Grad.	57	1.0%
Other	167	3.0%
Total	5634	



-31-

### University of Georgia Division of Student Affairs DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY HOUSING Occupancy as Percentage of Enrollment

Year Total Enrollment	otal Enrollment Res Halls Apts.		Apts.	On-Campus Frat/Sor		% of Total	Off-Campu:	Off-Campus Frat/Sor		
		Occ.	%	Occ.	%	Occ.	%	Enrollment	Occ.	%
Fall 1998	30,009	5,671	18.9	682	.022	299	.0099	18.9	1065	.035
Fall 1997*	29,692	5,383	18.1	705	.023	293	.0098	18.1	1095	.036
Fall 1996*	29,404	5,329	18.1	713	.024	344	.0116	18.1	1134	.038
Fall 1995	30,149	5,986	19.8	718	.023	356	.0118	19.8	1134	.038
Fall 1994	29,469	6,233	21.1	700**	.023	411	.0139	21.1	1185	.040
Fall 1993	28,753	5,912	20.5	700**	.024	400**	.0139	20.5	1200**	.041
Fall 1992	28,493	5,915	20.7	700**	.024	405	.0142	20.7	1228	.043
Fall 1991	28,691	5,904	20.5	700**	.024	409	.0142	20.5	1234	.043
Fall 1990	28,395	6,045	21.2	700**	.024	430	.0151	21.2	1235	.043
Fall 1989	27,448	5,849	21.3	700**	.025	427	.0155	21.3	1228	.044
Fall 1988	27,176	5,977	21.9	700**	.025	427	.0157	21.9	1228	.045
Fall 1987	26,547	6,132	23.0	700**	.026	427	.0160	23.0	1228	.046
Fall 1986	25,698	6,235	24.2	700**	.027	483	.0187	24.2	1211	.047
Fall 1985	25,408	6,362	25.0	700**	.027	466	.0183	25.0	1241	.048
Fall 1984	25,230	6,406	25.3	700**	.027	450**	.0178	25.3	1200**	.047
Fall 1983	25,052	6,397	25.5	700**	.027	450**	.0179	25.5	1200**	.047
Fall 1982	25,909	6,333	24.4	700**	.027	450**	.0173	24.4	1200**	.046
Fall 1981	25,641	6,341	24.7	700**	.027	450**	.0175	24.7	1200**	.046
Fall 1980	23,470	6,401	27.2	700**	.029	450**	.0191	27.2	1200**	.051
Fall 1979	23,359	6,322	27.0	700**	.029	450**	.0192	27.0	1200**	.051
Fall 1978	23,286	5,858	25.1	700**	.030	450**	.0193	25.1	1200**	.051
Fall 1977	23,285	5,874	25.2	700**	.030	450**	.0193	25.2	1200**	.051

*Reed Hall closed for renovation.

**estimated occupancies w:\director\myk\wp\enroll %2.tbl 1/4/99

# New Freshmen Living in UGA Residence Halls Fall Term



New Freshmen are those who first enroll at UGA in Fall Term

-33-

# **UGA RESIDENCE HALLS**

# Fall Occupancy History As Percentage of Capacity



### ATHENS-CLARKE COUNTY APARTMENT AND CONDOMINIUM BEDROOMS ADDED VS. UNIVERSITY ENROLLMENT CHANGE 1990-97

Year	#Bedrooms Added	Univ. Enrollment	Enrollment Change
1990	14	28,395	
1991	1,280	. 28,691	+296
1992	262	28,493	-191
1993	192	28,753	+260
1994	598	29,469	+716
1995	1,171	30,149	+680
1996	2,501	29,404	-745
1997 (Jan-Oct)	379	29,693	+289
TOTALS	6,397		+1,298

Note: Above figures do not include duplexes, only apartments and condominiums.

### REGENTS-MANDATED ENROLLMENT TARGETS FOR FUTURE YEARS

Year	Target	Allowable Range	Projected Change
1998	30,388	29,780 - 30,996	+695
1999	30,838	30,221 - 31,455	+450
2000	31,288	30,662 - 31,914	+450
2001	31,838	31,201 - 32,475	+550
2002	32,500	31,850 - 33,150	+662

Total Projected enrollment growth 1990 - 2002 = 4,105

Total apartment bedrooms built 1990 - 1997 = 6,397

w:\director\myk\wp\apt-enrl_tbl 12/02/98

### **Occupancy Information and Market Conditions**

- <u>1998 Occupancy Situation</u> Residence hall occupancy at opening was 95% of operating capacity.
- <u>Residence Hall Return Rates</u>
   **30.5%** of Spring Quarter, 1998 residents returned to the halls for the current year ( the return rate for 1997 was 31%).
- <u>New Freshmen in Residence Halls</u>
   83.7% of new freshmen elected to live on-campus beginning Fall Quarter, 1998 (typical yields have been 81-85% in recent years).
- <u>Explosive Growth of Private Housing Stock</u>

Nearly **6,400** new apartment bedrooms have been added to the local community housing stock from 1990-1997, a number greater than the total number of campus residence hall beds. More than 2,800 were added in 1996-97. The great majority of these new developments have been targeted at student renters.

Vacancies now exist in the private housing stock where they have historically been low.

**Popularity** of off-campus apartments is related primarily to bathroom/bedroom privacy and size. Parking close to the apartment and absence of regulations ("freedom from rules") are also mentioned as benefits of off-campus living. The newer units with master suites for each resident and fewer residents per apartment are the most popular. Price does not seem to be a major concern, with most students committing to 12 month leases and paying around \$300 per month plus \$50 or so for utilities (compared to \$265 per month over 9 months for residence hall accommodations including all utilities).

### Residence Hall Pricing

UGA rates are in the upper third of comparable regional institutions.

**Freshmen** are not price sensitive, and demand for higher priced accommodations appears unrestrained among new and returning students. Demand for single accommodations is very high, yet some students still prefer a roommate. Ninety-two percent of Spring Quarter, 1998, residents reported that they did not share a bedroom in high school.

**Campus residents** give evidence that they are not well informed about comparable costs and services for on and off campus housing.

w:\director\myk\wp\future.2 11/18/98

# **Contrast of Residence Hall and Apartment Life Features**

1	Residence Hall	Off Campus Apt.
Amenities	<ul> <li>✓Fully furnished</li> <li>✓Custodial care of bathrooms and kitchens</li> <li>✓All-in-one bill includes all utilities</li> <li>✓Cable TV included</li> <li>✓Movie channel included</li> <li>✓Phone w/upgrades included</li> <li>✓In-hall or nearby computer labs</li> <li>✓Study rooms</li> <li>✓Convenience to campus resources and activities:</li> <li>classes</li> <li>bus system</li> <li>libraries</li> <li>student activities</li> <li>cultural and entertainment events athletic events</li> <li>recreational facilities</li> <li>✓In-hall services: mail delivery,</li> <li>laundries, two convenience stores, one ATM, seven copy machines, two fitness centers, meeting rooms</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>✓Private or semi-private bath</li> <li>✓Single occupancy bedrooms</li> <li>✓Temperature control by occupant</li> <li>✓Parking near living unit, often reserved</li> <li>✓Some are furnished</li> <li>✓Living room</li> <li>✓Kitchen with appliances</li> <li>✓Most have laundry facilities in apartment</li> <li>✓Clubhouse, swimming pool and recreational/sports/fitness features</li> <li>✓Copy/fax service</li> <li>✓Typewriters and/or word processors</li> <li>✓Few rules on behavior</li> <li>✓Relatively new</li> </ul>
Staffing	<ul> <li>Seven live-in professional educator/managers</li> <li>Nine on-site offices</li> <li>Graduate Resident per 250 residents</li> <li>Resident Assistant per 40 residents</li> <li>CLASS Advocate per 400 residents</li> <li>Seven 24 hour desks</li> <li>Duty staff nights and weekends</li> <li>Security staff at night</li> <li>Maintenance and custodial staff</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>✓On-site office with management and office staff</li> <li>✓Maintenance service</li> <li>✓Some have live-in staff</li> </ul>

Security	<ul> <li>Access control system in 16 halls</li> <li>Seven 24 hour desks</li> <li>Uniformed security staff at night</li> <li>Two way radios for desk and security staff</li> <li>Fire alarms connected to UGA Police</li> </ul>	✓ Some form of security, may include guards on site or on tour, gated access to property or groups of apartments, security systems in apartments
Educational Features	<ul> <li>Preferred transition living arrangement for first year college experience</li> <li>Staffing patterns and training based on knowledge of students' developmental needs and practical aspects of academic and campus life</li> <li>Activities and programs by staff, focused on academic success and personal growth needs of residents</li> <li>Typically higher GPA attainment than off campus residents</li> <li>Connected to campus communications and learning technology</li> <li>Entryway to involvement in leadership development programs</li> <li>Limitless opportunities for involvement in self governance, community service, and campus activities</li> <li>Structured and informal contact with "peer superiors" - students who have made a successful adjustment to college life</li> <li>Individualized attention by well trained and dedicated staff</li> <li>Significant experience with a diverse peer group</li> <li>Employment opportunities in a supportive organization - associated with retention, academic success and satisfaction</li> </ul>	✓Living with other students

mation based on four at complexes popular wit UGA students Lease (typically required 4620 for single bedroom
4020 for single bedroom h semi-private bath <u>t does NOT include</u> e deposit and monthly fe y deposit and monthly fe le TV basic service* Premium channel with one exception estimated to average \$50 nonth - \$600 per year <i>ts sharing homes near</i> <i>typically pay \$320+ per</i> <i>cluding utilities - \$3840+</i> <i>per year</i>

w:\director\myk\wp\contrast.myk 11/18/98

### Housing Facilities Component of Physical Master Plan

Map of Current Housing Stock and Potential Expansion Sites. The current housing stock is indicated on the map of the campus Physical Master Plan plan in blue highlight with potential housing constructions sites in yellow.

Lindsay A. Desrochers Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources

Phone (404) 656-2231 1998 SEP Far. (404) 657-7433

MEMORANDUM

October 20, 1997

To:

From:

cc: Baut &

Presidents University System of Georgia

Lindsay A. Desrochers Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources

Subject: Housing Policy

On behalf of the Board of Regents, I want to call your attention to a new policy concerning campus housing adopted at the October Board meeting. (See attached)

This policy grows out of a Student Housing Task Force report presented to the Board last May 13th." Simply put, the purposes of this new policy are two-fold:

The Task Force was composed of Mr. William Gerspacher, Vice President for Business & Finance, North Georgia College & State University; Mr. James M. Brignati, Vice President for Business & Finance, Valdosta State University; Mr. Joseph A. Buck, Vice President for Student Affairs, Armstrong Atlantic State University; Dr. James F. Day, Housing Director, The University of Georgia; Dr. Barry A. Fullerton, Vice Chancellor for Student Services, Board of Regents; Mr. Thomas F. Godbee, Comptroller, Dalton College; Ms. Ebony Hall, Student Resident Advisor, The University of Georgia, Dr. Michael L. Hanes, President, Georgia Southwestern State University; Dr. Paul K. Jahr, Director, Residence Life Office, Georgia College & State University; Ms. Rosalind Meyers, Associate Vice President for Auxiliary Services, Georgia Institute of Technology; Mr. Ervin Ogden, Director of Plant Operations, Savannah State University; Mr. Donald Silvels, Hall Director, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College; Ms. Gita Hendessi, Office of Facilities, Board of Regents; Mr. Levy G. Youmans, Assistant Vice Chancellor - Management & Audit Advisory Services, Board of Regents; and Mr. Patrick Wamsley, Vice President for Fiscal Affairs, Middle Georgia College. The Report, previously sent, was entitled "Student Housing Task Force Report, April 1997".

- First, to assure that each campus with residential housing has a comprehensive plan in place which assures that campus housing goals are clear and related to mission; that appropriate financial projections are made; that housing facilities are properly maintained; that all alternatives, including privatization are considered in the development of housing facilities; and
- Second, to aid the Board of Regents and its staff in assessing facility needs; facility proposals; and annual housing fee requests from campuses.

### General Information

1.

It is the intention of the Board of Regents that comprehensive housing plans be submitted to the Office of Capital Resources and updated on an annual basis. I request that all campuses which currently have student residential housing begin developing these plans and submit them by May 15, 1998, if possible. In some cases campuses are developing physical master plans which may need completion prior to finalizing comprehensive campus housing plans. Please notify the Office of Capital Resources of the specific situation on your campus and likely time line, via a letter to this office. Many campuses have major elements of the planning requirements already available; some campuses have reasonably complete plans now. For general assistance, please contact Associate Vice Chancellor William R. Bowes regarding financial aspects of the plan or Vice Chancellor William Chatham on facilities aspects.

### Financial Statements

One element of the comprehensive housing plan is financial projections which show both revenues and expenditures. While financial projections will become a part of the comprehensive housing plan submitted annually in February, this year we will need finacial projections submitted by February 15, 1998, by all campuses with residentital housing, in order to properly assess housing fee proposals. Should you have any questions on this matter please contact Associate Vice Chancellor William Bowes.

### Campuses With New Housing Programs

There are a few campuses which do not now operate housing programs but which have proposed some housing capacity for their campus. A comprehensive housing plan must be submitted prior to any action item to the Board of Regents for a facility proposal. It is our intention to report these housing plans as information items to the Committees on Finance & Business / Real Estate & Facilities prior to taking any action items to the Board. Again, the overall goal of the Board of Regents in passing this new policy is to assure that campuses are appropriately planning for housing needs and that the Board of Regents has better information available to assess facility needs and make fee determinations. Attachment

cc: Chancellor Stephen R. Portch Dr. James Muyskens Mr. William K. Chatham Mr. William R. Bowes Chief Business Officers Vice Presidents - Student Affairs

2

.*

LAD/rh

# Student Housing Comprehensive Plans

Each campus which provides, or plans to provide, a residential student program shall develop a student housing comprehensive plan that addresses all facets of the creation, expansion, and operation of the student housing facilities. The student housing plan will address academic mission, the specific role or purpose of student housing within that mission including student life programs, access to the campus or other needs, enrollment projections in relation to housing and financial considerations, including an evaluation of the desirability and practicality of achieving these student housing objectives through private sector partnerships on campus lands or lands proximate to the campus. The student housing plan will include the following:

A business plan that explains the role of the student housing program in the context of the institution's academic mission, includes concrete goals and objectives, defines an operating strategy including marketing plans, programs and services, fees, assignment of indirect costs and use of reserves for repair and maintenance, major renovation and, if planned, expansion of capacity. The plan should also contain a financial pro forma which projects future revenues and expenditures consistent with stated goals and objectives and includes plans for capitalization, maintenance and operations and facilities renewal.

- A facility evaluation assessing the appropriateness of rehabilitation versus demolition and new construction:
- A market needs assessment, including justification for additional student housing capacity where appropriate; and
- The housing facilities component of the institution's physical master plan (site, circumstance and impact on other campus functions):

### Student Housing Financial Statements

To support requests for changes in housing fees, each institution shall submit in accordance with procedures established by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources a financial statement which projects revenues and expenditures based on estimated housing enrollments, salary adjustments, inflationary expense and other relevant factors.



Dr. Dwight Douglas Vice President for Student Affairs Academic Building

Dear Dwight:

I am enclosing a copy of a memorandum dated September 10, 1998, addressed to President Adams from Regents staff regarding a plan to house all freshmen and sophomores on campus at UGA. As you can see, an updated housing plan should be submitted to the Regents staff as soon as possible because of its requirement associated with the University's facilities master plan scheduled for completion no later than the end of November 1998.

Please contact Messrs. Danny Sniff or Adam Gross if there are any questions.

Sincerely,

Allan W. Barber Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration

CC: President Michael F. Adams Dr. Karen Holbrook Ms. Jackie Kohler Mr. Danny Sniff Mr. Adam Gross 11-06-98 11:02AM TO

84103478519,,8016535 ≖171 P.1/1

Post-it Fax Note 7671	706 542 7388 11-06-98 1		
TO LUANNE GREEN	From ALL AKSR, -		
Со./Дер1.	Co.		
Phone #	Phone #		
IX H	Fax #		

NIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA ton Street, S.W. la 30334-90070 er 10, 1998

(404) 856-2245 FAX 857-7433

Dr. Michael F. Adams President The University of Georgia Lustrat House Athens, Georgia 30602

FRUM CAMPUS PLANNING

RE:

Physical Master Plan Progress Meeting

Dear President Adams:

On behalf of Dr. Desrochers, I would like to Thank you for taking time out of your undoubtedly busy schedule to meet with us last week and for your leadership and personal involvement in this important project. The meeting was productive from several viewpoints. Dr. Lindsay Desrochers and Bill Chatham were brought up to speed on the status of your master plan. This was also an effective way to view the general direction of your plan and to discuss some issues associated with your master plan concept.

As discussed and as required by the Physical Master Plan Template, your plan must address the other land holdings in Clarke County (including existing and proposed agricultural lands disposition or acquisition concepts), the Botanical Gardens, the Experiment Stations, Extension locations, forestry lands, etc. The template also requires documentation of areas with environmental issues (such as land fills or wet lands) as well as all leased facilities. These items will enhance and provide the appropriate context for your plan. I know that the master planning team has visited Griffin and Tifton and I suspect that you have already

On the issue of student housing, as discussed, the plan to house all freshmen and sophomores on campus is a change to the UGA housing mission as it was last presented to the Board. An update to your campus housing plan should be submitted to Dr. Desrochers as required by a housing policy adopted by the Board of Regents in October of 1997.( I have attached a copy of this policy for your easy reference.) Typically, the master plan shows future building sites, not specifically designated as proposed housing, until after your

The next step, after the above issues have been addressed, will be to convene the second Cross Team meeting at your campus. The purpose of this meeting as required by the Template, will be to review your planning goals and underlying assumptions along with your preliminary master plan alternatives. I look forward to working with your staff to schedule and attend the Cross Team meeting at your campus as soon as the campus and the consultants are prepared to proceed. Please let me know if you have any questions or

Sincerely.

uoloss

Gita Hendessi Director of Planning

Dr. Lindsay Desrochers Mr. William K. Chatham Dr. Allan W. Barber Mr. Daniel E. Sniff

CC:

Mr. J. Dorscy

UGA Master Flats Tile



Department of University Housing

10-10-20

Student Affairs October 8, 1998

MEMORANDUM

11.40 AM

Russell Hall Athens, Georgia 30602-5575 (706) 542-1421

RECEIVED

OCT 1 3 1998 CAMPUS PLANNING

I II I

10:	Bob Bugbee
	Associate Vice President for Business and Finance
FROM:	Jim Day
	Director, University Housing
RE:	Project Proposals for Capital Funding

In response to Ryan Nesbitt's request, I am forwarding herewith three proposals for campus housing construction which could be funded by "payback" bonds. I understand that these proposals will be included among those to be considered in developing the campus capital fund budget request for the fiscal years 2001-2005.

Included with brief project descriptions are preliminary project cost estimates. These estimates are based on the cost of similar projects in the region. Projected debt service requirements, recommended reserve contributions, and operating cost estimates based on recent experience then indexed for expected inflation are also provided. The inflation factor for operating expenses is 5% and for construction project cost is 4%. If these projects are funded, it will be vitally important to structure a new reserve contributions formula that is tailored to the long term refurbishment, renovation, and repair needs of housing facilities. The current formula, 5% of revenues, while perhaps satisfactory for book stores, food services and other similar operations is grossly inadequate for campus housing operations where facilities and furnishing needs are greater.

The high total cost of construction and associated fees for state projects indicates that this will be a very expensive approach. Our current highest academic year residence hall rent is \$3,280 (for a single occupancy room with shared bath in Reed Hall). Assuming similar operating costs, the lowest breakeven academic year rent for a single occupancy room with shared bath in an apartment type accommodation constructed this year and financed by 30 year payback bonds at 5% interest would be ways of project delivery and financing be explored in addition to the "payback" bond program if these projects are to move forward.

I would be remiss if I did not emphasize that these are preliminary estimates and should not be used in anything but a preliminary planning context. As you may recall, our preliminary estimate for the Reed renovation was converted into a project budget without study or revision, resulting in considerable difficulty for all concerned.

Dr. Douglas Dr. Porter Ryan Nesbitt

capplan.4

C

Post-It Fax Note 7671	Dete # of >
TO SURPACE HUDEN	From Luna Arelia
Co./Dept.	Co.
Phone #	Phone #
Fax #	Fax #

#### University of Georgia DIVISION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS Department of University Housing

IU/

### FY 2001-2005 Campus Housing Construction Projects

### FY 2001 Project

10 00

- 1 · 4 0 AM

Apartment style accommodations for 200 residents adjacent to Oglethorpe House. Estimated 70,000 academic year rent \$5,066 per resident.

#### FY 2003 Project

Apartment style accommodations for 600 residents on east campus near the Ramsey Center. Estimated 210,000 gsf and project cost \$28,076,400 financed by 30 year bonds at 5% interest. Minimum estimated academic year rent \$5,524.

#### FY 2005 Project

Apartment style accommodations for 600 residents on or near the current graduate parking lots on Hull Street. Estimated 210,000 gsf and project cost \$30,367,800 financed by 30 year bonds at 5% interest. Minimum estimated academic year rent \$6,024.

Assumptions and indexing: These are preliminary estimates based on single occupancy bedroom apartment construction using state construction standards, 350 gsf per resident, \$40,000 per bed project cost in 1998 indexed at 4% for inflation. Estimated rents were computed by adding 5% to the sum of estimated debt service and operating expenses (actual FY98 indexed for inflation at 5%).

Capplan.4 10/8/98

Office of the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration

The University of Georgia

September 21, 1998

AYERS / SAINT / GROSS, INC.

CANNE -

Dr. Dwight Douglas Vice President for Student Affairs Academic Building

Dear Dwight:

I am enclosing a copy of a memorandum dated September 10, 1998, addressed to President Adams from Regents staff regarding a plan to house all freshmen and sophomores on campus at UGA. As you can see, an updated housing plan should be submitted to the Regents staff as soon as possible because of its requirement associated with the University's facilities master plan scheduled for completion no later than the end of November 1998.

Please contact Messrs. Danny Sniff or Adam Gross if there are any questions.

Sincerely,

Allan W. Barber Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration

CC: President Michael F. Adams
Dr. Karen Holbrook
Ms. Jackie Kohler
Mr. Danny Sniff
Mr. Adam Gross √

Lindsay A. Desrochers Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources

Phone (404) 656-2231

MEMORANDUM

October 20, 1997

cc: Bart &

To:

Presidents University System of Georgia

From:

Lindsay A. Desrochers Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources

Subject: Housing Policy

On behalf of the Board of Regents, I want to call your attention to a new policy concerning campus housing adopted at the October Board meeting. (See attached)

This policy grows out of a Student Housing Task Force report presented to the Board last May 13th.^{*} Simply put, the purposes of this new policy are two-fold:

The Task Force was composed of Mr. William Gerspacher, Vice President for Business & Finance, North Georgia College & State University; Mr. James M. Brignati, Vice President for Business & Finance, Valdosta State University; Mr. Joseph A. Buck, Vice President for Student Affairs, Armstrong Atlantic State University; Dr. James F. Day, Housing Director, The University of Georgia; Dr. Barry A. Fullerton, Vice Chancellor for Student Services, Board of Regents; Mr. Thomas F. Godbee, Comptroller, Dalton College; Ms. Ebony Hall, Student Resident Advisor, The University of Georgia, Dr. Michael L. Hanes, President, Georgia Southwestern State University; Dr. Paul K. Jahr, Director, Residence Life Office, Georgia College & State University; Ms. Rosalind Meyers, Associate Vice President for Auxiliary Services, Georgia Institute of Technology; Mr. Ervin Ogden, Director of Plant Operations, Savannah State University; Mr. Donald Silvels, Hall Director, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College; Ms. Gita Hendessi, Office of Facilities, Board of Regents; Mr. Levy G. Youmans, Assistant Vice Chancellor - Management & Audit Advisory Services, Board of Regents; and Mr. Patrick Wamsley, Vice President for Fiscal Affairs, Middle Georgia College. The Report, previously sent, was entitled "Student Housing Task Force Report, April 1997".

- First, to assure that each campus with residential housing has a comprehensive plan in place which assures that campus housing goals are clear and related to mission; that appropriate financial projections are made; that housing facilities are properly maintained; that all alternatives, including privatization are considered in the development of housing facilities; and
- Second, to aid the Board of Regents and its staff in assessing facility needs; facility proposals; and annual housing fee requests from campuses.

### General Information

It is the intention of the Board of Regents that comprehensive housing plans be submitted to the Office of Capital Resources and updated on an annual basis. I request that all campuses which currently have student residential housing begin developing these plans and submit them by May 15, 1998, if possible. In some cases campuses are developing physical master plans which may need completion prior to finalizing comprehensive campus housing plans. Please notify the Office of Capital Resources of the specific situation on your campus and likely time line, via a letter to this office. Many campuses have major elements of the planning requirements already available; some campuses have reasonably complete plans now. For general assistance, please contact Associate Vice Chancellor William R. Bowes regarding financial aspects of the plan or Vice Chancellor William

### Financial Statements

One element of the comprehensive housing plan is financial projections which show both revenues and expenditures. While financial projections will become a part of the comprehensive housing plan submitted annually in February, this year we will need finacial projections submitted by February 15, 1998, by all campuses with residentital housing, in order to properly assess housing fee proposals. Should you have any questions on this matter please contact Associate Vice Chancellor William Bowes.

### Campuses With New Housing Programs

There are a few campuses which do not now operate housing programs but which have proposed some housing capacity for their campus. A comprehensive housing plan must be submitted prior to any action item to the Board of Regents for a facility proposal. It is our intention to report these housing plans as information items to the Committees on Finance & Business / Real Estate & Facilities prior to taking any action items to the Board. Again, the overall goal of the Board of needs and that the Board of Regents has better information available to assess facility needs and make fee determinations.

1.

Attachment

cc: Chancellor Stephen R. Portch Dr. James Muyskens Mr. William K. Chatham Mr. William R. Bowes Chief Business Officers Vice Presidents - Student Affairs

, •

LAD/rh

### POLICY ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF REGENT, OCTIBER 1997

## Student Housing Comprehensive Plans

Each campus which provides, or plans to provide, a residential student program shall develop a student housing comprehensive plan that addresses all facets of the creation, expansion, and operation of the student housing facilities. The student housing plan will address academic mission, the specific role or purpose of student housing within that mission including student life programs, access to the campus or other needs, enrollment projections in relation to housing goals; geographic, economic and demographic factors on the campus and in the local community, and financial considerations, including an evaluation of the desirability and practicality of achieving these student housing objectives through private sector parmerships on campus lands or lands proximate to the campus. The student housing plan will include the following:

A business plan that explains the role of the student housing program in the context of the institution's academic mission, includes concrete goals and objectives, defines an operating strategy including marketing plans, programs and services, fees, assignment of indirect costs and use of reserves for repair and maintenance, major renovation and, if planned, expansion of capacity. The plan should also contain a financial pro forma which projects future revenues and expenditures consistent with stated goals and objectives and includes plans for capitalization, maintenance and operations and facilities renewal.

- A facility evaluation assessing the appropriateness of rehabilitation versus demolition and new construction;
- A market needs assessment, including justification for additional student housing . capacity where appropriate; and
- The housing facilities component of the institution's physical master plan (site, circumstance and impact on other campus functions);

### Student Housing Financial Statements

To support requests for changes in housing fees, each institution shall submit in accordance with procedures established by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources a financial statement which projects revenues and expenditures based on estimated housing enrollments, salary adjustments, inflationary expense and other relevant factors.

# The University of Georgia Technical Memorandum

Date	2/23/98
Project	University of Georgia Physical Master Plan
Subject	Appendix Information
From	Ayers / Saint / Gross
То	University of Georgia
	UGA Athletic Association Capital Projects
Architects and Campus Planners	
Ayers/Saint/Gross	
222 Saint Paul Place	

Ayers/Saint/Gross 222 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, MD 21202 410/347-8500 Fax 410/347-8519

#### Architecture and Engineering Heery International

999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30367 404/881-9880 Fax 404/875-1283

#### Landscape Architecture Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan

1708 Peachtree Street, Suite 444 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/876-7726 Fax 404/876-6858

### Traffic Engineering

LRE Engineering 1475 Peachtree Street, Suite 220 Atlanta, GA 30309 404/888-8800 Fax 404/876-7797

#### Academic Programming

 Paulien & Associates

 899 Logan Street, Suite 508

 Denver, CO 80203-3156

 303/832-3272

 Fax 303/832-3380

 $F:\label{eq:appendix} UGA \ Athletic \ Assoc. \ Capital \ Projects \ (updated). doc$ 

Proje	ect Title Budge	t Remarks
Sanford Stadium	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
Media Interview Room	\$60,000	Pre-engineered structure
East End		Need funding
Add Skysuites, Sky Club, &	\$12,000,000	Design Development
new Concessions		
Miscellaneous improvements	\$15,000	Completed
(signs, lighting, misc. repairs)		-
New Skysuite Wallcovering	\$50,000	Included in Skysuite project
Retrofit Skysuite Window	\$9500	
Blinds		
Skysuite window repairs	\$10,000	
TV Truck Parking	????	
Letterman's Club entrance	\$2000	Awaiting granite marker
Replace toilet partitions	\$50,000	Completed
Concession improvements	\$250,000	Funded by Global/FY99
Waterproof So. Upper Deck	\$350,000	Funded
Coliseum		
Retrofit entrance / stair tower	\$100,000 budget	Construction 50% complete
	\$10,000 for design	
Cheerleaders Dressing Area	\$40,000	Fund raising
Men's Track Locker Room	\$12,000	Completed
Replace wooden arena seats	\$400,000	Need funding
New Basketball Floor	\$125,000	Installed and in use.
Press Room/Weight Room &	\$162,000 budget \$15,000 design	Completed
Men's Track Locker room		
Olympic Annex Fire	\$100,000	On Hold
Sprinklers		
Office Renovation (3 floors)	\$586,000 (UGA funds)	Under construction
Upgrade officials and visitors	\$5,000	Need funding
Dressing rooms		
Butts-Mehre		
Replace carpet $(2^{10}, 3^{10}, and 4^{10})$	\$130,000	Completed
floors)		
#rd & 4 th Floor renovations	\$9,000	Underway
(finishes)		
New All Sports Kiosk	\$50,000	Ordered but not yet installed
Refinish dome framing	\$5,000	Need funds
New ACT ceiling Rm.101	\$12,000	Need funds
Re-landscape front of bldg.	\$88,000	Underway
Replace broken granite at front	\$5,500	Soliciting proposal

entrance		
Tennis Complex		
New Men's Pavilion, Stands	\$2,000,000	Pavilion Drawings completed Fund
and Game Courts		raising underway
"Luxury" Boxes Ventilation	\$13,000	Soliciting proposals
Replace ceiling @ indoor	\$50,000	\$13,763.97 available funds
courts		need additional funds
Replace skylights @ indoor	\$12,000	Need funding
Reconstruct Storm Drainage	\$20,000 PPD funds	Completed by PPD
New Women's Pavilion	\$600,000	Fund raising
Track Facility		
Resurfacing Spec Townes	\$225,000	Completed and in use.
running track		1
New Lumpkin St. Bleachers	????	Need program & estimate
Golf Team Clubhouse	\$600,000	Completed
Athletic Academic	Includes new training room for	Need funding
Achievment Center	women's sports. No budget yet.	Location adjacent to Annex
30,000 sp.ft.		
Indoor Athletic Facility	\$10,000,000	Includes practice football field, running
100,000 Sp, Ft.		track, field events and other sports
Women's Athletic Fields		
Phase I	\$333,679.00	Completed (PPD funds)
Phase II	\$900,000.00	Completed
Phase III (Maintenance	\$150,000	Construction 95% complete
facility, deceleration lane		-
entrance sign and gate)		
Phase IIIa (lighting for game	\$400,000	In design. Install by Fall 1999
fields and parking areas)		
Phase IV (1 st phase of	\$600,000+10% for Architect	Need funding
building, paving, sewage	fees, survey, etc.	
disposal system)		
Phase V (plaza, ticket booths	\$250,000	Need funding
fences, concessions)		Ũ
Phase VI (2 nd phase of	\$500,000	Need funding
building)		
Phase VII (Paving, fencing	\$250,000	Need Funding
landscaping, signage)		Č