Planning & Development Committee Meeting  
September 24, 2001  


Absent: Al Baumstark, John DeCastro, Nick Demos, Dabney Dixon, Richard Fendler, Martin Fraser, Peggy Gallagher, Ronald Henry, Steven Kaminshine, Richard (Dick) Miller, Joseph Rabianski, Vijay K. Vaishnavi, Marta S. White, Carol Winkler  

Others Attending: Sarah Pallas  

Agenda  
1. Approval of August 21, 2001 Minutes  
2. Update of the Planning Facility  
3. Fire Safety Issues  
4. Miscellaneous Planning Issues: University Systems Shut-Off  

1:07pm  
Phang Tai called the meeting to order & asked if there were any corrections to the September 21st minutes. Diane Taylor suggested that the end of sentence 1 on pg. 2, section 8, be changed to read . . . “faculty staff and student activity” and that department & building plans include staff as well. Dr. Tai mentioned that the committee would continue to talk about more safety regulations later and the change was approved by all.  

P.C. Tai moved on to the 2nd item of the Agenda; various representatives to different committees briefed the committee. The discussion that followed covered both items #2 and #3.  

P.C. Tai briefly discussed Planning & Facilities issues in the absence of Harvey Shumpert. In the original list of Minor Capital Renovations, on the top of the list was the Arts & Humanities Safety, apx. ~ 3.5 million dollars. There was a CBSAC discussion in regards to the Aquatics Building: "It needs HVAC Repairs; and CBSAC thinks it would be appropriate to solve the problems in both buildings at one time. If the problems with Aquatics were taken care of in a timely manner, Arts & Humanities could be used for other purposes. The CBSAC recommended funding for a feasibility study."  

Jeff Rupp added that the CBSAC discussion evolved around the question of "whether it was best to spend money to renovate the area because of the health & safety issues vs. potentially moving it all into the Aquatics building." The difference in cost would be 3 to 3.5 million vs. 4 to 4.5 million. "What CBSAC ended up approving was a recommendation to allocate funds to do the design work of the Aquatics building and to look into (in more detail) the feasibility of moving the ceramic art from the Arts & Humanities building."
Nancy Floyd mentioned that she was in the area of Photography (one of the areas that had problems with ventilation) and that they might be moving to the Aquatics building. She questioned whether the whole School of Art & Design would be moving to that building. Charlene Hurt answered that Photography was not one of the areas that was supposed to be moved, and that Sculpture, Jewelry, Ceramics, and Painting & Drawing were the departments to be moved, and that after the move, the ventilation system would then be able to handle the remaining departments.

Tai mentioned that it was too premature to discuss all the details at this time.

George Rainbolt asked whether it was correct to say that the moving of those departments would result in a net increase of space. Tai confirmed yes, and noted that it would be more expensive & disruptive to fix an HVAC system in an existing building than it would be to build one in to an empty building that was still under design.

Tai mentioned that the 2nd major concern of the FACP committee under was the section of “move & renovation.” The issue was whether $60,000 in design money that was released, was put back on hold again. Jeff Rupp’s understanding was that the money was released & not put back on hold. Charlene Hurt agreed, and said that she also thought the money had been released at the CBSAC meeting and thought that CBSAC released the money for 2 projects & discussed the possible renovation of the pool area for Art & Design.

Lauren Adamson introduced that Kathy Johnston had helped set up a 'framework' of planning, so that there might be a small amount of space opening up in the Park Place building because of the “Athletic move,” but that the area would only be used by academic units. Use by any other area would be given only with considerable justification and based on extraordinary difficult circumstances. "If more space becomes available, more discussion on different uses of that space allocation will probably follow."

Charlene Hurt mentioned that she thought particular discussion (on that space) would take place in the upcoming Deans' meeting so that the deans could present their schools’ & college’s needs. Tai added that hopefully (from that meeting) some sort of information would emerge (from the domino effect that would take place from all the “moving & freeing-up of space”) and let P&D know what to plan for in the long run.

Charlene Hurt gave an update on the Library South building. "The contractors are now trying to agree on a date where they can open L.S. to the public. The building should be partially open to the public between the 12th & the 26th of October. Areas that people will be kept away from will be the Decatur Street side of the building & the bridges between the two buildings. The opening of the total 2 buildings in their entirety should be January 1, 2002. For employees who have to work between Oct 01' & Aug 02', the wearing of earplugs is actually being discussed."

Tai briefly mentions that there are searches going on for a new Physical Plant Director, and a Director of Facility Services to replace Harvey Shumpert's old position.

Tai moved on the item #4 in the agenda.

George Rainbolt questioned the “tearing up” of the grass in Woodruff Park. “Why was it done?” Katherine Johnston answered that through a foundation, partnership donations, and grant money that was being used, funds were obtained to repair bare areas of the grass that needed re-sodding & to replace the sprinkler system. "The expected re-opening of the area will be on “Arts Day” in October."

Tai opened up the issue of communication problems between different administrative rules & faculty needs. Example: Classrooms that were not always available/assigned to the main departments that they were designed for.

Damon Camp responded that in Tai’s example, the classroom in question was originally designed for a different department’s use, then provided that any problems of a similar nature should be directed to Edgar Tolbert, Chair of Classroom Facilities.

Tai spoke on IS& T’s shutdowns & upgrade issues, saying they should not occur before 5pm and should probably be performed over the weekend and then cited the disruption of faculty & staff work. Katherine Johnson said that the last major shutdown/upgrade was actually done over the weekend, Friday through Sunday, and that the alternative was Saturday through Monday, and that notice of the shut down was sent out several weeks in advance. Charlene Hurt mentioned that she thought she’d seen the notice on an email announcement through “Groupwise.” Lloyd Nigro mentioned that it had been his experience that many people just didn’t pay attention to the announcements made. George Rainbolt agreed.

Sarah Pallas opened discussion on including people in on unmentioned & new implementation and interpretations of Fire Safety
Regulations, and discussions on compliance issues began.

Katherine Johnson said that care should be taken so that bigger issues, due to non-compliance would not began. She mentioned that departments needed to make sure that the Fire Safety code was read, understood & advocated properly.

Sarah Pallas mentioned that she had read the original code in great detail, but there were things being implemented in the University that she had not seen anywhere in the code.

Phang Tai mentioned that one major problem was that certain codes were implemented under the direction of one Fire Marshall & then once a different Fire Marshall came in, interpretations of those codes by the new Fire Marshall were different. One issue currently going on is the interpretation of the opening of laboratory doors & the doors of offices connected to laboratories. The “Fire Code” says that all those types of doors should be closed, but "University Code" says when dealing with students, doors (in the case of offices connected to laboratories) should remain open.

Lauren Adamson opened discussion on the New York bombings of September 11th. "We're in extraordinary times. The University had problems closing. We need to consider what was done, and plan to do things differently. First a message was sent out by the university saying that we were open, then within one hour a second message was sent out saying that we were closed, which caused an extreme amount of confusion. Do we want to consider, as a planning committee, levels of closing, so people aren't dramatically thrusted into the streets?”
George Rainbolt said that his department has an intercom system which is extremely old and inaudible and that the "last resort" of using it to tell people to evacuate the building would probably scare people. He agreed with Lauren's idea of "levels of closing" & suggested the following levels as an example:

- **Level 1** - Classes would be open, but optional depending on the teacher's discretion.
- **Level 2** - Classes would be closed, but offices would remain open.
- **Level 3** - Both classes & offices would be closed, but students would be allowed to remain in certain open areas of the university (some students had absolutely no where to go during the September 11th bombings).
- **Level 4** - Evacuation, everyone must leave!

Nancy Floyd discussed how, on that day, the evacuation of vehicles was a disaster and that some people were stuck on the top of the G-Deck parking lot for over an hour!

Bonnie Fritz asked whether the university had a crisis plan. Hazel Scott said that she had heard of an actual Crisis plan. Katherine Johnston said that she thought this plan probably came from GSU's Dept. of Occupational Safety & Risk Management. Robert Sattlemeyer said that work on a similar plan had been done right before the Olympics & that it would be a good idea to consult it. **More discussion of that day’s events took place & it was decided that a possible sub-committee for a shut down plan would be on the agenda of later. A motion was made to create a sub-committee, the motion was seconded and passed.**

Katherine Johnston, in regards to the new sub-committee, introduced that a fact-finding mission for information should take place. **P.C. Tai stated that the 1st charge of the sub-committee would be the fact-finding mission.**

Nancy Floyd asked whether Arts & Humanities were supposed to be given audiovisual rooms. Robert Sattlemeyer answered that he didn't know but would find out.

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:56pm**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz