The meeting began at 1:08pm. The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of Feb. 19th, 2001 Minutes
2. 2002 MRRF
3. Draft Report - Subcommittee on Traffic Safety
4. Resolution for an Increase in Tenure-track Faculty Appointments

Phang Tai brought the meeting to order; no changes were made to the 2/19/02 minutes. The minutes were approved; Tai moved on to the next issue.

Katherine Johnston reported on the 2002 MRRF List. “This year we tried to prioritize the system. We looked at some criteria that would help us prioritize, and then we applied weights to those criteria.” She explained that the list of items on the MRRF was large, but money was limited. She said her highest priority was to minimize the impact of the MRR on the operating budget; “This year the amount of MRR going from the Legislature to the Regents & then to us, will be less: $30 million as opposed to $54 million.” More discussion took place between the committee, and Katherine explained answered questions in more detail in regards to structure, content and logic used to come up with the report.

Steve Kaminshine mentioned that the purpose of the report was to provide some predictability, and questioned how reliable the current criteria would be in the coming future. Katherine Johnston explained that the current list was done quickly because of a time-line that its committee was on; a proposal was due to the Board of Regents by March 20th, but that once the committee received a broad acceptance, she didn’t think the criteria that the list was based on would change.

John DeCastro mentioned how the list contained about $26 million dollars in repairs when the entire system consisted of apx. $30 million dollars in total. “Is there anything that we as a senate can do to help lobby this situation? Do resolutions help?” Katherine said that alternative funding was currently being looked into. She mentioned that a report had been published on deferred maintenance that suggested that institutions defer $4 dollars for every $1 dollar they spent on maintenance, because they were just not getting enough money to do it. “We’ll do what we can with the money we’re given, but there are consequences for continually rationing down the maintenance budget.” Discussion about the MRRF list ended, and a motion was made to approve the FY 2003 MRRF Project List by Rank Order; the motion was seconded and approved.

Carol Winkler raised the issue of buildings that were not funded by MRR because they were foundation owned. After discussing as an example the 1 Park Place building and its issues of bad air quality she made
the following motion.

**MOTION #2**

Carol Winkler made a motion that . . . “the P&D Committee send a recommendation forward to FACP, that if there were not other funding sources available, that FACP consider health issues of the buildings that don’t fall within the MRR List.” Her motion was seconded and approved. John DeCastro commented that he wasn’t disagreeing with the motion, but just wanted to note that GSU was . . . “prevented by regulation from spending capital improvement money on any building that we don’t own; so we might like to do that, but we may be prohibited.” He explained that sometimes that problem could be ‘worked-around’, by declaring the project a maintenance issue, (i.e., “There’s a distinction between replacing an HVAC system and having to consider it a Major Capital Improvement.”).

**MOTION #3**

Bonnie Fritz made a motion to open discussion on the “Immediate Action” of the Traffic Safety Proposal - Interim Report to Planning & Development. Her motion was seconded & and approved.

Bonnie Fritz Discussed the Draft Report from the Subcommittee on Traffic Safety. She said the report had been divided into 3 units: Immediate Action, Short Term (apx. 1yr), & Long Term.

Dick Miller started the discussion out by commenting on the potential dangers on the corner of Decatur Street & Central Ave./Peachtree Ctr. Avenue. He warned how pedestrians were no longer paying attention to the traffic lights and even though vehicles in the left turning lane of Decatur Street ‘had the light,’ pedestrians constantly crossed in front of those vehicles, preventing the vehicles from turning and angering the drivers. He suggested a crossing guard. Bonnie Fritz explained that GSU officers protested to dangerous/busy crosswalks because of previous accidents & problems enforcing tickets at those crosswalks. Katherine Johnston explained that GSU’s campus was partitioned into about 7 zones and had apx. 1 officer per campus zone, but that there were not enough resources to cover everything that needed to be covered. She also explained how the crossing guard that was located at Courtland Street was removed due to budget cuts. More discussion went on in regards to the traffic safety issues (staggering class times, walk/don’t walk lights, the diverting of traffic, ticketing methods, traffic monitors, etc.) and the following changes were made to the report.

Within the discussion of the Traffic Safety Proposal - Interim Report to Planning & Development, several suggestions were made.

Carol Winkler moved that item #2 on page 2 of that report be “excised from the plan.” John DeCastro disagreed and thought that #1 on that same page needed to be “strengthened.” Katherine Johnston mentioned that if too many “key locations” would make things overwhelming and we didn’t have enough manpower to cover those locations. She explained that only sworn police officers were allowed to direct vehicle traffic. Peggy Gallagher questioned the idea of traffic monitors that were not actually positioned within the main flow of traffic, but who were positioned on the corners so that some sort of police presence could be noticed. Dabney Dixon also suggested that some sort of Ambassador Force be present. Robert Sattlemeyer recommended that #2 on page 2 of the report be kept, mentioning that right now, there weren’t many more options, and some sort of human presence was needed. He mentioned that it wouldn’t “tie anyone’s hands.” Bonnie Fritz mentioned that she was hesitant to remove item #2 right now, because some type of insurance of a safety presence was needed.
Steve Kaminshine mentioned that the immediate concern was the Aderhold Building, and he wasn’t sure if #2 was needed for the Aderhold; but he thought that it was “friendly” enough to accept as is right now. Al Baumstark suggested that the phrase “and other crosswalks” be added to the end of the last sentence of #1 on that same page.

Phang Tai mentioned that the phrase “In addition to the Decatur Street intersection” be inserted before sentence #2, of item #3 on that same page.

Jeff Rupp “If the effect of passing this means that the Immediate change will affect only the Aderhold Building, then I have to strongly OPPOSE passing it. I’ve seen two people killed. It should NOT pass if it ties the hands of the administration!”

Nancy Floyd questioned whether a path could be designed so that students would have to use traffic lights in order to cross dangerous intersections.

**MOTION #4**

AFTER MUCH DISCUSSION, a motion was made to omit item #2 on page 2 of the “Immediate Action” of the draft, add the phrase “In addition to the Decatur Street intersection” to the beginning of sentence #2 of item #3, and to insert the phrase “such as safety monitors” to the end of #3 on that same page.

The motion passed 9 to 4. Katherine Johnston abstained from the vote. The motion will be forwarded to the Executive Committee for action.

Discussion leading up to motion #4 dominated the latter part of the meeting, then the meeting ended at apx. 1:45pm.

Respectfully Submitted

Lydia K. Woltz
Administrative Coordinator