Planning & Development Committee Meeting  
February 17th, 2004

Present:  Al Baumstark, Mary Jane Casto, Timothy Crimmins, Paula Eubanks, Martin Fraser, Charles Gallagher, Peggy A. Gallagher, Christine Gallant, Sandra Garber, Hugh Hudson, Charlene S. Hurt, Marcia Pearl, Jerry Rackliffe, George Rainbolt, Jeffrey C. Rupp, Debra Snell, Phang C. Tai, Vijay K. Vaishnavi.


Others Attending:  Harvey Shumpert, Ramesh Vakamudi

The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of 1/20/04 Minutes
2. Discussion and action:  Harvey Shumpert  
   MRRF and 5 Year: Ramesh Vakamudi  
   Regulatory List
3. ASUR Police Report:  Hugh Hudson/Joan Carson
4. Academic Program Review: Dept. of Communication FYI
5. Other Issues

Item #1 on the Agenda - The January 20th minutes were seconded & approved.

The meeting moved on to item#2 on the agenda.  The following documents by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia passed out for the discussion:

1) Summary List of Requests for Five-Year Capital Projects (FY2006 - FY2010)

2) Two lists of the Summary List of Requests for Major Repair & Rehabilitation (MRR) Projects FY2005; SUM-MRR1 and SUM-MRR2

Harvey Shumpert opened the discussion, briefly commented on the diversity of the groups and people within the university consulted in regards to the lists, then introduced Ramesh Vakamudi to answer any specific questions.

Ramesh explained that the joint committees on MRRF rated all the projects on the reports based on system reliability in areas such as system life, how many times the system was fixed, hot cold costs (i.e., mechanical costs), number of work requests received, etc.  He mentioned that a database was being kept to track all the information received.
Charlene Hurt & Hugh Hudson questioned and discussed the Library Building receiving what was thought of as a “less than important” rating of 1. Charlene expressed that for such an important building, the main building used to support students’ learning, its rating was not appropriate. Phang Tai mentioned that because the process was so far underway it may not be feasible to try to change anything at the current time, and that future change may be a better alternative; otherwise, it would have to be “sent back through” to the Joint Committees.

Christine Gallant questioned how ADA compliance was factored into the reports, especially in regards to the rating of elevator issues. Ramesh responded that compliance was being followed as long as there was a plan in place to address any ADA compliance issues occurred.

Al Baumstark mentioned that there was discussion to either address ADA compliance issues on a separate list or to incorporate them into the current list, but that both would not be done and it was his understanding that the issues would be addressed in a separate list.

Harvey Shumpert explained that ADA projects were coordinated with the Disabilities Committee.

Tim Crimmins - “On the design fees for the 2006 projects, is there a list for these?”
Ramesh Vakamudi - “It is this same list. We only get apx. 3 million/yr. If we get the 3 million this year, the remaining price on this list is what we use as the design fee.”
Tim - “Is this a new way of doing this?”
Ramesh - “Yes.”
Phang Tai - “This is actually a nicer way of doing it. You usually can’t do anything until July 1st (until the money comes); then you start on the design and there’s no time to complete things in a timely manner (esp. HVAC). This way, you can design a year earlier and then right when the money comes, you can start to build.”

Tim Crimmins - made the motion to accept “Summary List of Requests for Five-Year Capital Projects (FY2006 - FY2010)” and also motioned that for clarity purposes the current list be modified so that people would know the status of the ranked projects and “where they stood”. His motion was seconded and approved.

Ramesh gave updates and answered individual questions on the other buildings and projects listed. He announced that the ground breaking for the new Science Teaching Lab building should be in 2007. He mentioned that the case was being given to the Board of Regents about the uniqueness of the University in that the majority of the buildings donated/utilized/owned by the University were not built for a university setting and were over 30 and 40 years old. Being that there was only so much that you could do with these buildings because of their uniqueness, the case was being made to the Regents that a large sum of money was indeed needed to keep them going.

George Rainbolt - made the motion to accept Summary List of Requests for Major Repair & Rehabilitation (MRR) Projects FY2005 - SUM MRR1. His motion was seconded and approved.
Ramesh then briefly spoke on the **Summary List of Requests for Major Repair & Rehabilitation (MRR) Projects FY2005 - SUM MRR2**. He explained it was basically a regulatory list used primarily to fix code violations.

**Tim Crimmins made a motion for its acceptance. His motion was seconded and approved.**

Before discussion ended on the MRR projects, various questions were asked to Ramesh and **Jerry Rackcliffe** about the status on various buildings and projects. Phang Tai asked about feedback on the physical conditions of the foundation owned buildings *(see P&D minutes Jan. 1, 2004)*. Jerry Rackcliffe mentioned a report was in progress and thus far it focused on the Foundation (at a minimum) maintaining ADA compliance & Fire Safety to the buildings they owned.

**The meeting then moved on to item #3 on the Agenda.**

**Hugh Hudson** outlined the (ASUR) Administrative Support Unit Reviews for the following two Units:

1) Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and the Teaching and Learning with Technology Center (TLTC)

2) University Educational Technology Services (UETS)

Brief discussion in the similarities of the CTL & TLTC took place.

**The ASUR report for CTL & TLTC was motioned in and accepted by the committee.**

George Rainbolt made a motion to recommend that the directors of the two centers of the CTL & TLTC consider whether combining under one name would be useful. His motion was seconded & passed.

**The ASUR report for UETS was motioned in and accepted by the committee.**

Hugh Hudson praised the effectiveness of UETS and made the following comment:

> “We would like UETS to consider a means of obtaining feedback data to determine their effectiveness and include an assessment of diversity training. In their Action Plan they report a number of activities for diversity training. We’re sympathetic to possible needs for staff increases.”
Phang Tai brought to the meeting a report from the Research Center Review Subcommittee of the Senate Research Committee in regards to a review of the Center for International Media Education (CIME). He mentioned it was FYI information only. The group acknowledged the report, and the meeting came to an end at apx. 2:11pm.

Respectfully Submitted

Lydia K. Woltz
Administrative Coordinator