Planning & Development Committee
March 13, 2006


Others Attending:  Beth Jones, Harvey Shumpert

Lydia Woltz announced by email that the minutes for the 2-21-06 would be sent to the group for approval in the following week, so the only item on the agenda for the day was the approval of the MRRF Report.

Phang Tai called the meeting to order at apx. 1:05pm. Tim Crimmins asked if anyone knew if there were any changes from the draft passed out at the last P&D 2-21-06 meeting. Sandra Garber mentioned that item numbers 4 & 6 would be funded soon and eventually removed from the list and Phang Tai reminded the group that the list was now complete, including the added list of Major & Minor Capital lists.

Harvey Shumpert headed the discussion on the report (passed out via email) and asked the group if they had any questions or comments.

Tim Crimmins questioned the use for the Academic Building listed under the Major Capital list. Harvey replied that it was initially to be used for the Counseling Bldg. or the building next to it on Courtland Street, and Jerry Rackliffe & Robin Morris explained to the group that it also was used as a place holder (being that it took such a long time to get items on the list).

Tim Crimmins brought up the "Campus Development Plans" project and mentioned that this would be a good time (with all of the new lists being made/approved to be sent over to the senate) to discuss a way to have those project plans incorporated into the review process. He also mentioned that P&D should consider having one list of all the major plans/projects under review.

Harvey Shumpert reminded the group that all campus development plans were listed on the Master Plan. Phang Tai mentioned that there Ramesh Vakamudi from Planning Facilities had made a presentation of the Master Plan within the last year. Robin Morris also explained that a lot of donations went into the funding of the plan.
Frank Whittington agreed with Tim, mentioning that because membership on the committee was rolling, a lot of members didn’t/wouldn’t know of items from the Master Plan, being that it was only approved every 5/10 years. He mentioned as a new member he would appreciate & benefit from some sort of larger review list. The group didn’t come to final decision on how to implement an updated process, and Tim mentioned he would like to see a 2/3 year plan of all items to be sent to the Board of Regents.

Harvey then quickly briefed the group on the Minor Capital items. He mentioned that a lot of these items were left on from the last year and went over the various problems/issues facing each item on the list.

Tim questioned whether anyone knew of the savings that would result from item #2 (Campus Chilled Water Loop). Harvey replied that he didn’t know right now, and that there was a lot of electrical work needed before that project could fully take place. Tim questioned whether the university could benefit from building its own power plant (as done in the new Atlantic Station Condominium Project on 17th Street in downtown Atlanta). Harvey explained that for a State funded institution, there were legalities involved in that same type of project used for infrastructure upgrades, so that it was not something that the university could do. Jerry Rackliffe & Robin Morris also mentioned that it was very expensive. They mentioned that Georgia Tech just built one that cost apx. $35 million. That ended the discussion on the matter and with no more discussion about the list, the group motioned in and accepted the report.

There were no subcommittee reports to comment on and the meeting adjourned at apx. 1:25pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz, Admin. Coordinator