The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of the minutes 12-18-06

2. 2007 Action Plan Draft - Provost Henry

3. Foundation Building Acquisition & Maintenance, Q&A (Mark Lawson)

4. Subcommittee Reports
   a) MRRF, Pre-CBSAC Update - (Sandra Garber)
   b) Campus Safety (Beth Jones)

_Agenda Item #1 - Minutes_ - Phang Tai called the meeting to order at apx.1pm. The group motioned in and approved the minutes.

_The meeting then moved on to the 2nd item on the agenda - 2007 Action Plan_

Ron Henry lead the discussion and informed the group that the plan followed the same format as it had from previous years. He mentioned that there was a Strategic Plan Subcommittee in place for the Plan and that they had finished early in December with all final concerns.

Phang Tai asked about the dashboard benchmark data on page 1 of the report. Bill Fritz explained that as soon as the incoming information from the other universities were received, page 1 would be updated. [Page 1 was the only page waiting on updated information (all coming from outside sources/institutions) all other pages pertaining to GSU, were up to date.]
Ron Henry informed the group that the Regents’ S.P.I.S. Plan would change in August, and that the Action Plan may also be updated at that point.

George Rainbolt called for 2 friendly amendments to the Action Plan: “On page 12 under Faculty/Staff Salaries, can we change the words highly competent to something else? . . . Q.E.P. was mentioned twice on pg 14 . . . and also on page 17, the last 2 sentences about security awareness should go under Campus Safety on page 16.”

The group agreed with Rainbolt, and motioned in and approved the 2007 Action Plan.

The meeting then moved on to the 3rd item on the agenda
Foundation Buildings Acquisition & Maintenance

Mark Lawson headed the discussion on this, and began with explaining why Foundation buildings were not being able to be placed on the MRRF list like university owned buildings. Mark explained to the group that there were different types of Foundation buildings, and he briefly went over the history of some of them and explained the various ways they were funded.

• “Over time we’ve learned we need capital reserves in case of emergencies for these buildings. When 1 Park Place & the Rialto were purchased, there weren’t enough funds available, which is why so many repairs are needed. 1 Park Place has the most concerns. The firm that looked at the building gave estimates of $15 million in costs to update it; the building is worth about $5 million. That’s a problem.

• The Sun Trust has more potential and less immediate needs, and if we move people from 1 Park Place to SunTrust, we can figure out how to better handle the Park Place building.

• 34 P’Tree Street and 10 Park Place; We only lease those buildings, we don’t own them.”

He explained that contractually (being that the buildings were Foundation owned buildings), they took care of capital repairs such as roofing & HVAC issues and other major repairs, but that the University was responsible for daily-upkeep/maintenance repairs. “Currently users flow problems through maintenance, who get the reports of problems back to us.”

Tim Crimmins - “My concern is having the 2 different operations: 1 handling the Foundation buildings and 1 handling the university buildings. How can we combine them? There should be a similar MRRF plan for Foundation Buildings.”

Mark responded that there was a real estate group in place looking into these matters, but that they were still getting plans together to handle the issues. Those plans would be developed from input from both in-house users and the Foundation group. Tim asked how the plan could be implemented into CBSAC and P&D. “As Stakeholders, we may have plans related to these buildings.”
Ron Henry informed the group that the Senate groups governed only where the University had a financial stake in the matter. “Here, the Foundation has the financial stake, not us; MRR money is not spent on these buildings.”

He added that he wasn’t saying that input shouldn’t be taken, he just wasn’t in favor of having a committee do the work of overseeing the matter.

Tim Crimmins - “We have an interest here, because there are faculty & staff in these buildings. 5-10 yrs in the future, the Foundation will be responsible for them; there needs to be a way for a review, and reasonably so, it should come through us. It’s not unreasonable that we should be able to receive some sort of annual review of the issues with these buildings; not necessarily creating a new committee, but bringing these issues through the normal process as we do with other buildings. If we have to make a recommendation to the President, we should be able to offer advice to the Foundation.

OTHER INPUT

Also mentioned - Some members voiced the question “How far does this go? Are we going to start reviewing committees of all of the buildings, when do we stop?”

Sandra Garber added the example: “Tenants should tell landlords about maintenance issues, but we can’t bind the Foundation through our requests, but maybe there should be something.”

George Rainbolt “I’m not sure if the Foundation needs to report via P&D, but it might be useful for us to have something like a yearly tenants meeting.”

Mark Lawson “We have something similar, just not at such a high level yet. It’s still in progress based on the feedback from maintenance.”

Phang Tai asked Mark if P&D could receive a copy of the information that they compiled from input from maintenance and work orders received. Mark said he’d be happy to and assured the group that the Foundation would do their best to work with/towards the wishes of the university.

Towards the end of the discussion, Tim Crimmins made the following motion:

“I move that we ask the foundation to send to us an annual report to review for us to offer advice to the foundation for it’s list of priorities.”

This motion was not seconded.

PHANG TAI SUGGESTED THAT THEY MAKE THIS INTO A FRIENDLY REQUEST FOR THIS INFORMATION TO BE SENT FYI FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES, AND HIS SUGGESTION CLOSED THE MATTER ON THE ISSUE.
THE MEETING THEN MOVED ON TO THE LAST ITEM ON THE AGENDA
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

MRRF, Pre-CBSAC Update - (Sandra Garber) - The group briefly went over the MRRF Project list. Items on the list were as follows (in order of Priority):

- Replace Counseling Center HVAC System
- Repair class South HVAC System, Repairs at the Language Research Center
- Replace HVAC & Light Components in Urban Life, Install West Campus Chilled Water Plant - Chiller #4
- Install New Roof & Correct Safety Problems in Sculpture Bldg
- Replace Law Library AHU, Modernize Classroom South Elevators
- Install Digital Controls & New Terminal Units in Alumni Hall - Floors 1, 2, 3, CDC
- Replace Kell Hall 7th Floor HVAC System
- Replace University Book Store HVAC System
- Replace Robinson CBA Business High Pressure Fan
- Replace Sports Arena Building Windows

Sandra gave the background on the committee and explained that the list was put together based on numbers crunching & presentations after compiling complaints/requests from occupants, work order reports, facilities reports, and the Strategical Impact Reports from the Deans & VPs. She mentioned that the subcommittee generally asked for apx. $7 million from the Board of Regents for these funds, but that they were told they would only get between $4-5 million for the current period.

Greg Brack brought to the group’s attention that the Counseling Center (#1 on the list) was worse than people realized. “Working in the Summer is extremely hard. The water has actually been deemed poisonous; it contains too much lead. Fungus grows within the building during the Summer.” He explained that there always seemed to be some issue that got these repairs pushed back on the list.

Phang Tai mentioned that it had been pushed back due to the demolition of the Counseling Center, but that the demolition had been delayed, resulting in the Counseling Center needs being put back on the list.

Ramesh Vakamudi mentioned that after the occupants’ scheduled move-out in May 2008, the project would only take about 6 months to complete. Sandra mentioned that the list would go to CBSAC on Thursday, then come back to P&D for final approval at the next P&D meeting on February 19th.

AFTER MORE BRIEF COMMENTS REGARDING THE INFORMATION WITHIN THE REPORT THE GROUP MOVED ON TO THE NEXT SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT.
**Campus Safety (Beth Jones)** - Beth began by mentioning that the subcommittee on lighting were having a hard time getting together to meet, but that over the Holiday break more lighting (along with more police presence) was placed around campus. She also mentioned that Connie Sampson, GSU Police Chief, added 2 students on staff as escorts.

P&D applauded George Rainbolt for the suggestion of student escorts to Connie during the last P&D meeting.

In closing, Sandra mentioned that they were currently looking into having a study done on the parking issues, but that they were still looking into the funding needed for the study.

The campus safety update was the last issue of the day; afterwards, **Phang Tai adjourned the meeting at apx. 1:50pm.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz, Admin. Coordinator