Planning & Development Committee  
November 18th, 2008

Present: Pam Barr, Elizabeth Beck, Cathy Brack, Douglas Covey, William M. Downs, Evan Eskridge (Student Senator), Mary Finn, Christine Gallant, Sandra Garber, Chris Henrich, Casey Long, Phillip Mitchem, Robin Morris, Jeffrey C. Rupp, Mary Shoffner, Roy Sobelson, Ruth Stanford, Phang C. Tai, Vijay K. Vaishnavi., Bruce Seaman, Nancy Seamans, Carol Winkler.

Absent: Al Baumstark, Jennifer Chiovaro, Marsha Clarkson, Timothy Crimmins, Michael Eriksen, Terry Grissom, Carol Hansen, Ron Henry, Beth Jones, Richard Miller, William Nichols, Jerry Rackliffe, D. Mike Raderstorf, George Rainbolt, Andrew Sumner, Maryann Wysor.

Others Attending: Beth Jones, W. John McCullum, Officer Keith Sumas

The Agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Approval of the 10/27/08 P&D Minutes
3. Proposed Revisions of ASUR Review (Mary Finn)
4. Proposed Amendment of the Feb. 2008 P&D Minutes (Christine Gallant)
5. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS & OTHER BUSINESS
   a) MRRF
   b) Campus Safety

Agenda Item #1 - Approval of the Minutes
Phang Tai called the meeting to order at apx. 1:03pm. At the bottom of page 3 of the 10/27/08 P&D minutes, the wording, “for the next 2 years” was corrected to “for the next year”. The motion was then made and seconded to approve the October 27th minutes.

Agenda Item #2 - Action Plan 2009 - Draft 6
The 2009 Action Plan draft was brought as an FYI item only. Phang Tai quickly went over the report & it’s purpose and mentioned that Provost Henry would try to make it to the next P&D meeting to discuss the report in depth. Sandra Garber highlighted some quick corrections on page 27 of the report. Also on page 16, under Technology, she mentioned she wasn't aware that the PAWS system (Panther Access to Web Svcs) was available to staff. Beth Jones explained that it was available to staff in a testing phase only, but that it should be fully available in December.
Christine Gallant mentioned she would send over a friendly amendment to add in information about broadcasting the new web accessibility policy that was being implemented university wide, that would essentially allow the online websites to be accessible to the disabled. Being that the report was brought for previewing only, Phang Tai then moved the group on to the next item on the agenda.

**Agenda Item #3 - Proposed Revisions of ASUR Review (Mary Finn)**

Mary Finn headed the discussion on the report. She explained it was a proposal to modify/streamline the ASUR process. She mentioned that she talked to the Deans' groups, Administrative Review Councils, & the VPs about the report, but that she would wait for P&D to approve the report before taking it to those groups for their approval. After going over the report & some very brief Q&A, P&D approved the report, commented on Mary & the ASUR committee's hard work and noted that the report did appear to be much more streamlined than it was.

**Agenda Item #4 - Proposed Amendment of the Feb. 2008 P&D Minutes (Christine Gallant)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 2008 Motion to Amend Previously Adopted Minutes by Christine Gallant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 3-4 of the 2/18/2008 minutes records the committee approval of the &quot;DIC Proposal for a Policy on Priorities in Allocations for ADA-Compliance.&quot; I wish to add the name of this proposal on page 3, and the correct wording of the approved motion on page 4. The wording as given is confusing and inaccurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On page 3, to the sentence reading, “From the Jan. 2008 P&amp;D meeting, Christine Gallant proposed to add members of the Disability Initiatives Committee (DIC) to the MRRF committee as ex officio members” ADD, “and to adopt the ‘DIC Proposal for a Policy on Priorities in Allocations for ADA-Compliance.’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On page 4, for the present sentence under Motion #2, “The MRRF Committee should expand &amp; collaborate a policy with Facilities and DIC to develop a prioritized projects list for Regulatory Funding,” SUBSTITUTE “Using the DIC Policy on Priorities in Allocations for ADA-Compliance, the MRRF Committee should collaborate with Facilities and DIC to develop a prioritized projects list for Regulatory Funding.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pages 3 & 4 from February 18, 2008 P&D Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIC PROPOSAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From the Jan 2008 P&amp;D meeting, Christine Gallant proposed to add members of the Disability Initiatives Committee (DIC) to the MRRF committee as ex officio members. They would review MRRF’s annual list of projects for repair &amp; renovation and help prioritize that list according to ADA’s list of priorities based on the following ADA order:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Priority 1, Accessible Approach/Entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Priority 2, Access to Goods and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Priority 3, Access to Rest Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Priority 4, Additional Access not required by priorities 1-3. “When amenities such as drinking fountains &amp; public telephones are provided, they should also be accessible to people with disabilities.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*page 3*
At that meeting there was an ongoing discussion of where MRRF's own priorities would rank before, within, or after ADA's list of priorities.

During this meeting Christine presented a memo which entitled

“Proposal for Policy on Priorities in Allocation for ADA-Compliance”

Christine mentioned that the intentions from Frank Whittington & the ADA group was to draft a policy that would effect the allocation of the funds in question in time enough to present it to the full Senate on March 13th.

Q&A regarding the proposal

Phang Tai explained that P&D was the group that would/could initiate sending policies to the Senate if needed, and that MRRF was only a subcommittee of P&D (joined/assisted by Budget) so that bringing the matter to the full Senate was not needed. Other P&D members agreed.

After much discussion on this issue by B. Blackwell, M. Finn, S. Garber, C. Hurt, and J. McCullum it was suggested that the phrase “wherever / whenever possible” be inserted before “when deciding” in that sentence. Christine Agreed this could be done.

AFTER THEIR DISCUSSION, THE FOLLOWING 2 MOTIONS WERE MADE:

MOTION #1
The motion was made to add 2 members of the Disability Initiatives Committee (DIC) to the MRRF Committee. The motion was seconded and approved.

MOTION #2
The MRRF Committee should expand & collaborate a policy with Facilities and DIC to develop a prioritized projects list for Regulatory Funding. The motion was seconded and approved.

Janet Burns praised Christine & the committee members on the great extent of their commitment to the extensive issues & work involved, then the group moved on to the next item on the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM# 5B, GREEN ISSUES WAS TABLED UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING

Christine briefly went over the proposal and mentioned to the group that the proposal wasn't anything new it was just to make the motion more clear in regards to it's composition and policy, especially since future MRRF committees would be referring to it.

Phang Tai mentioned (having recently consulted with the By-Laws Committee Chair and the Legal Office) that based on Roberts Rules of Order, there may be some issues in regards to changing an accepted motion, and that also there were now different people sitting on the committees involved (which may also pose a problem) He mentioned that it may be better just to propose a new motion.

Jeff Rupp asked John McCullum was it expected that in the future there wouldn't be separate regulatory funding, and that there would just be one big pot of MRRF funds. John replied, that for all the projects on the list some ranking factors were applied just to give an initial starting point. They used 5 ranking criteria: 4 from facilities & the 5th from MRRF committee.
John McCullum - “What happens however, is b/c of competing factors there has to be sort of a higher power that uses judgement and comes in to play when selecting projects to fund so that there’s some level playing field. What we’ve elected to do this year (instead of listing ADA projects as individual projects) is to have a category of ADA projects of $500,000 and above. So what happens is that the project will eventually rise to the top of the list.”

Jeff Rupp - “I recall what we did was target a certain amt of money this year $500,000 of the total to focus on ADA related projects. Christine b/f u make your motion (I'm assuming that the MRRF Committee would continue to do that) you should include that this priority list would apply to the amt of funding that the MRRF Committee focuses on ADA projects within any given year.”

John reminded the group that the priorities list(s) or what and how much to allocate to those list(s) would come from the DIC & MRRF Committees and not Facilities; facilities (if/when possible) would just implement what was on the list.

Sandra Garber
If we strictly use the model of the past, we'd have to chose from (for example) the life safety dollars for the public address system or the ADA. We now have a model where we can fund both or reduce both or that can fund 1 or the other as the need is greatest; we now have a system which allows the committee that flexibility & that judgement.

As far as the proposal being made: that refers just to the allocation of ADA funds if ADA funds should be made available. This yr in FY09, there are going to be $500K made available, so John & Ramesh came to me and said can we sit down w/ a sub group of MRRF (i.e., the DIC members) and develop the list of how that half million should be spent. We all met and using the criteria the DIC members brought to the table.

Sandra noted that the DIC was in charge of allocating ADA money used on the MRRF list and that the MRRF committee then just sets a sum for general use.

It will be the DIC & & the Chair of MRRF, using the criteria that the DIC adopts, come up with the list of what those projects should be. I personally would not like written into a motion the details of how the DIC is to do their job, I myself would personally would like to leave it as it was written, b/c the DIC members themselves bring to the committee the current priorities as it is set and their best judgement in any given situation when the monies become available.

Christine Gallant - “I think the DIC intended the priorities policy to apply to ADA projects in general; i.e., the ADA projects listed on the allocation list would follow these priorities. These are the priorities set by Federal Guidelines. I certainly would not want to undercut the judgement of the DIC members, but I'd like to see (and I think the DIC would like to see) some policy in effect that they should follow, and not leave it up to the judgement of the individual members, but have some policy in place that follows federal law. What if the members want to recommend something that's not on the priority list? The whole point of the policy is that at the point when your deciding what projects get on the list, you follow that policy which sets priorities, and not leave it up to individuals to decide.
Jeff explained - “The problem you're going to run into is that there's going to be a limited amount of money. How the proposal is written, if there isn't enough money (for example) to complete all priority 1, you leave money sitting there b/c of the way this is currently written. You'd have to put some wording in there to give the committee some flexibility to move down the list and not have to spend every single dollar on priority 1 if there's not enough to do it.”

John suggested - “One way to approach this is to look at some of the buildings. Would it be better off to take care of entrance & accessibility problems in the Courtland that has 54 students or the GCB that has 36,000 students?”

The group ended the discussion after one of the members suggested that the current wording be kept as is for a year and then revisited to see if that process was or was not working. The Committee agreed with that suggestion then moved the meeting to the next item on the list. Christine thanked everyone for their valued suggestions and mentioned that she would report back to the DIC chair Susan Easterbrooks with the suggestions & comments made.

Agenda Item #5 - SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS & OTHER BUSINESS

MRRF Committee (Major Repair and Renovations Fund)
Sandra Garber gave an update of the MRRF Committee. She said that they had met in November, sent a re-prioritized list out to the Deans & VPs for feedback, and would meet again in December to finalize the 2010 MRRF proposed list. Afterwards the list would go to CBSAC 1st then back to P&D probably by January 2009.

“I recently met with John McCullum & Ramesh Vakamudi and learned that ADA money would probably be in hand by January/February of 2009; Ramesh wanted to meet to determine how it should be spent. We all met with the 2 DIC members & learned that some of the projects had already been completed and some of the buildings involved were not GSU buildings, so Ramesh agreed to revise the list & the group would meet again next week.”

There was some brief discussion about resources and issues in regards to the Foundation owned buildings and Beth Jones mentioned she would see if she could get a list equivalent to the MRRF list but for the Foundation Owned Buildings. Robin Morris went over some of the options that could be taken with the buildings being leased, when it came down to repair issues.

Campus Safety
Beth Jones mentioned that the Escort Service was going very well (there were walking and van services), and the GSU Police officers were walking from the Commons to the campus just to show presence. She mentioned that there were some thefts in the library so signs had been put out to remind students to be careful with their items.
New Science Building

Robin Morris mentioned all was going well, and that the biggest problem they were having was due to the problems going on in the world and keeping up the juggling act of following which banks the money was moving to/from. He mentioned that the enclosures currently going up were to protect against the environment, and that the topping off ceremony was due next month and the only item left to finish was the penthouse area where all the mechanical items were located.

Parking/Safety - Robin mentioned that for safety reasons the University tried (and were still trying) to get walkways, wider sidewalks, closed lanes, & other speed reduction devices on the Piedmont side of the street, but the City said no, so it was suggested to add an additional lane for parked cars which had a way of buffering and slowing cars down. Sandra Garber added studies had been done, and people were asked, whether they J-walked or walked down to the light when exiting that MARTA Station, and an overwhelming amount of people admitted to J-Walking. Robin mentioned that there would be more students using the building than there had ever been at any of the new buildings, apx. 5,000/day, so that they had to resort to something to aide with pedestrian safety since the City said no on initial proposals.

After Robin's report, Phang Tai adjourned the meeting at apx. 2pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lydia K. Woltz, Admin. Coordinator