Council of Built Environment (CBE)  
February 8, 2011  

Minutes—approved February 22, 2011

I. Meeting called to order by Tom Taylor (1:30 p.m.)
   A. Voting members present: Bill Dugas, Konrad Johnson, Jeannie Laird, Clint Magill, Kate Miller, Jeff Seemann, Drew Shelnutt, Jorge Vanegas
   B. Voting members absent: Mladen Kezunovic, Joe Weber
   C. Ex-Officio members attending: Tom Taylor, B.J. Crain, Lallah Howard, Kevin Hurley, James Massey, David Woodcock, Deborah Wright
   D. Non-voting members present: Scott Bowen (Voting FY12)
   E. Non-voting members absent: Rod Weis
   F. Guests: Matt Fry, John Clark

II. Quorum Voting Results
   A. Tom Taylor presented the electronic voting results
      1. Regarding the number of CBE members present to make up a quorum -- 9-YES votes and 1-NO vote supported six (6) CBE members to make a quorum. In the future, 6 voting members will be needed to take official action.
      2. Regarding the use of electronic voting when needed -- 9-YES votes and 1-NO vote supported the use of electronic voting. In the future, electronic voting may be used, if needed.
      3. Regarding the use of a signed proxy for voting -- 5-YES votes and 5-NO votes for the use of signed proxies. Motion failed and signed proxies will not be used for CBE actions.
   B. Based on these results, CBE will require at least six (6) members to be present before voting on issues. If there are not six (6) members present, electronic voting will be permitted, but not the use of signed proxies.
   C. CBE Charge will be revised to add this statement: CBE will require at least six (6) members to be present before voting on issues. If there are not six (6) members present, electronic voting will be permitted.
III. Minutes for January 28, 2011 with editorial corrections were approved
   A. Jorge Vanegas moved to approve and Clint Magill seconded the motion.
   B. CBE approved unanimously.

IV. Installation of Two Solar Tables ~ Information provided by David Woodcock, Chair of
    Design Review Sub-Council, and Kelly Wellman, Sustainability Officer, Division of
    Operations
   A. Proposed two solar tables to be installed as a demonstration project ~ one at
      Blocker and second one at Bio-Bio on west campus. Others will possibly be
      added around campus later, if these prove to be useful to students.
   B. Tables operate on full solar power, contain USB port and LED lights, and will cost
      $9500 each.
   C. Tables will be anchored and meet Campus Masterplan standards.
   D. Design Review Sub-Council has completed their study, which included
      discussions with the Technical Review Sub-council, and recommended approval
      to the CBE.
   E. Jeff Seemann moved to recommend the installation of these two solar tables and
      Drew Shelnutt seconded the motion.
   F. CBE voted unanimously to send a letter of recommendation for the installation of
      two solar tables.

   Action/Recommendation: Letter will be sent to President Loftin stating that CBE recommends
   the installation of two solar tables.
   Responsible Parties: Karan Watson and Tom Taylor (Jo Williams to draft letter)

V. Vacated Space – A suggested format for responding to requests for a schedule of
   vacated space vs. new space was distributed to CBE. There was considerable
   discussion.
   A. Jorge Vanegas suggested clarification of “vacated space”
      1. What is included in assignable space? Does this include public spaces
         (i.e. hallways, storage closets, bathrooms, mechanical spaces, etc.)?
      2. James Massey responded that assignable space does not include the
         areas mentioned in #1 above. James Massey’s office can provide
         assistance with this information. Reports can be run and expanded to
         indicate which are classrooms, public spaces, etc.
      3. Visual floor plans would be helpful for CBE members in determining
         space assignments.
B. The idea is to determine if the vacating unit is gaining space when they move into new space.

1. The best time in the future for this decision to be made is before the new building is approved.

2. Question was raised as to whether Engineering and Liberal Arts have provided data for space they will be vacating as their new buildings come on-line.
   a. The answer was that the information has been requested from Engineering, but has not been received at this time.
   b. It is unclear whether Liberal Arts has been asked for this information, but it is appropriate to do so.

C. CBE should review vacated space and study the best use for the units requesting.

D. Four sub-councils will all work together to provide input when vacated space is being reviewed.

E. CBE focus at this point is on space being vacated and which is the most appropriate unit to move in.

VI. Agenda Item #4 regarding the Space and Land Use Management Rule was pulled from this meeting and will be added to Feb 22nd meeting.

VII. J. K. Williams Building Discussion

A. Discussion of Architecture being relocated (not by choice) to Scoates

   1. Are the two spaces comparable?

   2. Review should be done as to the “types” of space in each building.

   3. Visual documentation would be helpful in comparing these two spaces.

B. Transparency of CBE is important

   1. Several members voiced support for CBE to be in the loop in all of the decisions.

      a. They understand that the President has made the decision to move to the Williams Building but, apparently, there are discussions going on outside of CBE about what to do with certain units that will be affected.
b. The group was fairly uniform in the desire for all space requests outside of Williams Building to come through CBE. This is the only way the process can be transparent and avoid “backroom deals”.

2. Need to notify others of space available

3. Jorge Vanegas stated that he wants to make sure everything is transparent and follows formal procedures—does not want Architecture seen as “land grabbing.”

C. Special considerations

1. CBE will honor the President’s commitment to keep Architecture whole in terms of amount of space and quality of space since they are being “evicted” from J. K. Williams Building.

2. HLKN will be required to vacate their space in the Read Building. Should they get preferential treatment since it is not their choice to move? There may be a different process for units that are “evicted”.

D. Drew Shelnutt re-emphasized the importance of following CBE criteria procedures

E. A renovations assessment is in progress. There will be a better idea of the timeline for the relocation of the President’s office and other administrative offices after this is completed.

1. Major renovations are not being planned

2. Routine updating planned

3. Deferred maintenance items are being considered ~ it may be more cost effective and easier in a vacated building.

F. Space in Rudder will probably not be available for one year.

VIII. Update on pending projects

A. Campus Clocks—Class of 2000 is working with the MSC Director, Luke Altendorf

REMINDER: Next meeting for CBE will be on Tuesday, February 22, 2011
1:30 – 3:00 p.m. @ J. K. Williams Administration Bldg, Conf Rm 228