I. Attendance
   A. Voting members present: Bill Dugas, Mladen Kezunovic, Jeannie Laird, Clint Magill, Kate Miller, Drew Shelnutt, Jorge Vanegas, Joe Weber
   B. Voting members absent: Konrad Johnson, Jeff Seemann
   C. Ex-Officio members present: Karan Watson, Rodney McClendon, B. J. Crain, Kevin Hurley, James Massey, Valerian Miranda, Tom Reber, Rod Weis, David Woodcock
   D. Non-voting members present: Scott Bowen (Voting FY12)
   E. Guest: Matt Fry

II. Meeting was called to order by Dr. Rodney McClendon (1:30 p.m.)

III. Approval of April 12, 2011 Minutes
   A. Revised minutes for April 12, 2011 were distributed during CBE meeting after corrections were submitted electronically:
      1. VI.A.1.c. was corrected to state “Class of 1983 is considering recreating their gift, the eternal flame. This eternal flame was removed years ago.”
      2. VIII.B was corrected to state “CBE Co-Chairs will make the decision and inform CBE.”
   B. CBE unanimously approved the revised minutes as distributed.

IV. Presentations by Sub-Councils
   A. Sports Performance Center for Football
      1. Technical Review Sub-Council—comments from Tom Reber, Chair
         a. Sub-council had met with Kevin Hurley, but there was no formal report prepared at meeting time.
b. Sub-Council was in favor of recommending this project, but noted that proposed location is the utility junction on campus.

c. Costs to move utilities is estimated to be $662,000 plus another $90K to relocate telecommunication equipment in that area.

d. Kevin Hurley stated that the Athletics Department will be responsible for paying these expenses to move the utilities and telecommunication equipment.

e. Technical Review Sub-Council recommended to the CBE to build the Sports Performance Center with the stipulation that the cost for moving the utilities and telecommunication equipment is funded by Athletics.

2. Design Review Sub-Council—comments from David Woodcock

a. Design Review Sub-Council to meet with Athletics on April 27, 2011 to discuss the proposed sports performance center; therefore the sub-council had not prepared a report.

b. Chair of the sub-council attended the Facilities Utilization Sub-Council meeting where the project was discussed.

c. Design Review Sub-Council chair does not anticipate any design issues, but would like the sub-council to review building plans as they are developed.

3. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council (FURS) met on April 19, 2011—comments provided by written document and James Massey

a. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council suggested the following points should be considered when CBE acts on this request:

   i. Athletics has indicated a need for sports performance facility to remain competitive.

   ii. Endorsement of the master plan (recently completed by the Athletic Department) should precede the recommendation of the Sports Performance facility. (CBE owes it to the President to inform as to whether or not a project alters the Campus Master Plan)

   iii. Traffic pattern was discussed. FURS proposed a traffic impact analysis (TIA) be performed in this area. The proposed facility will use 50 parking spaces.

   iv. Concerns raised by FURS report—and other CBE members—on the advisability of constructing such a facility
during the current budget situation including reduction of staff and faculty on campus.

v. With a 9-3-1 (nine for, 3 against, 1 abstention), the Facilities Utilization Sub-Council recommended that CBE support the proposed construction of the facility.

4. Maintenance Sub-Council did not review, but question was raised as to whether there is a maintenance endowment for this building. Answer was no facilities have maintenance endowments, but funds are available in Athletics Department for maintenance.

5. Other comments/concerns

a. TV station is not scheduled to expand and satellite dishes will not be affected by location of new sports center.

b. Steed building will eventually be going away—or reduced to half its current size.

c. If the Sports Performance Center is approved, Athletics Master Plan must be completed and approved before they can come back to CBE with another request.

d. Suggested caveats to use for recommendation to the President if CBE votes to recommend:

i. Athletics to guarantee they will assume ALL utility costs.

ii. Further analysis for parking will be performed—traffic flow will be addressed.

iii. Final approval after DRS has reviewed plans.

iv. Noted that facility doesn’t strictly adhere to Campus Master Plan.

v. Concern raised about the symbolic message sending to campus—Athletics can afford this building, but not applying these funds to Kyle Field renovation.

vi. After all sub-councils have reviewed, if CBE votes not to recommend, this will be pulled from BOR agenda.

e. Discussion followed as to whether the recommendation to President should include the budgetary timing concerns.

f. Prioritization is a concern. Is recruitment more important than
student safety? Is funding available for building a new sports center, but not for demolition?

6. Joe Weber moved to have a vote and Scott Bowen seconded the motion. CBE voted 7-2 in favor of moving forward with the recommendation.

7. Since the motion passed to move forward with the recommendation to the President, CBE unanimously voted to add the following caveats:
   a. ALL master plans must be submitted to CBE to integrate with the Campus Master Plan and be approved by CBE before requests can be submitted to CBE.
   b. A cost model provided that confirms all costs are funded by Athletics, including the relocation of the underground utilities and telecommunication equipment.
   c. All sub-councils will be informed and involved as the project moves forward.

Action/Recommendation: Letter will be sent to President Loftin stating that CBE recommends the building of the Sports Performance Center with the above caveats.

Responsible Parties: Karan Watson and Rodney McClendon (Jo Williams to draft letter)

V. Process for Establishing Deferred Maintenance Priorities
   
A. PowerPoint Presentation by James Massey

B. Next Steps in the Process
   1. Verify recommended priorities ranking system is valid
   2. Validate Cost estimates

Action/Recommendation: Priorities ranking system will be reviewed and cost estimates validated.

Responsible Parties: James Massey—to include interactions with Maintenance Sub-Council and others as needed.

VI. Items Forwarded to Sub-Councils
   
A. Northside Residence Hall—All sub-councils

REMINDER: Next meeting for CBE will be on Tuesday, May 10, 2011 1:30 – 3:00 p.m., 510 Rudder Tower