Council of Built Environment (CBE)  
May 10, 2011  

Minutes ~ approved May 24, 2011

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

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

III. Approval of Minutes
A. April 26, 2011 minutes were approved unanimously.
B. March 8, 2011 minutes were approved on April 12, 2011.
   1. Correction made to the minutes in Section VII.A. to state “There are no updates on Class of 2000 re: campus clocks. However, the Class of 1983 is now reconsidering the recreation of its former gift—an eternal flame.”
   2. March 8, 2011 minutes (with correction) were unanimously approved.

IV. Presentation by Sub-Councils—Northside Residence Hall
A. Design Review Sub-Council—David Woodcock, Chair
   1. The Northside Residence Hall will be an anchor to the north side of campus. The design of this facility will be even more visible if the Dulie Bell Building is demolished sometime in the future.
   2. Design Review Sub-Council expressed some disappointment in the initial design development of the concept.
3. Campus Master Plan is a “guide” and the design team was encouraged to review the project.

4. Design Review Sub-Council recommends approval of the Northside Residence Hall.

B. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council—James Massey, Chair

1. Traffic flow around the new facility needs to be examined, especially at the northwest corner of the building.

2. Residence Life should reexamine the balance between the cost to the student and the additional cost of adding amenities to the facility.
   a. Concern that the “commons” area was too far away from the core of the students to justify the addition as a campus-wide benefit.
   b. Concern that additional cost of amenities would place financial hardships on students who want to live on campus.
   c. Dan Mizer stated that a week-long study was done with students—and they were excited to see study lounge space, programming space, TV lounges, Wi-Fi capabilities, etc.
   d. It was pointed out that many of the amenities are not designed for social aspects, but to support student learning.

3. Consideration should be given to building a “30-year” facility rather than “100-year” facility.
   a. “30-year” could lower construction and allow for more frequent replacement.
   b. Discussion followed regarding “30-year” vs. “100-year” buildings. Systems cannot last for 100 years, but well-constructed buildings can.
   c. There was concern that in a prominent location, such as where the Northside Residence Hall will be located, it would not be good to be replacing the building every 30 years.
   d. FURsc suggested that the “100 year” building specification for the Northside Residence Hall should be considered.

4. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council recommended approval for the Northside Residence Hall.
C. Technical Review Sub-Council—Tom Reber, Chair

1. Utilities & Energy Management (UEM) will need to perform updated Infrastructure evaluation and cost estimate for the proposed project—to ensure all utility infrastructure requirements for the project are fully considered.

2. A new fiber hub should be established as part of the first new residence hall’s construction.
   a. As new residence halls are built, the fiber optic cabling to each can be connected to the new fiber hub.
   b. When old fiber hub is demolished, the newer residence halls will not suffer any network outage and new fiber hub will be in place to connect any remaining older Northside residence halls.

3. Transportation Services coordination needs
   a. Will need to coordinate new entrances for specific lots
   b. Will need to coordinate with TXDot regarding construction entrances and phasing of the Northgate pedestrian improvement project as it relates to site access.

4. Technical Review Sub-Council recommended approval if the above concerns are addressed.

D. CBE voted unanimously to recommend to President the proposed concept for the Northside Residence Hall with two conditions:

1. “100-year” facility with interior flexibility
2. Turning radius around the residence hall will be increased

Action/Recommendation: Letter will be sent to President Loftin stating that CBE recommends the concept of the Northside Residence Hall with the above two conditions.

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

V. Space Requests

A. All submitted space requests for the first deadline, April 29, 2011, are academic units reporting to Dr. Watson.

B. Four non-contested space requests were received for April 29 deadline
   1. Read McDonald (Bennett for College of Engineering), Rudder Tower (Watson/units making it their first or second choice), WERC (Bennett for
College of Engineering), and Richardson (Bennett for College of Engineering). In addition, no unit made Bizzell their first or second choice, but in eliminating one of the conflicts with a college Watson will continue to assign units in Academic Affairs to this building.

2. CBE voted unanimously to award these non-contested space requests as submitted.

C. Numerous other space requests were submitted— with same spaces being requested. Discussion followed as to which method CBE would be used to handle multiple requests when they are all under same Vice President (Dr. Watson).

1. CBE as a whole would discuss, gather more information, and determine priorities.

2. Dr. Watson will work with the Deans and/or Vice Presidents
   a. Dr. Watson will meet with the units to find out more details to determine if there are conflicts over same space.
   b. If conflicting space is being requested, “units” will be given a month to provide more detailed information. Dr. Watson will review and hopefully a resolution can be made.
   c. Dr. Watson will bring recommendation back to CBE for voting.
   d. If NO resolution can be made with Dr. Watson’s meetings, the gathered information will be forwarded to the Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council for its assessment.
   e. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council will bring its recommendation to CBE for vote.

3. Jeff Seemann moved for Dr. Watson to first work with the “units” to prioritize contested requests for same space. Jorge Vanegas seconded the motion. CBE unanimously voted for Dr. Watson to do preliminary work with her “units” to hopefully resolve contested space requests before they needed to be forwarded to Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council.

VI. SNAPS Process— James Massey

A. Only Academic units were part of this Fall 2008 space needs assessment.

B. Buildings constructed since the 2008 assessment were not included (i.e. Agriculture Headquarters, ILSB, ETED, and NMR buildings).
C. Comment: The SNAPS assessment’s weakness may be that expressed need for special use space is self-reported by the department and not validated by the Dean. All of the Deans indicated to CBE that it was a fair representation of the need at the time; 2008.

D. Office space needs were based on the current office sizes to reflect the assumption that possible realignments to address needs should be based on the department’s current location. This context should be considered when considering the assignment of space.

E. All Deans had a chance to discuss the study findings with CBE. The findings should be taken in the context of the assumptions (room sizes, special use space needs, etc.) of the study.

F. Space shifts and other assignments since 2008 are not included in the stated figures.

G. The SNAPS space assessment is one tool to assist in considering request for space realignments.

VII. Deferred Maintenance Priorities—Rod Weis

A. Maintenance Sub-Council has reviewed the Deferred Maintenance Process and approves.

B. On May 17, 2011, the Maintenance Sub-Council will meet from 8:00-12:00, Rm 204 Facilities Services, to try the process with actual data.

VIII. Chamber of Commerce has made a request for some donated land or low-rent land. Technical Review and Facilities Utilization sub-councils will be meeting with Royce Hickman, President of the Chamber of Commerce.

IX. Update on Corps Dorm Renovations—David Woodcock

A. Details had been provided to the Design Review Sub-Council, but since the Concept for the Corps Dorm Renovations has already been approved by CBE and there is no significant change, this is FYI only for CBE.

**Action/Recommendation:** When updates are received and reviewed by sub-councils, the CBE co-chairs will review the minutes to determine if the concept has already been approved—or if the request needs to come back to CBE.

**Responsible Parties:** Karan Watson and Rodney McClendon (Administrative assistance to be provided by Jo Williams)

**REMINDER:** Next meeting for CBE will be on Tuesday, May 24, 2011
1:30 – 3:00 p.m., 707 Rudder Tower