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

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

III. Approval of May 24, 2011 Minutes
   A. Corrections to the minutes
      1. I.D. Add “David Woodcock”
      2. V. B. Add clarification to “single compromise request”
      3. VI.E.g.2. Correct “criteria” to “criterion”
   B. Minutes (with above changes) were approved unanimously

IV. Presentation by Sub-Councils
   A. Decommissioning Classrooms—to be dropped from the University’s classroom inventory
      1. Scoates Rm. 317 used primarily by Agriculture classes
a. 317 Scoates has 36 seats in 1,219 sq. ft. and is not suitable for classroom use (vision impairing pillars, not compliant with ADA). The College of Agriculture proposes to use the space to enlarge an adjacent room (318 Scoates Hall) to create a laboratory.

b. The University’s Registrar has indicated that the current classes held in this room could be relocated.

2. Zachry Engineering Center

a. Request was to decommission five rooms—to be used for Engineering Student Services & Academic Programs Office and the Engineering Honors program.

b. Specific loss of instructional capacity of classrooms can be absorbed by existing classroom inventory.

3. Target date for decommissioning is Spring Semester 2012

4. It was mentioned that CBE should be cautious in supporting future losses to the University’s classroom inventory. However, Dr. Watson stated that the BOR is strongly encouraging more frequent use of classrooms.

5. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council recommended that a Classroom Management Plan be compiled and implemented to assure that sufficient classroom space exist to support the university’s instructional mission.

6. CBE voted to recommend the decommissioning of listed classrooms to the President.

   a. Five votes for “yes”

   b. One vote to “abstain”

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter will be sent to President Loftin stating that CBE recommends the decommissioning of Scoates Hall Rm 317 and the Zachry Engineering Center--Rms. 104A, 104D, 127A, 128A, 128D.

**Responsible Parties:** Karan Watson and Rodney McClendon

B. Request for Building additions to Building 1171 (Radioactive Waste Building) and 1247 (Hazardous Waste Office and Support Building)—both requests from Environmental Health & Safety

1. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council—report by James Massey

   a. Both of these buildings being requested are due to an expansion need in locations belonging to the Environmental Health & Safety Department.
b. The total project costs for the addition to Bldg 1247 is available in EHSD and UPD reserve accounts. The total project costs for the addition have been estimated by Facilities Services to be approximately $410,000.

c. The total project costs for the addition to Bldg 1171 have been estimated by Facilities Services to be approximately $122,500. These funds are available in EHSD reserve accounts.

d. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council recommended the additions to Buildings 1171 and 1247.

2. Design Review Sub-Council—report by David Woodcock

a. Ward Wells conducted the Design Review Sub-Council meeting in David’s absence but the sub-council found no concerns for either addition.

b. Design Review Sub-Council recommended both additions.

3. Technical Review Sub-Council—report by Tom Reber

a. Addition to Buildings 1171 and 1247

i. On June 13, 2011, John Salsman and James Rainer from EHS and Mike Reagan from UPD presented information to the sub-council. The proposed space for Bldg. 1247 will be used entirely for storage of EHS and UPD items. The proposed space for Bldg. 1171 will be used for storage of liquid radioactive materials.

ii. Sub-council recommends approval for both additions if the CIS Networking and Telecommunications concerns are addressed and funded.

4. CBE voted unanimously to recommend the approval of the additions to Building 1171 and Building 1247.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter will be sent to President Loftin stating that CBE recommends approval for the additions at Building 1171 and Building 1247.

**Responsible Parties:** Karan Watson and Rodney McClendon

V. Deferred Maintenance Priorities

A. Karan Watson suggested a three-part process as a set of directives of what to start and when to start

1. Incorporate the technical knowledge of our staff (Step 1)
a. A lot of people know a lot of things about our buildings
b. These folks know what should be done and when it’s time to do it.

2. Sub-Councils begin sequencing (Step 2)
   a. Use knowledge of available funds
   b. Review upcoming projects—what makes sense?

3. CBE Reviews (Step 3) the recommendations sub-councils propose
   a. Does one project need to “pass” another due to other factors?
      i. Is it empty vs. occupied? Does a building sit empty for 2 years or does it make sense to move folks in and then back out?
      ii. Change the order due to mishap that must be fixed (“steam pipes”)?
      iii. Recruiting opportunity—an exceptional new hire opportunity, but space needs to be redesigned—and scheduled for deferred maintenance 3 years later? Does this change the order?
      iv. Must be fairly fluid, must be transparent, and never commit all the money because something will always go wrong.

4. Provide President a recommended list of projects and plans for deferred maintenance by the end of the spring semester. (Step 4)
   a. List to be revisited and revised, if needed, every spring. Annual recommendation letter to President should be presented by the end of the spring semester.
   b. This year only, no later than July.

B. James Massey distributed a handout “Facilities Maintenance & Renewal Program Schedule” which listed buildings (ordered by building number) and stated dollar amounts of Capital Renewal, Deferred Maintenance, Safety/Code, Elevator, and Grand Total by building.

1. Handout was a high order summary and did not break out into projects. This is a DRAFT.
   a. Some are vacated spaces, some not. Deferred Maintenance column addresses the $15M.
b. Capital renewal vs. deferred maintenance? Capital renewal beyond deferred maintenance. Example: Williams Bldg—HVAC system beyond a maintenance problem, needs to be update to new system. Motor control system for electrical system would be deferred maintenance; completely redoing electrical system would be capital renewal.

c. If Deferred Maintenance can’t schedule beyond $13.5M but if department comes before CBE saying they have large funds to contribute, CBE will want to review (Step 3)

d. Criteria for listings separated on FY2012 and FY2013—vacant spaces were the main driver. Were all originally in 2012, but budget forced separating. Can’t be fixed in 1, 3, or 4 years, but need to start somewhere.

e. This list is total project cost—not just construction cost. Includes total cost to repair—not just a “band-aid” fix.

3. Much discussion followed

a. These are in the tier to fix, but cannot afford to do all.

b. Figures are based on technical reasons, but programmatic reasons will be discussed also.

c. Is it possible, and possibly smarter, to break maintenance up into smaller sections?

d. Partially vs. fully empty buildings? There is no better time to work on a building than when it is completely vacant.

e. Do we want to call in programs to visit with CBE and have them explain why they need?

f. Does CBE needs the Maintenance Sub-Council to provide its recommendation based on technical standpoint?

g. When are the non-technical issues (i.e. “front door of campus”) evaluated?

h. What would a reordered list look like based on technical and/or risk issues?

i. If the names of the buildings were removed, what would the list look like?

k. Part of the conversation in rankings should include the historical value.
l. Can any of the big projects be divided into smaller projects—and completed in subsequent years? Can be done, but cost will be greater.

m. Number one priority should be safety/risk

n. Should displacement of people be considered? Yes, but vast majority of maintenance projects will have people in the buildings.

o. Should transition buildings be used as swing space? Groups are more tolerant of lesser conditions when using temporarily while new location is being updated.

p. Using supplemental worksheet, provide samples of what MUST be done in individual buildings (i.e. HVAC)

4. CBE agreed to use $13.5M as figure when establishing list. The $13.5M figure was determined by using $15M and setting aside 10% ($1.5M) as a contingency fund.

5. Maintenance Sub-Council to remove those buildings from the list with projects less than $250K and bring new list to CBE. Maintenance Sub-Council will use $500K to resolve getting projects less than $250K completed and will prioritize as they determine appropriately. Dr. Watson’s hope is that they will get the small ones off the list.

6. All sub-councils will review and be prepared to input ideas when Maintenance Sub-Council brings forward their recommendation.

7. Suggestions of how to sequence buildings for Maintenance:
   a. Coding to show risk of safety—not money, but risk
   b. Coding to show risk of loss of functionality
   c. Technical Information (Priority)—what really is running out of time
   d. If feasible, divide bigger projects into multiple years with a sense of project management. Add comment that this “will add to the cost”

**Action/Recommendation:** 1) A revised Maintenance Program Schedule will be provided to CBE showing an informed sequence with coding on how they prioritized and why they sequenced that way. This new list will be based on technical information without guidance on “front door to campus, historical factor, etc. CBE will review and may reorder based on historical, programmatic, etc. issues before making recommendation to the President. 2) More detailed information to be provided on what is planning to be fixed according to the list. 3) A new list showing what smaller projects ($500K used for $200-$250K projects)—what went off and
what didn’t. 4) Provide supplemental worksheet showing breakdown of what must be done in individual buildings (i.e. HVAC)

**Responsible Parties:** Maintenance Sub-Council; Other sub-councils to review and be prepared to give input when Maintenance Sub-Council provides information to CBE.

**VII. Decommissioning of Scoates Hall, Rm. 214**

A. Dr. Watson recommended CBE needs to decommission more classrooms or add more students. Other classrooms will be brought forward for decommissioning also.

B. CBE voted unanimously to recommend approval by the President to decommission Rm. 214 Scoates.

C. Colleges receiving the decommissioned classrooms should note that we cannot assure decommissioning until spring 2012 because fall classes are already scheduled. If spaces can be located for all fall classes scheduled in rooms to be decommissioned—and ALL of the units offering those classes find the new rooms acceptable, then the decommissioning may begin earlier.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to the President to recommend decommissioning of Scoates Rm. 214.

**Responsible Parties:** Karan Watson and Rodney McClendon

**VIII. Vacated Space for Scoates Hall**

A. Deans Vanegas and Hussey have reached agreement for vacant space in Scoates, but only if Rm. 214 is decommissioned. (CBE voted to recommend approval by the President to decommission Rm. 214 Scoates)

B. Division of space would allocate approximately 10,800 sq. ft. to Architecture and 3,100 sq. ft. to Biology and Agricultural Engineering.

C. CBE voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Scoates space compromise between Architecture and College of Agriculture and Life Sciences to the President.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to the President to recommend approval of Scoates space compromise between Architecture and College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

**Responsible Parties:** Karan Watson and Rodney McClendon.

**REMEMBER:** Next meeting for CBE will be on Tuesday, June 28, 2011
1:30 – 3:00 p.m., 510 Rudder Tower