Council of Built Environment (CBE)
July 12, 2011

Minutes ~ Approved July 26, 2011

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

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

III. Approval of June 14, 2011 Minutes
   A. Corrections to the minutes
      1. Page 5—3c. Correct 5th word to “possibly”
      2. Page 5—3d. Correct “that” to “than”
      3. Page 5—3h. Correct “reorder” to “reordered”
   B. Minutes (with above changes) were approved unanimously

IV. Presentation by Sub-Councils
   A. MSC Renovation User Committee had received request to place flag poles on the south side of the MSC
      1. Design Review Sub-Council reviewed on June 15, 2011
2. Flag display is proposed as a way to designate the facility as a memorial from the outside.

3. Nine flagpoles would be installed in planter boxes which are already part of the project, with following flags: United States, State of Texas, Texas A&M University, Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, and Merchant Marines.

4. DRsc had questions about the proper flag placement and etiquette and will confirm etiquette before proceeding with the final design.

5. There are ongoing discussions on the type of lighting for the flagpoles.

6. CBE voted unanimously to recommend this project.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter will be sent to President Loftin stating that CBE recommends the Exterior Flag Memorial for the MSC.

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

**B. Football Master Plan**

1. Facilities Utilization Sub-Council (FURsc) met on July 8, 2011 to review.

   a. The extent of the area being considered is generally bounded by George Bush Drive, Wellborn Road, Joe Routt Blvd and Houston Streets.

   b. The “Athletic Village” described in the document provides the planning guidance for the placement of facilities, the access including traffic impact issues and the other elements associated with each specialized use of this area of campus.

   c. FURsc voted unanimously to recommend that CBE support the proposal to approve the Football Master Plan.

2. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc)—David Woodcock

   a. DRsc distributed Football Master Plan by email and responses were received from a quorum of the sub-council.

   b. Requested more time to review 66-page Football Master Plan document. Will review more thoroughly at its July 20, 2011 meeting, but did not find anything to oppose.

   c. Noted that the concept of an “Athletic Village” within the Campus Master Plan is consistent with the Historic Core District plan already approved and incorporated in the CMP.
d. DRsc would like to ensure that the interface issues between the broad university community, as well as “branding” and image proposals reflect the entire Texas A&M University community.

3. CBE unanimously voted to recommend that the President approve the Football Master Plan.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter will be sent to President Loftin stating that CBE recommends the approval of the Football Master Plan.

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

C. Kyle Field Renovation

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

   a. Renovations will be done in two phases

      i. Phase One: West Side of stadium renovation would be initiated after the 2012 football season with an anticipated completion date prior to the 2013 football season.

      ii. Phase Two: East Side of stadium would be initiated after the 2013 football season with an anticipated completion date prior to the beginning of the 2014 football season. East Side project would include the demolition of the current Reed Building.

   b. Funding for the West Side Renovation would be provided by the 12th Man Foundation and funding for the East Side renovation is pending. Each phase is expected to be approximately $50 million.

   c. Some discussion among FURsc members regarding compliance factors and the sequence of the planned renovations. FURs was reminded that both east and west sides have compliance issues that need to be addressed.

   d. FURsc had one “no” vote because the East side was not being renovated first, but the vote passed that CBE support the renovations to both sides of Kyle Field with the conditions that the renovations be completed within a 24-month period.

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

   a. DRsc commented that the Texas Historical Commission should be notified of the removal of the historical fabric.
b. DRsc notes that there are few visible remains of the early Kyle Field and requests the usual review of the schematic design and material selection as the project proceeds.

c. DRsc recommends approval of the concept design of the Kyle Field Renovation, Phase 1.

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

a. TRsc met on July 11, 2011, but has not written their formal response, but verbally approved the Kyle Field Renovation.

b. TRsc questioned whether a high-level oversight group similar to the MSC Executive Group appointed by the president of TAMU would be appointed for the Kyle Field renovation project. Kevin Hurley from Athletics expressed support for this idea.

4. Sam Torn, member of the Board of Trustees of the 12th Man Foundation, was present during the CBE meeting and provided information to CBE members upon request.

a. Question was raised as to whether 12th Man Foundation would consider funding the renovation of the East Side stands (largely occupied by students).

b. Mr. Torn stated that the 12th Man Foundation exists to support the University and if donors are willing and able to contribute to such an initiative, the Foundation upon the request of the University president will do what it can towards that end.

5. Concerns were raised about the funding for this project.

a. Karan Watson clarified that although identification of funding sources are beyond CBE’s charge, there are mechanisms in place to ensure projects are not started without adequate funding sources identified.

b. Often the intricate details of a project’s scope and cost at the time of CBE’s initial deliberations cannot be known until University, System, and Board officials approve the broad concept to go forward for pre-construction analysis.

c. At the time of initial review, CBE’s role is to provide analysis of the project concept to the extent possible, raise to the president any observations and concerns, and ensure the project comes back through the CBE process post-analysis and/or design for more detailed analysis and subsequent recommendation to the President.
6. Noting the importance of fire and life safety and accessibility issues, all sub-councils recommended that CBE recommend to the president approval of the Kyle Field renovation project, subject to renovations being complete within a 24-month period.

7. CBE voted affirmatively upon the sub-councils’ recommendation. The final vote was 3 “yes”, 2 “abstain” and 1 “opposed”.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to President recommending the approval of Kyle Field renovation, subject to renovations being complete with 24-month period.

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

D. MSC Sculpture Competition—request was received from Catherine Hastedt

1. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc)—report by David Woodcock
   a. Materials used in construction of the sculpture comply with fire and life safety codes.
   b. Final sculpture design provide for ease of cleaning and maintenance.
   c. DRsc recommends the CBE vote to make the recommendation to the President to approve this request.

2. Technical Review Sub-Council—report by Tom Reber
   a. Review proposal and noted the same concerns as the DRsc.
   b. TRsc recommends that CBE vote to make the recommendation to the President to approve.

3. CBE voted unanimously to approve permission to hold a sculpture competition for the MSC and recommends approval by the President with one caveat: the sub-councils will review the “preferred” sculpture(s) before final selection.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to President recommending the approval of the MSC Sculpture Competition with the caveat that sub-councils review the “preferred” sculpture before final selection.

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

E. Vacated Space: BMSB facility—report by James Massey

1. FURsc reviewed two requests for vacated space in the Business Management Services Building (BMSB): Telecommunications and Transportation Services.
2. Future use of 8,220 assignable square feet was previously assigned to Texas AgriLife Extension. With opening of the new Ag Headquarters Bldg., the space will soon become available. No proposals for use as academic space were submitted.

3. Chairman James Massey excused himself from compiling the FURsc report because of affiliation with the Division of Administration—of which Transportation Services is a part. FURsc members Kathleen Hubbard and Sherry Wine drafted the sub-council report and Chairman Massey reviewed the report and concurred with its content.

4. FURsc recommended that CBE support the request to assign the future vacated space to Telecommunications because of the following:
   a. Academic link provided by the Advanced Telecommunications and Learning Technologies (AATLT)
   b. Size of the budgetary savings (and potential impact on the telecommunication rates)
   c. Long term use of the space better serves Telecommunications

5. FURsc advocates that a permanent solution for Transportation Services needs to be found and that there be transparency related to the savings realized by relocating Telecommunications to the BMSB.

6. CBE co-chair Dr. Karan Watson stated that rates are NOT likely to decrease so the CBE decision to award this vacated space to Telecommunications should not be based on this assumption.

7. CBE members voted unanimously to approve the assignment of vacant space in the BMSB for use by Telecommunications and recommends the President approve the request made by Telecommunications.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to President recommending the approval of the assignment of space in the BMSB facility be awarded to Telecommunications.

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

**F. Vacated Space: Francis Hall**—report by James Massey

1. FURsc reviewed two requests for utilizing vacated space in Francis Hall:
   a. College of Architecture (Department of Construction Science)
   b. Chemistry Department
2. Future use of the 19,539 square feet currently vacant in Francis Hall. Space is available due to move of Department of Recreation, Parks and Tourism Science to the Agriculture Headquarters Building earlier this year. There are three (3) classrooms located in the building, totaling 2,833 square feet.

3. Chemistry’s need was seen as valid.
   a. Department is growing and supports the instructional needs of a number of degree programs as well as their own.
   b. FURsc members suggested that the solution for the 5-6,000 square feet request could be addressed in another location
   c. FURsc suggested that IT improvement should be explored to confirm the scope of the need (i.e. Are there solutions which could be found through partnerships with CIS and others?)

4. Architecture Department’s proposal offered programmatic solution which would directly improve the Department’s academic purpose, provide a practical link to the Construction Industry, and provide a way to consolidate the faculty and facilities of the Department.

5. FURsc recommended that CBE support the proposal by the College of Architecture’s Construction Science Department and assign all the space in Francis Hall with the following conditions:
   a. Existing classroom inventory is unchanged.
   b. Specific planning and resultant cost of the renovations be leveraged by the fundraising offering of the College and the needed support by the University for the Operational & Maintenance issues. Other financial requirements related to the fundraising element of this proposal may be necessary.
   c. Depending on the scope of the building renovation, it could take as long as 24 to 30 months; if approved and in the interim, the Construction Science Department agrees to utilize the space provided by the CBE until the renovation is complete.

6. Design Review Sub-Council chair, David Woodcock, pointed out that Francis Hall is one of the most historical buildings on campus and would make a model study for Architectural students.

7. CBE members voted to approve the assignment of Francis Hall in its entirety, less the classroom spaces, for use by the Department of Construction Science, with the above caveats. The vote was 4 “yes”, 1 “abstain”, and 1 “no”. Therefore CBE recommends the President approve
the request made by the Department of Construction Science, with the above caveats.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to President recommending the approval of the assignment of space in Francis Hall be awarded to the Department of Construction Science, with the above caveats.

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

V. Deferred Maintenance Priorities—report by Rod Weis

A. As requested by CBE, the Maintenance Sub-Council compiled a list of facilities that are recommended for rehabilitation and/or renovation utilizing the $15M in finding designated for deferred maintenance in FY2012 and FY2013.

1. Technical ranking/priority listing for deferred maintenance project utilizing data from the ISES Facility Condition Analysis, the Sightlines Deferred Maintenance Plan, and from assessments completed by Facilities Services staff.

2. List is prioritized by fiscal year and there are two different listings for each year
   a. Building name only
   b. One which details the actual maintenance projects for each of the buildings.

3. Formula was utilized to develop the projected costs
   a. FY2012, estimates determined by Facilities Services based on current prices. If a project was recommended by ISES or Sightlines, 10% was added for contingency and 15% for design.
   b. FY2013—utilized same formula as for FY2012 plus a 4% increase for inflation.

4. Maintenance projects totaling $13,564,727 were identified for FY2012.
   a. Suggested by CBE that a portion of the $15M be set aside to allow for emergency repair projects. The Maintenance Sub-Council agrees and the plan reserves $1,435,273 for emergencies.
   b. Three of facilities on FY2012 list—Jack K. Williams, Scoates, and Francis—are partially or totally vacant. Msc recommends that projects in these facilities be completed prior to moving any new occupants into the facilities as the projects can be accomplished more efficiently when the space is unoccupied.
5. Beginning FY2013, the current $3M in annual funding for fire and life safety projects expires so it will be necessary to determine how we address fire/life safety issues as well as necessary deferred maintenance projects.

6. Maintenance Sub-Council recommends approval of the Deferred Maintenance Priority list for FY12 and FY13 by the CBE.

B. Design Review Sub-Council David Woodcock mentioned the importance of the cultural and historical buildings—and noted there are three (3) on the list.

C. CBE approved unanimously the Priority List as presented and recommends presenting the two-year model to Dr. Loftin with the understanding that the list will be reviewed and reaffirmed or possibly changed/updated throughout the year.

Action/Recommendation: FY 2012 and FY 2013 Deferred Maintenance Priority List to be provided to Dr. Loftin

Responsible Parties: Karan Watson and Rodney McClendon

IV. Koldus Space Allocation Request from Division of Student Affairs

A. For new buildings, the model has been for the vacating unit to inform CBE. CBE approves, allows campus to submit proposals for the vacated space. However, Deans or Vice Presidents can reassign within their own spaces without coming to CBE.

B. When the MSC finishes, units will be moving and small nuggets of space will be available. Under current process, units will be asking to get approval for spaces they are vacating.

C. Discussion was whether the move from Koldus for the Division of Student Affairs would be handled the same way: CBE recommends approval for move from Koldus, campus units bid on vacated space (including Division of Student Affairs), and CBE recommends approval for which unit is awarded space?

D. Alternative method would be for CBE to endorse Student Affairs to vacate various areas around campus to shuffle into MSC, but CBE would recommend who is assigned vacated space.

E. CBE unanimously voted to endorse plan for allowing vacating space without coming to CBE, but “bidding” process through CBE will be used for assigning vacated space.

REMINDER: Next meeting for CBE will be on Tuesday, August 9, 2011 1:30 – 3:00 p.m., 510 Rudder Tower