I. Attendance

A. Voting members present: Clint Magill, Thomas Mather, Kate Miller, Kevin Pollak (Student Government), Jeff Seemann, Joe Weber

B. Voting members absent: Bill Dugas, Scott Bowen, Mladen Kezunovic, Genyne Royal, Jorge Vanegas

C. Ex-Officio members present: Karan Watson, James Massey, Rod Weis, David Woodcock

D. Ex-Officio members absent: Rodney McClendon, B. J. Crain, Kevin Hurley, Tom Reber, Deborah Wright

E. Non-voting members present: Valerian Miranda (voting FY12)

F. Non-voting members absent:

G. Guest(s): Matt Fry, Peter Lange, Marty Scholtz, David Morrison, Dan Mizer, Ralph Davila, Richard White

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

III. Approval of July 12, 2011 Minutes

A. Design Review Sub-Council had met and further reviewed the Football Master Plan as per their request on July 12th meeting.

1. For purposes of compliance with the Campus Master Plan, it would be more appropriately named as a district plan, recognizing that it applies to a geographic area, not a specific function.

2. Members also commented on the football-specific language that is used even though many facilities in this area will be for all student athletes and for other members of the university community.

3. DRsc recommended Football Master Plan be changed to Kyle Field District Plan.

4. David Woodcock stated that Kevin Hurley was supportive of this change.
B. CBE unanimously voted to approve the name change to *Kyle Field District Plan* and recommends approval by the President.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to President recommending the approval of the name change of the *Football Master Plan* to *Kyle Field District Plan.*

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

C. Minutes were approved unanimously

IV. Presentation by Sub-Councils

A. Scotts Miracle-Gro Facility for Lawn and Garden Research

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

   a. DRsc reviewed on June 15, 2011

   b. DRsc recommends exploring the use of metal walls on all sides, and considering this as a prototype for future agricultural research facilities.

   c. Questions were raised about how parking will be addressed.

   d. DRsc would like to see project at schematic design phase to review these two issues.

   e. DRsc recommends approval of this project but looks forward to reviewing more detailed drawings that would address the concerns above.

2. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc) Report—Peter Lange on behalf of Tom Reber

   a. Dr. Richard White from the Department of Soil and Crop Sciences presented to the TRsc on June 27, 2011.

      i. Facility is needed to continue further development of Turfgrass Teaching Research and Extension outreach programs by supporting student and scientists with a modern facility.

      ii. State-of-the-art facility will have offices, conference room, seminar room, laboratory, equipment room, mechanical shop, and crop protection chemical storage.

      iii. Proposed location for 12,000 sq. ft. facility is approximately 800 feet north of F&B Road and about 0.5 miles west of GSC on Agronomy Road.
b. TRsc supported the new facility in concept, but there were numerous questions and concerns about the road that supports the facility and the proposed number of parking spots.

c. TRsc recommends the approval of the concept for this project, but recommends the project return to CBE for final approval after more study regarding infrastructure is completed.

3. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council (FURsc) Chairman James Massey stated that the proposal is consistent with the Campus Master Plan, but would be interested in future discussions with AgriLife regarding the benefits to campus as related to building opportunities north of Agronomy Rd.

4. CBE unanimously voted to recommend the concept and placement of the Scotts Miracle-Gro Facility for Land and Garden Research.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter will be sent to President Loftin stating that CBE recommends the approval of the Scotts Miracle-Gro Facility for Land and Garden Research.

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

**B. Basketball and Volleyball Courts**

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

   a. Chareny Rydl met with DRsc on July 20, 2011, to present the request to construct a basketball court in the future park area that will be located on the site of the old University Apartments.

   b. Residence Life also requests the addition of a concrete basketball court in the Northside residence area west of parking lot 32. This will replace the basketball court which must be removed to make way for the Northside Residence Hall. The proposed recreation area would also add a sand volleyball court and canvas shade structures and would be designed by the Northside Residence Hall design team.

   c. David Woodcock mentioned that it is unfortunate that the new recreation area is the lay-down area so will need to wait for the Northside Hall to be completed.

   d. DRsc recommends the approval of the basketball and volleyball courts, and notes that furniture and lighting, where installed, should meet university standards.

2. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc) Report—Peter Lange on behalf of Tom Reber

   a. TRsc met with Chareny Rydl on July 18, 2011, and reviewed this proposal.
b. TRsc comments

i. Contractors must follow contractor parking guidelines and coordinate any parking or lay-down needs with Transportation Services.

ii. Proposed footprint for the Northside courts is clear of existing utility infrastructure, except for storm drainage inlets on the perimeter of the site. The inlets will need to be adjusted, and the design engineer will need to look into regarding the entire area.

iii. No utility infrastructure should be involved in the University Apartments court project, but the demolition project should make sure to remove any utility lines that fed the old structure.

c. TRsc recommends approval of this project if these concerns are addressed and funded.

3. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council (FURsc) did not review, but the sub-council chair stated the location is acceptable as related to the Campus Master Plan

4. CBE unanimously voted to recommend that the President approve the construction of the basketball and volleyball courts.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter will be sent to President Loftin stating that CBE recommends the approval of the construction of the basketball and volleyball courts.

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

C. Cricket Pitch

1. Residence Life is requesting approval to install a cricket pitch in the University Apartments area (east side of the field between Nicolas Ave. and Front St.) for the Aggie Cricket Club.

   a. Currently using section of sidewalk in one of fields located in the University Apartments area.

   b. Current site has been deemed “unfit” by the International Cricket Council due to the tripping hazard of the uneven pavement and surrounding terrain.

   c. New cricket pitch will help the Aggie Cricket Club to better prepare for upcoming competition and enhance the landscaping of the area.

   d. Project will demolish existing sidewalk, re-grade land, install cricket pitch, 66 feet X 7.5 feet, and install Astroturf.
2. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc)—report by David Woodcock
   a. DRsc reviewed this proposal on July 20, 2011 and noted that the construction of a new cricket pitch would increase safety for the players and provide a better playing surface.
   b. Cricket field normally has a marked boundary, and DRsc suggests that this be addressed with the team as the work proceeds.
   c. Aggie Cricket Club has raised funds for new cricket pitch.
   d. This cricket pitch will continue as a temporary use pending future development plans.
   e. DRsc recommends approval of the proposal to improve the cricket playing area as presented.

3. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc)—report by Peter Lange on behalf of Tom Reber
   a. TRsc reviewed proposal on July 18, 2011, with Charney Rydl
   b. Noted that contractors must follow contractor parking guidelines and coordinate any parking or lay-down needs with Transportation Services.
   c. A 2" IP Ploy II gas line crosses north of the site and Residence Life should take this into account during design.
   d. Residence Life must ensure construction does not interfere with any natural gas lines in the area. Cricket Pitch will not include irrigation.
   e. TRsc recommends approval if the concerns above are addressed and funded.

4. Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council—did not review, but James Massey states there are no concerns with the location.

5. CBE voted unanimously to recommend approval by the President.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to President recommending the approval of constructing a new Cricket Pitch.

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

D. Jack E. Brown Made Green Project (Solar Panels Installation)

1. Project is coordinated by EPICs (Engineering Projects in Community Service) to install a 3.2 kilowatt array of photovoltaic solar panels on the
first floor roof of the Jack E. Brown Engineering Building. A display in the lobby area of the building will be included.

a. Two goals: provide supplemental power to the building and use installation of solar panels to raise awareness for alternative and renewable energy sources.

b. Utilizing funds provided by the Aggie Green Fund

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

a. No visual impact of the 14 inch high solar panels from the ground and acceptable impact on views from inside the building.

b. No glare issue since the solar panels are angled away from the building.

c. DRsc recommends the project.

3. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc)—report by Peter Lange on behalf of Tom Reber

a. Two main long-term concerns were maintenance and funding.

i. Funding source to pay for the photovoltaic system maintenance must be established prior to installation

ii. Utilities & Energy Management (UEM) and Facilities Services must both review and approve plans and specifications for the Photovoltaic system prior to installation.

b. Environmental Health & Safety stated that students are not allowed to have access to any roof areas at the J. E. Brown Bldg.

c. TRsc recommends approval if the above concerns are addressed and funded.

4. CBE unanimously voted to recommend the President’s approval for the J. E. Brown Made Green Project (Installation of Solar Panels) provided UEM and Facilities Services both review and approve plans and specifications for the Photovoltaic system prior to installation.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to President recommending the approval of the J. E. Brown Made Green Project (Installation of Solar Panels) provided EUM and Facilities Services both review and approve plans and specifications for the Photovoltaic system prior to installation.

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

E. Vacated Space: Blocker Building (Phase 1)—report by James Massey
1. FURsc reviewed requests for vacated space in the Blocker Building:
   a. Four academic colleges: College of Engineering, College of Science, College of Liberal Arts, and College of Education
   b. One Administrative Division: Vice President for Information Technology

2. Space is for Phase 1—36,232 square feet of assignable space and includes all of 3rd floor (24,892 square feet) and 11,340 square feet on the 4th floor. Space is primarily office space; there is no wet lab space available in this building.

3. FURs discussed the use of space to be vacated on 1st and 2nd floors of Blocker, but deadline is not until September 1, 2011 to submit proposals. Requests submitted by that deadline will be reviewed for Phase 2 space in Blocker.

4. Dr. Karan Watson comments
   a. Vice President has ability to prioritize or work with units for reconciliation. Since there was no reconciliation within these units, Dr. Watson brought these requests to CBE for review and its recommendation.
   b. All have a space need and all colleges can point to their needs impacting progress.
   c. Engineering and Science have high needs--Mathematics would be providing vacant space (23,000 sq. ft.) in Milner Hall to consolidate with part of the department housed on the 6th floor of Blocker.
   d. Liberal Arts—Psychology Department is scattered and this would be an attempt to combine together. Reassignment of space in the current Psychology Building would result if all combined in Blocker.
   e. Education (HLKN—Health and Kinesiology) is being evicted as early as summer 2012 in preparation for the razing of the Read Building.
   f. CBE members should not vote based on anticipation of who will be awarded space in Blocker during Phase 2. CBE should be considering only Phase 1 for this vote.

5. FURsc Review and Analysis
   a. College of Engineering
i. Recent SNAPS space needs indicated that the space in the Blocker Building was needed to support critical programmatic growth.

ii. Addition of ETED Building and bid to retain space being vacated in Zachary Engineering Center is expected to help address their need, but more space is required.

b. College of Science

i. Space in the Blocker Building was the college’s top priority

ii. Space would support the growth of both Mathematics and Statistics departments, consolidate the Mathematics Department (one part already housed on 6th floor) in one location, provide vacant space (23,000 sq. ft.) in Milner Hall, and provide space to support Statistics’ initiatives.

c. College of Liberal Arts

i. College’s proposal includes the movement of the entire department into the space currently vacated (36,232 sq. ft.) and the space to be vacated later in 2012 by the English and Performance Studies Department (30,674 sq. ft.)

ii. Assignment would allow the reassignment of the current Psychology Bldg.

d. College of Education

i. Proposes to utilize space in Blocker Bldg. as office space projected to be lost as the Read Bldg. is razed and the HLKN is displaced, generally in summer of 2012.

ii. Use of space will allow consolidation of the faculty currently displaced and located in the Dullie Bell Bldg.

iii. Dean outlined a proposal to the FURsc for 26,921 square feet to primarily address the office needs of the Health & Kinesiology Department (16,560 square feet in Read Bldg., plus 10,361 square feet in the Dullie Bell Bldg.)

iv. Alternatives such as Milner Hall, the Psychology Bldg. and other spaces were explored. Given the pressing timetable to vacate the Read Building the Blocker Building option is most apparently the best option.
e. Vice President for Information Technology

i. Open access computer lab currently located in the Read Bldg. will be lost when the building is razed next year.

ii. Proposal to enlarge existing open computing center located on the first floor of Blocker Bldg. was presented to FURsc. This will be considered with review of Phase 2 vacant assignable space of Blocker Bldg.

f. Recent plans have been approved by the President to renovate the west and east stands of Kyle Field. The target date to vacate the Read Building (located under the east stands of Kyle Field) has been set for the summer of 2012.

6. FURsc recommends that CBE assign the vacant and available spaces on the 3rd and 4th floors of the J. R. Blocker Building as follows:

   a. 4th Floor space of 11,340 square feet to the College of Science

   b. 3rd Floor space of 24,893 square feet to College of Education (HLKN)

7. CBE members voted unanimously to recommend the President’s approval of the FURsc recommendation.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to President recommending the approval of the assignment of space in the Blocker Building as proposed by FURsc—4th floor space to the College of Science and 3rd floor space to the College of Education.

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

F. Vacated Space: Zachary Engineering Center—report by James Massey

1. FURsc was forwarded two requests for utilizing vacated space in Zachary Engineering Center: College of Geosciences and College of Engineering

2. College of Geosciences withdrew their request for this space.

3. FURsc recommends the CBE support the request by the College of Engineering to retain the space they are vacating (44,937 square feet) in the Zachary Engineering Center.

4. CBE members voted unanimously to recommend the President’s approval of the FURsc recommendation.

**Action/Recommendation:** Letter to President recommending the approval of the assignment of space in Zachary Engineering Center to the College of Engineering.

**Responsible Parties:** Karan Watson and Rodney McClendon
V. Future vacant assignable spaces
   A. September 1, 2011 is the deadline for proposals for vacant space in Blocker (phase 2) and the Academic Building.
   B. Possible space coming up in Milner and Leggett
      1. Space in Leggett Hall was turned into offices by Liberal Arts at the cost of $150K a year to Residence Life.
      2. Revenue streams are needed to repair other dorms. At one time, there seemed to be a push for fewer living quarters on campus. At the current time, there is no gain—but no loss—of living quarters.

VI. Discussion of CBE flow of information
   A. Should we post all paperwork on a website instead of sending attachments?
   B. Suggestion was made to have a cutoff on Friday at 4:00 p.m. for all documents to be submitted to CBE for the following Tuesday meeting, a zip file created containing all documents and placed on a website, and a reminder of the meeting sent on Friday at 5:00 p.m., and last minute documents printed and brought to CBE meeting.
   C. CBE members to contemplate this proposal and discuss further at next meeting.

Action/Recommendation: CBE members to continue thinking about ways to improve the flow of information—and the ideas presented today.
Responsible Parties: All CBE members

VII. Discussion of CBE process will be an agenda item for future meeting

Action/Recommendation: CBE members to be thinking about the CBE process—what is working, what improvements need to be made.
Responsible Parties: All CBE members

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