Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of the Council for the Built Environment
October 9, 2012, 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

I. Attendance
   A. Voting members
      1. Present: N.K. Anand, José Bermúdez, Pierce Cantrell, Thomas Harwell, Valerian Miranda, Joe Newton, Holly Scott*, Janice Walpert
         A quorum was present.
      2. Absent: Theresa Fossum, Bhimu Patil, Kevin Pollak, Joe Weber

   B. Non-voting members:
      1. Present: Bill Dugas, Taylor Smith, Jose Solis, Tom Swanner
      2. Absent: Paul Hardin,
         *office/organization representation for the Vice Presidents, Agencies, CPI, USC, GSC and SGA have voting and non-voting members; in meetings where the voting member is absent, the non-voting member assumes voting status.

   C. Ex-Officio members
      2. Absent: Kevin Hurley


II. The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair McClendon at 1:30 p.m.
   A. Approval of the Minutes: The Minutes were approved as submitted.

   B. Updates and Announcements
      1. Milner Hall – the Deans of the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Education and Human Development have worked with the Provost and agreed on a mutually acceptable arrangement for assignment of space in Milner Hall. The building will be shared between the CEHD’s Texas Center for the Advancement of Literacy and Learning, to be housed on the third floor; and the COLA’s Department of Psychology, residing on the remaining floors.

      2. Privatized Housing – copies of the Chancellor’s September 24th memo re: Privatized Housing were distributed. The memo was to remind CEO’s of the System members that a revision of the Real Estate policy was adopted November 2011, stating that “unless waived by the chancellor, prior to submitting a student housing construction program to the board for approval as a system project, a member must undertake a procurement process to identify a potential private partner/developer to design, construct and operate the project under a ground lease.” Note this is related not only to the construction but also includes the operation of a project which means for new housing construction on these various campuses,
the potential partner that builds it might also be operating it. Effective immediately there
must be a market analysis and an RFQ process for the design, construction and operation of
any new housing. All system members will be covered by this memo.

3. Equine Complex Update – DRsc, Lilia Gonzales
   Following the Design Sub-Council’s review of the schematic design of Phase I of the Equine
Complex, Gonzales offered an informational update on some modifications to the previously
approved Equine Complex plan approved by President Loftin in April. Changes from the
approved plan relate primarily to adjustments to the NCAA Cross Country Track, removing the
Polo Field from this phase of the plan, alignment to the final boundary survey, as well as other
minor building use and building feature modifications and adding tailgating recommendations to
the parking areas to be developed as separate projects. It was further noted that while originally
the conceptual design was to align with the Large Animal Clinic, in the course of development
and design refinements of the function and uses within the complex and neighboring
developments, it now appears more appropriate for the complex to be complementary in texture,
color and durability to other approved agriculture/industrial facilities in the area.

4. Deferred Maintenance Contingency – Msc, Ralph Davila
   Davila reported on the Maintenance Sub-Council’s (Msc) plan to execute spending of the FY
contingency fund in the amount of $1.125M. Co-Chairs reinforced the authority of the
Maintenance Sub-Council to spend this amount without requiring the approval/action of the CBE.
Co-Chair Watson requested the Sub-Council provide an update on last year’s maintenance
expenditures and reconfirm the Msc’s plan for the next three years.

   Action Recommendation: Msc Chair Davila will present at future CBE meeting on past year’s expenditures
   and three-year plan forward.
   Responsible Party: Ralph Davila

5. Campus Condition Index report to THECB – David Morrison
   In the past the university submitted reports on MP2 and MP4, reports on maintenance conducted
by the university as well as deferred maintenance. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating
board (THECB) also calculated a replacement value for the buildings for which we reported on
the facilities inventory. They’d take the deferred maintenance and divide by the replacement
value that they had calculated to come up with a ratio which had to be 5% or lower for Texas
A&M to receive a “passing” report. The ratio is important because if an institution was over 5%,
and a request went forward to the THECB, it would be significantly more difficult to receive the
required approvals. Moving forward, the THECB has decided the 5% process needed revision.
The new system is called the Campus Condition Index. The ratio still exists but the divisor is no
longer deferred maintenance but the total amount of maintenance. In gathering the data the
comparison in this policy change are: last year the total of budgeted maintenance for Texas
A&M and the agencies combined was $8M, value calculated at $3.1B which resulted in a %
report of appx 2.5%. Initial projections for this new procedure are approximated at $470M, just
Texas A&M (without the agencies) with a value calculated at $7.6B. This includes ALL space auxiliary, E&G, and infrastructure which were never included in the past. The ratio with this calculation is approximately 6.1%. However, since the process has been radically changed, the idea is that if we are reporting an accurate picture of what needs to be done, what’s projected to be done, what we have done and the maintenance needs of this campus, and we do not do this accurately, we will never be able to present an accurate picture to the legislature and hope to ever receive any additional funding above what we already receive. If we only report the amount we have to spend on the maintenance that we need, it is all we can ever hope to get. We are working with the THECB; there are some technicalities that make reporting for Texas A&M and the agencies accurately a challenge. We want the THECB to make these adjustments and believe if the THECB makes these changes, it will be better for other institutions’ reporting as well. We will be submitting our report for certification by October 15. This briefing was brought to the CBE as it is the first time that TAMU has ever exceeded (or come close) to the 5% ratio. There is some discussion that the THECB may raise the 5% ratio since others may be experiencing the same impact we are finding. Lastly, please be aware that this is the last year we are required to report this data to the legislature as the requirement expires this year. The THECB will work to renew this requirement. Whether the data is required for legislative submission it is still recommended that we collect it for maintenance and operations at Texas A&M and the agencies.

McClendon highlighted the discussion by stating that Texas A&M has a reputation for integrity in reporting and that we will continue to keep this data even if the legislature allows the requirement to expire.

Watson commented the critical factor is that if your institution’s ratio is above 5% and you have any major renovation or new construction that requires THECB approval, when you are over the 5% ratio, the number of processes for approval is greatly increased and approval is significantly harder. Concern is that the formula has changed and the ratio ‘limit’ has not officially been raised.

6. Website [http://cbe.tamu.edu](http://cbe.tamu.edu)

   Urbina recognized the valuable contributions of Karen Bigley, Communications Manager, Division of Administration, and Jim Bouse of DoA-IT for their assistance in the development of the new site. With the data projector display, she reviewed a number of tabs on the site to orient the CBE members to materials of interest. She demonstrated how to navigate the site to locate the presidential action memos, request processes/workflow, policies, the Sub-Councils’ information and meeting materials.

III. Presentations by Sub-Councils

A. Lubbock Street Improvements

1. DRsc – recommends approval for the circulation restriction of Lubbock Street between Spence and Coke Street to be limited access from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., as described in the Campus Master Plan. Support for this request is contingent on the street surface being
replaced with concrete, widening the sidewalks, installation of a gate island and attention to ADA accessibility issues.

2. TRsc – supports the proposed improvements and recommends approval of the project.
   Specific comments were as follows:
   EH&S - supports the proposed improvements and has no safety concerns.
   Procurement Services – as long as university vehicles have access, supportive of the request.
   Facilities Services – support as presented
   Utilities & Energy Services – no issues
   University Police Department – no issues
   Transportation Services – approves of plan

3. Tabled. Questions regarding the possibility of including a bike lane on the street were raised.
   It was determined that additional information would be needed to address the issue. The item was returned to the Design Review Sub-Council to explore factors related to the absence of the bike lanes and the potential to add them to the project.

**Action/Recommendation:** Item tabled. DRsc Chair Gonzales to collect findings on the potential to include bike lanes on the street and report back to the full CBE.

**Responsible Parties:** Lilia Gonzales

---

B. TEEX request to construct a Warehouse at Riverside Campus

1. DRsc – reviewed the schematic design and found the proposed warehouse to be in compliance with the Riverside District Plan and recommends approval to proceed forward with building construction.

2. FURsc - supports the request to construct an Electric Power warehouse on the Riverside campus.

3. TRsc – recommends approval, provided the following items are addressed and funded:

   **Utilities & Energy Services:** a new transformer will need to be included in the project; sizing will be determined by TAMU-UES, based on building-load calculations. A revenue quality electric meter will need to be included in the project per TAMU-UES standards. If communications are available in the building, the meter will also need to be connected to the TAMU-UES system for data collection.

   Natural gas is available on the Riverside Campus and would be a much more efficient source to heat the structure.

   The project does not specify a domestic water connection to the building. If a connection is desired, a TAMU-UES standard revenue water meter will be required.

   **Facilities Services:** Facilities Services supports the project if the following concerns are addressed:
(1) The building’s foundation needs to be designed by a professional engineer.

(2) A professional engineer needs to calculate the project’s impact on storm drainage and ensure proper handling of it. The engineer needs to calculate both the before and after-construction storm drainage and incorporate means to detain the increase for at least 24 hours. These calculations and the planned means of detention need to be presented during the design process.

*Telecommunications:* The cost estimate for getting fiber to the proposed TEEX warehouse (materials and labor) should not exceed $7,000. (NOTE: Additional work beyond the portion estimated will be required [running 48 sm fiber down 7th Street]; however, this is considered University infrastructure, so Telecommunications will bear that expense.)

*Facilities Coordination:* The TEEX warehouse project is consistent with the other uses at Riverside Campus. Facilities Coordination supports this project.

*Environmental Health & Safety:* Since the warehouse will only be used for storage, no normally occupied spaces, it does not require a sprinkler system. However, it will need a Siemens fire alarm system that reports to the Communications Center.

4. CBE voted unanimously to recommend the President’s approval for the construction of a warehouse to support the Electrical Power Training program and for the program’s storage, given the above-referenced Sub-Council considerations are addressed.

**Action/Recommendation:** Memo will be sent to the President recommending his approval of the construction of a TEEX warehouse to support the Electric Power Training Program.

**Responsible Parties:** Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

C. Corps District Plan – DRsc

1. DRsc – reviewed the Corps District Plan and found it to adhere to the main principles of the Campus Master Plan. The DRsc recommends support with the following observations and recommendations:

- All subsequent developments within the District Plan proceed through the review and approval process as established by the University.
- The final Corps District Plan graphically indicates the district area in relation to the overall Campus Master Plan to provide context. This includes the representation of proposed buildings to be demolished.
- It is also understood that all covenants and restrictions that govern the Campus Master Plan are applied to the Corps District Plan

2. CBE voted unanimously to recommend the President’s approval of the Corps District Plan provided the above-referenced Sub-Council recommendations are addressed.
**Action/Recommendation:** Memo will be sent to the President recommending his approval of the Corps District Plan.

**Responsible Parties:** Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

IV. Miscellaneous – Co-Chair Watson offered a couple of alerts on some activities that may happen rapidly in the next 2-3 months:

A. IODP – the time to “re-compete” for the renewal of the International Ocean Drilling Program is approaching. It has been a very important program over the past 20 years, with more than $1.4B generated. Typically the project generates between $60-$75M/year, larger than our average research program. The “Intent to Propose” is due at the end of this month. The proposal team is working to provide estimates for what is needed. An area where investment could be required is in deferred maintenance issues of the IODP building. In Texas A&M’s initial proposal to win the project we agreed to provide the building and we need to maintain it. Funding for IODP is restricted to research and expenses for their ship. Another issue is that the ‘library’ which houses the core samples will reach capacity in approximately two years. The proposal requires core storage for an additional eight years.

While every attempt will be made to keep the CBE apprised and involved in the process, time constraints, the holiday schedule and negotiations among the partners of IODP may require some quick review from the Sub-Councils, and electronic voting of the CBE. The proposal is due in January. Watson stated that President Loftin wants to have the CBE’s involvement and review, especially on any deferred maintenance or building issues prior to making a financial commitment.

B. One Health Building – HSC and TAMU may identify funding for a “One Health” building that is strongly supported by the System. There has been some discussion of this going to the BOR this semester, most likely through a special meeting. As a result of this possibility, there may be a quick turnaround on this request as well. Additional information will be provided as it is available.

C. CBE Tours – McClendon announced that a tour of some select sites around the campus has been offered to CBE members in the past and he would like to have the option for members to tour areas for which they may not be familiar. Examples of sites could include the Physical Plant, Riverside Campus, IODP, etc. Once sites, dates and details are organized we will forward the details to register for the tour.

V. Meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** November 13, 2012 - 1:30 – 3:00 p.m. - 410 Rudder Tower