Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of the Council for the Built Environment
December 11, 2012, 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

I. Attendance
A. Voting members
   1. Present: Bill Dugas; Pierce Cantrell; Joe Weber*; José Bermúdez; Joe Newton; Bhimu Patil; Valerian Miranda; Janice Walpert
      A quorum was present.
   2. Absent: Theresa Fossum; Thomas Harwell; Kevin Pollack

B. Non-voting members:
   1. Present: Paul Hardin; José Solis
   2. Absent: N.K. Anand; Holly Scott; Taylor Smith; Tom Swanner
   *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
   1. Present: Karon Watson; Rodney McClendon; James Massey; Tom Reber; Ralph Davila; Lilia Gonzales; Matt Fry; Deb Wright; David Morrison
   2. Absent: Bob Casagrande; B.J. Crain; Kevin Hurley

D. Guests: Dimitri Lagoudas (representing N.K. Anand); Merna Jacobsen; Cody Scarborough (representing Holly Scott) Marty Scholtz (representing Theresa Fossum)

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. Deferred Maintenance: Request for Approval FY 14-15 – Ralph Davila
      Maintenance Sub-Council Chair Ralph Davila reminded the CBE that the DRAFT FY14-15 Deferred Maintenance list was presented at the 11/13/2012 CBE meeting. This list was subsequently emailed to CBE members for their review and comment, but no comments were received. Davila now requests CBE approval of the FY14-15 Deferred Maintenance Plan.

      Dr. Pierce Cantrell asked if the planned fire/life safety improvements include funding for the Code Maroon interface with the fire alarms. Davila replied that he does not know, but will find out if that is included in the costs. Co-Chair Watson concurred that the CBE should create the expectation that the Code Maroon interface will be included in the cost of all future fire alarm systems. If Davila finds out that the Code Maroon interface costs are not already included in the estimated FY14-15 Deferred Maintenance plan, Watson will locate other funds for this. All future fire/life safety projects should include the cost of the Code Maroon interface.

      It was noted that any deviations from this plan would be presented to the CBE for approval.

   Action/Recommendation: Memo will be sent to the President recommending approval of the Maintenance Sub-Council’s request for the approval of the FY14-15 Deferred Maintenance plan as presented, with the following provisions: if Code Maroon interface costs are not included in these estimates, the Provost will
locate those funds; any future fire/life safety project estimates shall include Code Maroon interface costs; any changes to the plan must be approved by the CBE.

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

C. Dulie Bell Building – Ralph Davila

As requested by the Co-Chairs, Maintenance Sub-Council Chair Ralph Davila provided a report on the status and condition of the Dulie Bell Building and the possibility of its demolition. Davila reported that the Dulie Bell Building, built in 1942 at 51,802 gsf, has MEP and roof systems that are failing or have failed to a point that service is minimal at best. There are also major ADA and fire/life safety compliance issues. The costs to repair and upgrade the internal systems in this building are likely greater than 50% of the replacement cost for a new building, and the Deferred Maintenance Task Force Report identified Dulie Bell as a transitional building with significant repair needs that place it near the top of the list for demolition. It was noted that this unsightly building is in a very visible location.

Demolition costs are estimated at $500,000, and the estimated demolition time from the submission of a work request is five to six months. With this in mind, the Msc recommends that Dulie Bell be demolished as soon as possible. It was noted that approval for demolition from the Texas Historical Commission will be required, but that has already been taken into account in the demolition time estimate.

CBE members identified the current users of the building as the Public Policy Research Institute, the English Language Institute, and a small Anthropology lab. James Massey noted that the appropriate parties have already been contacted to begin the process of finding alternate space for these users. It was noted that the users’ safety is not in question and the building may still be used in the short term, but the major heating and cooling systems are failing and the CBE needs to take action.

**Action/Recommendation**: Memo will be sent to the President recommending immediate demolition of the Dulie Bell building, with the provision that accommodations must first be made for the current occupants.

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

D. Update on Outsourcing Contracts – Ralph Davila

Co-Chair McClendon reminded the council of the request from August 2012 for B.J. Crain to provide an update on the outsourcing contract, and specifically how SSC interfaces with the CBE and the university’s operational structure for determining maintenance priorities. Ralph Davila was recently named Contract Administrator for Compass activities and was asked to provide the update. Davila provided the following report:

1. **Amendment to Contracts**: there are four executed contracts (maintenance, landscape, custodial, dining), but the university is still working on one possible amendment, which is for a data feed that would allow an open port back to the university’s data. Dr. Pierce Cantrell recently provided a memorandum outlining all of the requirements that would have to take place for the contract amendment to occur, including the assurance of Compass’ protection of this confidential information. The request is now being reviewed by Office of General Counsel. This data feed would allow Compass to use the Aggie Works system, which provides project status information to the end users, and access to meal plan data.
2. Contract Milestones and Deliverables:
   a. Work Plan: By contract, Compass is required to provide TAMU with a work plan within nine months of the beginning contract date for all of the outsourced departments. In doing this, Compass will analyze the nature of the university’s deferred maintenance needs and recommend a plan to address them. This plan will also address the specific maintenance needs of each building, while recognizing the nature of each building and taking the specific user needs into account. This assessment is approximately 50% complete, and Compass does expect to meet the nine month deadline. The completed work plan will first be submitted to Davila’s office for review and then routed for further review as appropriate. Until that plan is complete and implemented, Compass will continue to provide services consistent with the current operating practices that are in place.
   b. Work Order System: Compass will implement a work order system, mutually-agreed upon by TAMU, preferably the Aggie Works System.
   c. Quality Assurance Program: Compass will also implement a quality assurance program which will be mutually-agreed upon by TAMU.
   Davila added that SSC reported that custodial is currently fully-staffed, and maintenance needs 12-15 licensed technicians to be fully-staffed.

3. Compass’ Role with CBE: SSC has assigned representatives to serve on each of the CBE Sub-Councils. SSC assured Davila that they view TAMU as their customer, and they intend to do as directed by CBE in accordance with the approval processes that are in place. For example, if there is a facility that needs to be renovated, SSC will follow the process of review and recommendation by the CBE Sub-Councils, recommendation by the CBE, and ultimate approval by the President. This process will be followed unless the CBE decides otherwise. Priorities and decisions on the built environment will be directed by TAMU and the CBE.

4. Project Funding: All deferred maintenance costs will be borne by TAMU. For other project requests, by contract Compass/SSC can only provide service up to $5,000. Anything above $5,000 requires TAMU approval. Once per week the TAMU Contract Administrator (Davila) will receive a list of projects for approval, whether they are deferred maintenance projects or projects by departmental request, which have typically already been assigned to an account. Once approved, Compass will be able to begin these projects since the funding will already be set in place. The TAMU Contract Administrator will also review requests related to routine maintenance to determine if the costs appear to be reasonable. Davila noted that he hopes to be able to perform on-site audits of some of these projects to ensure all expenses are appropriate. Example: any request under $5,000, such as replacing a light bulb, will be completed and TAMU will not receive an invoice. As soon as a project cost goes over the $5,000 threshold, TAMU will receive an invoice outlining the total costs to date, and TAMU will pay the costs exceeding the $5,000. As of 10/1/2012, there were 597 active construction projects in the A&M System, budgeted at $69M. Examples of items that are not considered preventive maintenance and would be funded by TAMU are building improvements, mitigation of mold/asbestos/mildew, materials and sub-contracts associated with Easterwood Airport, and special items like catastrophes and floods. Invoicing occurs at the beginning of each month.
It was stated by Co-Chair Watson, and Davila concurred, that if Compass proposes any adjustments to the FY14-15 Deferred Maintenance Plan or changes in priorities, they would be brought back to the CBE and its appropriate Sub-Councils for approval.

Cantrell asked if there were industry best practices for the number of requests that should be monitored or audited to ensure that TAMU is receiving the best value. Davila responded that the ultimate question is how much oversight the university wishes to have over all of the contracts. Co-Chair McClendon replied that based on research, he highly recommends that the university have a Vendor Management Program staffed by content experts to oversee these contracts. McClendon will share that research with Davila.

Co-Chair McClendon received feedback from departments who have not yet received a bill for projects that have been done, and they are afraid that when they do receive a bill it will not be for what they’ve budgeted. Deborah Wright confirmed that invoices are sent monthly to FMO, who then distributes them to the departments. Davila noted that if the data port is amended as requested, it will enable these departments to access project information and invoices.

Co-Chair Watson noted that various groups, including the Council for Strategic Budgeting, have inquired about the money from outsourcing, including where those funds are located and what they’re being used for. This question is frequently asked on campus, and while it is not Davila’s job to address it, she believes that we will continue to receive questions about this because what the media headlines claimed and what was actually in the final contract are different. Davila said that tomorrow he is providing an update to the Council of Principal Investigators on this topic.

It was asked if SSC would routinely attend CBE meetings, and Co-Chair Watson confirmed that, yes, the CBE recently approved Bob Casagrande as a regular, non-voting member. He did not attend today, but we will make sure he receives the meeting invitations and understands that his attendance is requested for each meeting.

Co-Chair McClendon expressed appreciation to Davila for presenting this update to the CBE.

E. CBE Tours – David Morrison
David Morrison reminded the CBE that on Friday, December 7 a tour was provided of the Equine Initiative site location and the Riverside Campus to interested CBE and CBE Sub-Council members. About 15 individuals attended the tour, and he believes it was a great opportunity for many to learn about the historical buildings and the various activities that occur at Riverside Campus. It was noted that the exterior concrete color of the Joint Library Facility at Riverside Campus, which was previously orange in appearance, has had work done to correct the color and is now an approved tan color. Appreciation was expressed to all those involved in the tour.

III. Presentations by Sub-Councils
A. WaterSmart Garden – DRsc, TRsc
The Texas Sea Grant Program requested CBE review and recommendation for approval to install
and maintain a WaterSmart demonstration garden on the Texas A&M University campus in the garden area on the south side of the TAES Annex Building. Texas Sea Grant will provide the upkeep and maintenance.

1. DRsc - believes the WaterSmart garden proposal would be an improvement to the campus built environment and recommends support of the conceptual design with the following observations and recommendations:
   a. should the Texas Sea Grant program leave the facility, they will return the beds to their original state.
   b. design details, including planting and signage, will be presented to the DRsc for approval prior to the installation of the garden.

2. TRsc - supports the construction of the garden and recommends approval; offers no additional concerns or recommendations.

Action/Recommendation: Memo will be sent to the President recommending approval for construction of a WaterSmart demonstration garden on the south side of the TAES Annex Building.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

B. TEES Request for Three Buildings at Riverside Campus – DRsc, TRsc, FURsc

Vice Chancellor and Dean of Engineering, Dr. Katherine Banks, requested CBE review and make recommendation to construct three buildings at the Riverside Campus to address space deficiencies (as acknowledged in the 2010 SNAPS report) and provide space for projected growth for soon to be established research centers. TEES coordinated with the Office of Facilities Coordination to identify locations for the proposed buildings.

1. DRsc - found the request to be in compliance with the intent of the proposed Riverside Campus Plan and recommends approval for the buildings with the following observations and recommendations:
   a. TEES should work with Environmental Health & Safety Department to ensure that the construction of Building 1 will be able to function under the university’s existing air control licenses and regulations.
   b. Further review of the design of each building would be presented to the DRsc at schematic design and design development, as well as an on-site exterior materials mockup review.

2. FURsc - recommends the CBE support the request by the Texas Engineering Experiment Station to construct the three proposed buildings at the Riverside Campus. The approvals and ultimate construction of the buildings should be guided by the Riverside Campus Plan.

3. TRsc - supports construction of the buildings on Riverside Campus and recommends approval, provided the following concerns/issues are addressed and funded.
   a. Facilities Services: Concern for storm drainage. For each building site, the project design team needs to model how much the project may increase the immediate runoff above the existing condition, and incorporate provisions to detain this increase.
   b. Utilities & Energy Services: Much of the TAMU Riverside utility infrastructure is over 50 years old and is showing signs of its age. UES personnel believe the electrical power and sanitary sewer capacity in place will be sufficient to feed the proposed facilities. Storm sewers will need to be looked at on a case-by-case basis, and the need for site detention determined by the design engineer. A detailed utility load analysis needs to be completed for each site and should also take into account the capacity consumed by all three sites combined. Current construction projects on campus have identified fire flow from the existing 8” DSW loop to be questionable (depending on building location and size) and will
need to be investigated thoroughly by the design engineer. The natural gas distribution system on the campus has been replaced in recent years and should have the capacity to feed Sites 2 and 3 if needed, however Site 1 will more than likely require a new connection to the ATMOS main (Highway 21) in order to provide the pressure and flow needed.

Site 1: The project should be prepared to fund the installation of a new 12” DCW line from the TAMU Riverside DCW distribution center approximately 2,500 LF to the site. The project should be prepared to fund the new installation of a natural gas main from the main ATMOS line on Highway 21 to the site, approximately 4,000 LF.

Site 2 and 3: The project will need to investigate the fire flow needed for the proposed structures and be prepared to tap the new 12” DCW installed by Site 1, approximately 750 LF.

c. University Police suggests enhanced security features for the UAV facility be considered. The real concern as this area continues to grow will be whether sustainable secured funding can be obtained to expand patrol and security coverage of the Riverside Campus.

d. CIS Networking: The research nature of the buildings proposed implies a need for connectivity to the campus data network. Fiber optic cable installation to each building should be included in the building budget. Also, the building budgets should include provision for contractor-installed structured cabling to be installed to TAMU data network standards. The natural gas engine test facility to be funded by and operated in conjunction with Cameron will require consultations with TAMU Networking regarding provisions related to the use of the TAMU data network in the associated contract between TAMU and Cameron.

e. Environmental Health & Safety: i. All buildings are likely to require fire alarm and sprinkler systems; ii. For any of the buildings to be constructed by a third party, it will be important to involve EHS early in the planning process to ensure compatibility with TAMU fire/life safety systems; iii. EHS will perform acceptance testing of all building fire/life safety systems; iv. All buildings (even those potentially occupied by a private entity) will be inspected annually by EHS.

Action/Recommendation: Memo will be sent to the President recommending approval of the construction of TEES’ three buildings at the Riverside Campus.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

IV. Miscellaneous

A. Campus Master Plan Presentation to CBE

Co-Chair Watson asked if CBE members might find it informative to have a presentation on the Campus Master Plan. Such a presentation might include an overview of the CMP, how it stands today, and how the various approved district plans fit in. Council members were in favor.

Action: Sub-Council chairs to develop a presentation (suggested 15 minutes) on the Campus Master Plan and inform the Co-Chairs when it is ready for presentation to CBE members.

Responsible Parties: Sub-Council Chairs (Design Review Sub-Council Chair Lilia Gonzales is point person)

B. SSC Ex-officio Membership on the CBE

To clarify a question raised at the December meeting, as Co-Chair Watson stated, Mr. Bob Casagrande was approved to serve as a non-voting member of the CBE in November. He was added to the listserv following the November meeting and has expressed great interest to serve on the Council. Unfortunately a pressing commitment scheduled prior to the vote made it impossible for him to attend December’s meeting. In a follow up conversation, Casagrande stated he looks forward to joining us at future meetings.

V. Meeting adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

Next Meeting: February 12, 2013 - 1:30 – 3:00 p.m. - 410 Rudder Tower