Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of the Council for the Built Environment  
February 12, 2013, 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

I. Attendance  
A. Voting members  
1. Present: Bill Dugas; Pierce Cantrell; Tyler Corder; Theresa Fossum; Thomas Harwell; Valerian Miranda; Joe Newton; Doug Palmer (substituting for José Bermúdez); Bhimu Patil; Janice Walpert. A quorum was present.  
2. Absent: Holly Scott  
B. Non-voting members:  
1. Present: N.K. Anand; Paul Hardin; Taylor Smith; José Solis; Tom Swanner; Joe Weber  
2. Absent: none  
*Coffice/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: Rodney McClendon; Bob Casagrande; Ralph Davila; Matt Fry; Lilia Gonzales; Kevin Hurley; James Massey; David Morrison; Tom Reber; Deborah Wright;  
2. Absent: Karan Watson; B.J. Crain  
D. Guests: Merna Jacobsen; Shelly Janac; Marty Scholtz; Doug Williams; David Woodcock

II. The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair McClendon at 1:30 p.m  
A. Appreciation was expressed to Ms. Ashley Skow for preparing the December Minutes.  
B. The Minutes were approved with a minor correction in section II.D.4. The sentence: “She [Wright] will ask John Crawford to contact McClendon to work out this issue.” was deleted.

C. Updates and Announcements - Lilia Gonzales  
1. Schematic Design Reviews  
   a. Jack K. Williams Building; renovations are estimated at $9M; few if any aesthetic changes to the building exterior or common spaces of the interior will be made; most work is deferred maintenance, ADA and other safety compliance modifications (construct a new staircase in the building). An historic preservation evaluation was conducted to ensure that none of the remodeling would interfere with the heritage features of the building.  
   b. Scoates Hall - $8.3M budgeted; most of the expenses are to address deferred maintenance items and some renovation to accommodate the residents of the building. Exterior changes are for ADA compliance for entrance to the building as well as access to a large lecture hall. A condition assessment was done to look at the heritage items in the building and ensure none of the work would impact these items.  

Co-Chair McClendon confirmed for the record that the aesthetic changes to each of these buildings will be minimal; the renovations are to address deferred maintenance, ADA and other regulatory compliance issues.

McCleonald asked Gonzales and guest, Doug Williams about the parking lots. Gonzales noted the parking lot #15 at Jack K. Williams is included in the renovation budget; the north one is not. Again the majority of the work will focus on ADA compliance and sloping. Related to the parking for the occupants of the building, Williams expressed confidence that
everyone in the building would be accommodated in other places. In response to other questions: the thirty-minute parking will be retained at the south entrance of the Williams Building; the timeline is to start construction in July and to complete it by November 2014.

2. Northside Residence Hall Art Competition
A jury has selected a finalist for the competition out of the 15 proposals received. The recommended artwork is a topographic map to reflect environmental degradation of the land. It is understood that the degradation is from natural effects. Gonzales will confirm this. The map selection will be created out of plastic materials and include lighting. The jury requested the map be from a place/region in Texas with relevance to Texas A&M.

III. Presentations by Sub-Councils
A. Riverside Campus Plan (RCP). Co-Chair McClendon recognized Professor David Woodcock as the committee chair for the development of the Riverside Campus Plan. He stated that initial discussions to create a document for Riverside date back to 2005.

In introductory comments, Lilía Gonzales stated the purpose of the RCP is to provide the framework to allow for decision making and management of the Riverside Campus. A recent request was made for a presentation on the Campus Master Plan; Gonzales will present on that and the district plans next month.

Woodcock presented slides on the RCP and pointed out the inclusive process in which the plan was designed noting the participation of the Council of Deans, occupants of Riverside, RCP Steering Committee, Center for Heritage Conservation, Office of Facilities Coordination and the Division of Administration.

The mission of the Riverside Campus is identified in University Rule 41.05.02.M1. The uniqueness of the campus is in two areas: (1) location and facilities: located 10 miles from the main campus, the remote site offers the opportunity to do things that cannot be done on the main campus; and, (2) heritage: the campus dates back to World War II and Korea.

The purposes of the plan are to provide a framework for decision-making (it closely parallels the Campus Master Plan) and to suggest a vision. The committee hopes to recommend something challenging to the university and the users of the campus as well as to offer future ideas, to be developed in meetings with the users.

The Riverside Campus reflects its heritage in a traditional military base layout. It was named Riverside Campus in 1988 and a Master Plan was developed but never implemented at that time. A number of the ideas (a Beef Cattle Center, a golf course for the university, etc.) have come to fruition, but in locations other than the Riverside Campus. As of last year, 45 departments, 5 System parts and one federal agency are active at Riverside. There is increasing pressure for activity at Riverside.

The RCP does not require anything to change the operation of current activities. As on the main campus, it is possible for spaces to be reassigned, buildings to be reassigned, circulation to change, etc. It is anticipated the RCP will provide the CBE and others with a framework under which to make decisions as the need and desire for change arises. Current conditions were examined with great care. Three separate meetings were held to identify issues. The
major needs identified were: roads are in poor condition; there is inadequate parking; and no emergency/alternative exit. The latter issue was particularly sensitive when brushfires in the area were a threat. Everyone agreed there are many buildings on the campus that are capable of re-use. Utility systems date back to the 1940-50’s; some of the natural gas system has been updated fairly recently. The population on the campus is much less now than the 1950’s so pressure on use is much less. Security is a primary issue and lighting is inconsistent. In 2011 a security audit of the campus recommended a number of important improvements and identified access to the campus as a major issue.

The goals behind the RCP are several: to make sure that as you drive onto the campus it is obvious it is part of Texas A&M and it matches quality and branding on main campus (currently the entrance gate has the look and feel of entering a quasi-abandoned military base). The entrance does not reflect you are entering a major research, Tier 1 institution. “Way-finding” is an issue. It is almost impossible to find where you are going on campus.

The overall goal is to provide a high-quality physical infrastructure, to propose design guidelines to re-use existing buildings, to add new buildings that are compatible to the environment and to identify the specific structures and layout to honor the historic and cultural heritage of the campus.

Sustainability Goal – opportunity for user groups to use the Campus for demonstration and test site for ideas under development. For example, TTI has a way-finding and signage unit; also testing a lot on environmental issues. The Energy Systems Lab is investigating solar energy and solar panels. These represent opportunities to make Riverside a ‘model’ campus.

Continuation Goal – ensure there is a continuation of good policy and good management. Assessment of current oversight is that development and recommendations for changes are working well. Office of Facilities Coordination should continue to oversee Campus.

Vision – The shape of the future campus does not differ greatly from the 1940 plan. Things are organized in what architecture calls ‘form follows function’. Things are dispersed in a way that makes sense; utility is the critical guideline. The RCP is not prescriptive, as with the Campus Master Plan, it includes prospective, potential and proposed building locations and is intended to offer guidance on where new buildings might go.

A conceptual design of a branded entry has been created to represent a visual of how the campus can be welcoming and secure. Adding community and facility services is recommended; currently there is no ‘center’ of campus; no equivalent to a student center, faculty club, nor administrative headquarters. Expect and hope there will be a Riverside Center with a point of arrival where there would be security and administrative offices, meeting rooms, places for researchers to interact and maybe a place to have lunch. Expect the campus to be technologically advanced; circulation on the campus might include a shuttle service from the Center to research institutes. Environmental and operational sustainability would be clear and current activities would expand, e.g. environmental test chamber. Clear and equitable policies would be created and observed.

Four zones recommended: East Zone is left primarily as is, pastureland, with the entrance gate being added; the South Zone, remains the same; West Zone is the runways and
taxiways. The central area is suggested as a military heritage district. This district is where the administrative and community life was housed when the campus was a military base. While there are a number of activities currently under way that are not consistent with this historical function, the plan would suggest that as things evolve on campus it might offer the opportunity to move activities not aligned with the plan to tidy up activities and take advantage of ways to draw attention to and celebrate the campus’ heritage.

It is recommended that Building 7046, one of the 1943 hangars still on site (currently used by Nautical Archeology) as well as the Control Tower, a 1953 structure, be retained and recognized as military heritage sites for WWII and Korea.

Operational issues: utilities and design. A design checklist was established, similar to that in the Campus Master Plan; a difference with the RCP is the suggestion that while signage and other additions to the Riverside Campus meet branding guidelines, at the same time take a fresh look at the options and meet the requirements with consideration toward the industrial/military character of the RCP.

Sustainability issue: water harvesting, renewal energy, recycled content, etc., are research activities going on at the Riverside Campus. There is a real opportunity to use the campus as a model for sustainability.

Operations and management of the site: Office of Facilities Coordination should continue to oversee the RCP and the operations on campus. The CBE should continue to develop policies for the equitable use of the space at the Riverside Campus. Also, recommend the CBE establish a Riverside User’s Council to operate much like the Design Review Sub-Council does on the Main Campus. This would promote a sense of community and promote interaction among the occupants at the Riverside Campus. It would offer the opportunity to bring the RCP vision forward and formally recognize efforts already established in an existing User’s Group chaired by David Morrison.

Commitments need to be made:
Institution: based in the CBE, ensure the campus is secure and safe; communication infrastructure now in place; utility infrastructure as referenced earlier; roads and parking; community support and central office support (the existing central office has long since reached the end of its useful life).
Users: support for improvements, continued sensitivity to the reuse of existing facilities.

Question raised on parking: Parking improvements may necessitate the introduction of parking fees; currently no-cost parking.
In response to the issue of shuttle service between the Main and Riverside Campus it presently does not appear financially viable given the limited demand.

Co-Chair McClendon asked Professor Woodcock to address for the record how the Riverside Campus Plan was named and why the RCP is not designated as a Campus Master Plan or as a District Plan as other units on the main campus are named.

Woodcock explained that when the Campus Master Plan was commissioned, the campus was defined as the properties contiguous to the main campus; district plans are within these
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bounds. In communications and planning for the RCP, the committee and the university administration agreed to have two “Campus Master Plans” would be confusing.

In addressing final questions Woodcock reiterated that the Riverside Campus Plan, like the Campus Master Plan, is prescriptive, not directive. He stated it is the hope of the committee that the historical corridor, as defined in the original layout, may, over time, inspire changes to clarify the unique and special aspects of the Riverside Campus’ heritage.

B. Athletic Facilities Master District Plan
   1. DRsc – recommends approval with the request retitled to “Athletic Facilities District Plan” and, if approved, the AFDP be recorded as an amendment to the Campus Master Plan. The DRsc will have further review at 50% completion as well as at the final draft submission.
   2. FURsc – recommends CBE support for the Athletics Department to proceed with the development of the Athletic Facilities District Plan.
   3. TRsc – recommends approval provided the following concerns/issues are addressed and funded:
      a. Procurement Services: Athletics to acknowledge that if the 12th Man Foundation initiates the project, any scope change or additional work will not be funded by Texas A&M University.
      b. Transportation Services: asks to be included in the process of updating the plan.
      c. Facilities Services: the plan needs to address storm drainage and incorporate detention features to prevent an increase in the immediate runoff above the existing condition.

Action/Recommendation: Memo will be sent to the President recommending approval for the Athletics Facilities District Plan (renamed) to be initiated to guide the department’s facility planning.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

C. Bike Lane Improvements
   1. DRsc – recommends approval of the proposed bike lane changes as presented.
   2. TRsc – the Facilities Services noted the project does not change the amount of paved area, and should not change storm water runoff; the TRsc recommends approval of the request.

Action/Recommendation: Memo will be sent to the President recommending approval for the Bike Lane Improvements as presented.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

D. Short Game Practice Facility at Traditions Golf Club
   1. DRsc – recommends approval of the request as submitted; no additional reviews are required.
   2. TRsc - recommends approval of the project.

Action/Recommendation: Memo will be sent to the President recommending approval for the Athletic Department, on behalf of the Texas A&M University System, to accept the donation of a short-game facility at Traditions Golf Club to be used as a practice course by the Texas A&M University golf teams.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

E. Request to expand the Office of Texas State Chemist facility
   1. DRsc – recommends approval of the proposed expansion of the Office of the Texas State Chemist; if approved, DRsc will review the project again at 100% Schematic Design and Design Development Phase, as per Design Review standard procedures.
2. FURsc - recommends the CBE support the request for the Office of the Texas State Chemist to expand their facility.

3. TRsc – supports the building expansion and recommends approval, provided the following concerns/issues are addressed and funded:
   a. Transportation Services: agrees the current parking lot is large enough to accommodate the expansion;
   b. Facilities Services: the project design team needs to model how much the project may increase the immediate runoff above the existing condition and incorporate provisions to detail this increase.
   c. CIS Networking: the placement of the layout of the cabling pathways needs to be 90 meters or less; if this is not possible, space will need to be allocated for a wiring closet in the expansion structure.

**Action/Recommendation:** Memo will be sent to the President recommending approval for the expansion of the Office of the Texas State Chemist.

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

IV. Miscellaneous

A. Pending items – Co-Chair McClendon is pleased to see those moving quickly; items lingering are being monitored with the requesting party and communications ongoing to close these.

B. CBE endorsement of funding request for classroom renovations - some discussion at the Sub-Council level related to a proposed endorsement of the CBE for additional funding to address classroom renovations through reallocation of funds. Some debate as to whether these are routine, preventive or deferred maintenance (DM). The Co-Chairs and others serving on the Council for Strategic Budgeting and the Reallocation Sub-Council have agreed that anything related to DM, including this type of request, will be reviewed in this context. This is a broader interpretation of DM. No action necessary by the CBE, this is an FYI.

C. Hurley announced the intent for the Kyle Field renovation request to go to the Board of Regents in May.

D. Reminder to all that the Campus Master Plan will be discussed next month.

V. Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

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