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

I. Attendance
   A. Voting members
      1. Present: Bill Dugas; Pierce Cantrell; Valerian Miranda; Joe Newton; Jorge Vanegas
         (substituting for José Bermúdez); Taylor Smith*; Bhimu Patil; Janice Walpert; Joe Weber*.
         A quorum was present.
      2. Absent: José Bermúdez; Holly Scott Theresa Fossum; Thomas Harwell;
   B. Non-voting members:
      1. Present: N.K. Anand;
      2. Absent: Paul Hardin; José Solis; Tom Swanner; Luke Cowsar
      *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: Karan Watson; Rodney McClendon; Bob Casagrande; Ralph Davila; Matt Fry; Lilia Gonzales; Kevin Hurley; James Massey; David Morrison; Tom Reber; Deborah Wright;
      2. Absent: B.J. Crain
   D. Guests: Merna Jacobsen; Shelly Janac; Marty Scholtz;

II. The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair McClendon at 1:30 p.m
   A. A few revisions to the February Minutes were offered:
      1. II.C.1.a. inserted “or common spaces of the interior” in second phrase to read,
         a. Jack K. Williams Building… “few if any aesthetic changes to the exterior or common spaces of the interior of the building;”
      2. The last sentence in II.C.1., paragraph two, was deleted as redundant.
      3. Reference to the south parking lot was clarified to identify the referenced lot as Lot 15.
      4. The Minutes were approved as amended.
   B. A follow up comment on the Northside Residence Hall Art Competition that was discussed last month. Co-Chair McClendon clarified that the artwork, depicting environmental degradation reflects natural effects, not man-made.
   C. Updates and Announcements – Co-Chair Watson
      1. College of Liberal Arts Request in Academic Building – Co-Chair Watson announced the College was swapping some space following the move of Performance Studies to the new Liberal Arts building. Consolidation of remaining departments as well as relocating others from Reed McDonald and moving Psychology out of Leggett were all part of the approved request. The Department of Psychology will be moving to Milner when it is ready. Co-Chair Watson emphasized that authorization for these moves does not include entitlement to the vacated, south end of the fourth floor of Academic, nor to Reed McDonald. A call to Deans and VP’s will be forthcoming when Milner renovations are complete and the building is occupied. If interested in space in Reed-McDonald or the south end of the fourth floor of the Academic Building, diagrams of the spaces will be sent with the call for space.
      2. Space exchange between the Colleges of Engineering and Agriculture & Life Sciences. The Deans from the Colleges of Agriculture & Life Sciences and Engineering submitted a memo
expressing a desire to exchange space in the Cater Matill and Animal Industries Buildings. The Animal Industries Building is next to the new Liberal Arts building. Cater Matill is on west campus near the new underpass. The agreement allows for each college to consolidate operations geographically. Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon are agreeable to the request and sought input from the CBE. The discussion is to ensure that CBE is informed; FCOR is aware and there are no concerns from the CBE members.

3. Co-Chair McClendon commended Patti Urbina on her summary of the Riverside Campus Plan in the February Minutes.

4. DRsc Updates and Communications – Lilia Gonzales
Gonzales advised the CBE members that updates from schematic reviews will be shared electronically the week following the monthly CBE meetings. These are informational updates on approved projects and are shared as a demonstration of the progress and ongoing review of subsequent phases of construction, remodeling or modifications to the built environment.

5. Visit of the University of Alabama’s Space Allocation Task Force - James Massey
Representatives from the University of Alabama’s College of Engineering visited our campus to see how space is managed at Texas A&M and to learn more about how the CBE functions. UA is a rapidly growing campus. While the school is smaller than Texas A&M, with approximately 4,000 students, they are experiencing double digit enrollment and are opening a new building every 90 days. Their visit was to ensure they are doing things well and to observe how space management is governed here. Massey expressed thanks to N.K. Anand and Marty Schultz for meeting with the guests; Lilia Gonzales and Co-Chair McClendon provided an overview of the CBE. The guests had a tour of the ETID building where our commitment to student use in building management was well represented. Growth on their campus is supported by Alabama’s U.S. Senator Shelby who has taken it as his personal mission to bring funding ($300M) for construction to higher education in his state.

III. Presentations by Sub-Councils
A. Campus Master Plan – Lilia Gonzales
University Architect (and Design Review Sub-Council Chair) Gonzales presented a powerpoint overview of the Campus Master Plan (CMP).

Gonzales outlined the CMP following the Four Intents, to provide: (1) Framework for Future Development of the Campus; (2) Establish goals for the University; (3) The Development of Maintenance of the Long Term Use; and, (4) Reflect the Energy and Spirit of the Community, thus aiding the university in meeting the ideals of Vision 2020.

The Eight (8) Goals of the CMP:
Reinforce Campus Identity Promote Spatial Equity and Appropriateness
Reinforce Campus Community Establish an accessible, pedestrian Campus
Establish Connectivity Promote Sustainability
Positive Architecture Develop a Supportive Process

The CMP’s organization is as an existing plan- showing a pattern of buildings and open spaces. The CMP allows for interpretation and is intended to be directive not prescriptive.
In the Long Range Plan a list of significant projects (e.g. Military Walk, Simpson Drill Field and the South and North underpasses) present “a hierarchical, comprehensive plan to bring the physical environment into alignment with the mission of the University.” These elements form a broad strategy for conservation and development of the campus.

To define outdoor spaces, landscape goals and landscape principles are in place to promote connectivity, to ensure quality, and to enhance the character of the campus. Architectural goals support “the civic structure of the campus and define and engage outdoor public spaces.” An analysis of architecture defines the street and block system, the relationship of the buildings to streets, preserve the historic campus buildings and reveal sites for new construction. Architecture should define space and give it scale. Attributes such as building heights, facades, entrances, identity and variety, building materials, additions to buildings, sustainability, appearances of nonacademic buildings as well as the interpretation and repetition of features should work to unify and reflect time.

Lacking a process there cannot be a successful plan. Architect selection, project definition and feasibility and design control are key. “A good Master Plan consists of a plan, guidelines and a process.”

Amendments to the plan are bridged through the development and evolution of District Plans. Through the CBE process eleven district plans have been accepted and two are in review. Bordering districts have to work with hardscape and landscape to promote flow.

Maintaining and updating the CMP is assigned to the office of the University Architect. The DRsc, through the CBE will bring to the President’s attention necessary revisions or updates to the plan.

Co-Chairs emphasized the oversight responsibility the CBE has for the CMP; they and other members of the CBE reiterated the desire for the campus community to be aware of the guidelines and devise ways for community engagement in the oversight process.

Professor Miranda noted the College of Architecture has developed a 3-dimensional map of the campus. Arrangements will be made to have the map displayed for the May meeting.

B. Bush School Signage for the Allen Building
   1. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc) – recommended approval of the additional signage as presented.
   2. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc) – supports the proposal and recommends approval. Signage request to more visibly recognize where Bush School is located. DR recommends.

**Action/Recommendation:** Memo will be sent to the President recommending approval for the new signage on the Allen Building.

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

C. OPAS Request
   1. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc) – Concept approved for a sculpture to be placed in the planter at the main entrance of Rudder Tower. The proposed sculpture is for three figures, a conductor, a ballerina and a child. No information on lighting or a identifying plaque were
The height of sculpture was projected to be as high as 11-12’. Detailed information on the exact height, materials, etc. is needed to complete the review of the request.

2. Maintenance Sub-Council (Msc) - long term maintenance for sculpture and site need to be addressed; recommend an endowment for maintenance be provided and that landscape be engaged.

3. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc) - met with the artist to discuss potential safety and liability issues (sharp edges); uncertain if surveillance would be necessary as a deterrent for climbing on the sculpture; need to identify details for lighting; planter is hand watered so perceived risk of water damage is minimal; agree it is a good place for sculpture.

It was the consensus of the Members that a formal recommendation be deferred until the Statues and Sculpture Committee has its policy approved. The final draft of the policy is anticipated in early April.

**Action/Recommendation:** Tabled until after the policy on Statues and Sculptures is complete.

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

D. Lot 30D REVISED Request

1. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc) – recommended approval of the parking Lot 30 renovation and expansion plan provided that the design should include landscaping elements for screening to face the highly visible corner of campus at Wellborn Road and University Drive.

2. Maintenance Sub-Council (Msc) – recommends approval of the Lot 30D renovation and expansion as presented and suggests Transportation Services work closely with SSC to define final grade specifications to lead to cost savings with the demolition contract.

3. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc) – recommends approval of the project noting that using the Dulie Bell footprint will save on building demolition costs, as the site will be prepped for Transportation Service’s use rather than returned to a finished state; and provided the following concerns are addressed and funded:

   **CIS Networking:** plans to maintain the fiberoptic pathway that connects the Main and West Campus data networks need to be addressed; Telecommunications and CIS need to have input during the planning of the demolition and the subsequent work on the site.

   **Telecommunications:** 90 days’ notice to reroute service provided by the 48 fibers in the renovation path are required.

   Co-Chair McClendon addressed the question of the site’s potential for a new building at some point in the future and noted that Transportation Services is aware that if a facility is ever considered for construction, the facility will have precedent over the existing parking lot.

**Action/Recommendation:** Memo will be sent to the President recommending approval for the request provided the landscaping offers sufficient screening to maintain nice aesthetics on this side of campus.

E. Signage request for Pickard Pedestrian Tunnel, Class Gift ’13

1. DRsc – does not recommend; unsure if lettering will match Kyle Field following renovation of Kyle Field.

2. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc) – maintenance cost endowment details; existing pedestrian and bicycle signs need to remain; plaque needs to be placed in a way that does not allow water penetration; wording needs to follow Texas A&M Plaque Policy.
The consensus of the membership was that some information on the maintenance endowment and other necessary details were lacking. The proposal was tabled in order to follow up on these questions.

**Action/Recommendation:** DRsc Chair Gonzales will meet with Class Agents to assist them in addressing issues identified in the discussion and facilitate ideas for adjustments or alternatives for their class gift. **Responsible Parties:** Lilia Gonzales, DRsc Chair

F. Request to Construct a new Urban and Structural Entomology Facility

1. **Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc)** – The DRsc recommends approval of the request with the following observations and contingencies: (1) realignment of the AgriLife District Plan; (2) Adherence with CBE policy regarding the repurposing of that site which was originally designated for Facilities Services. If approved, the DRsc will review the project again at 100% Schematic Design phase.

2. **Facilities Utilization Review Sub-Council (FURsc)** – recommends approval of the proposed new facility. FURsc notes the facility will allow the consolidation of program elements currently housed in five buildings into one location. In addition to the new facility, FURsc supports the program’s retention of existing facilities suitable for continued use near the proposed site of the new facility.

3. **Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc)** – recommends approval providing the concerns listed below are addressed and funded:

   - **Environmental Health and Safety:** retention of existing buildings requires renovations to address fire/life safety code and laboratory standards. The cost of these renovations could be significant.
   - **Facilities Services:** 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.
   - **Transportation Services:** parking lot construction will be paid for by Transportation Services who will ensure compliance with standards for lighting, as well as parking spaces for disabled, motorcycles, and bicycles are included at the appropriate levels. Additional details for the access road need to be identified, including a determination by a traffic engineer as to the best access from the east or west drive. The drive should be paved, and consideration given to access for the existing buildings to the north of the site.
   - **Utilities & Energy Services:** relocation of sanitary sewer lines crossing the site will be required; an in-depth survey of the site needs to be completed to assure the ability to relocate the lines from the site is an option, and to make sure that the cost of relocation will not be detrimental to the overall budget. Domestic cold water and electrical access is available. Natural Gas (ATMOS) should be included in the project for overall efficiency in heating the building. UES needs to inspect any reassigned space to evaluate the condition of the HVAC system and controls and ensure more efficient operation in the future.
   - **CIS Networking:** Provision in the budget should be made for installation of single mode fiber to the structure and contractor-installed structured wiring system to TAMU new building standards.

A majority of the members of the CBE voted in favor of the request, with the Agriculture Program representative abstaining, to recommend the President’s approval for the construction of the new facility for the Urban and Structural Entomology Facility and for the department to retain existing facilities suitable for continued use.

**Action/Recommendation:** Memo will be sent to the President recommending his approval for the construction of the new facility and the department’s retention of existing facilities suitable for continued use. **Responsible Parties:** Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon
IV. Miscellaneous
   A. In response to the question: will the CBE see a presentation on the Kyle Field renovations? Kevin Hurley reported that the department is presenting at the appropriate Sub-Councils. Co-Chair Watson suggested interested parties should attend a Sub-Council meeting if interested.
   B. Liberty Bell – General Weber asked if the lobby of the YMCA Building had been considered for the Liberty Bell’s relocation. Lilia Gonzales agreed to investigate the location and report back to the CBE.
   C. Meeting adjourned at 2:48

Next Meeting: April 9, 2013 - 1:30 – 3:00 p.m. - 410 Rudder Tower