Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of the Council of the Built Environment
April 9, 2013, 1:30-3:00

I. Attendance
A. Voting Members
   1. Present: Pierce Cantrell; Jose Bermudez; Joe Newton; Paul Hardin*; Valerian Miranda;
      Janice Walpert; Taylor Smith*.
   2. Absent: N.K. Anand; Bill Dugas; Theresa Fossum; Bhimu Patil; Thomas Harwell; Luke
      Cowsar.
B. Non-voting Members
   1. Present: Jose Solis; 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: Karan Watson; Rodney McClendon; Tom Reber; Ralph Davila; Lilia Gonzales;
      Kevin Hurley; B.J. Crain; Matt Fry; Deborah Wright; David Morrison; Bob Casagrande.
   2. Absent: James Massey.
   3. Guests: Merna Jacobsen; Shelly Janac; Marty Scholtz.

II. Call to Order: Co-Chair McClendon called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.
A. The March Minutes were revised in section II.C.1. to add the clarification, “south end” to the
   reference of space temporarily assigned to the College of Liberal Arts on the fourth floor of the
   Academic Building.
B. The proposed revision was accepted and the Minutes approved unanimously.

III. Updates and Announcements
A. College of Architecture and moves in Scoates and Francis Hall – Co-Chair Watson
   Co-Chair Watson offered an update on a vacated space memo from Dean Vanegas of the College
   of Architecture (CARC) outlining moves from Williams and the Pavilion and into Scoates and
   Francis. First, Watson emphasized that it needs to be clear: as a party moves to a new space, they
   are not allowed to keep the space vacated. When Agriculture moved to their new building there
   was a wide competition/open call for space in Francis Hall. Requests were evaluated on SNAPS
   data, the appropriateness of the available space and resources if renovations were required.
   Parties vying for space address questions through the FURsc. Francis was assigned to CARC; in
   part due to CARC’s agreement to fund $4M in renovations, many of which were deferred
   maintenance expenses. Watson detailed the moves and confirmed that the involved parties agreed
   were in agreement. While CARC has a net gain in square footage, there are differences in the
   types of space.

   In December 2014, CARC’s moves will result in the availability of 7600sf in the Pavilion. Watson
   asked for the CBE to address what will be done with vacated space and asked if there was a
   motion to hold an open competition for the space vacated in the Pavilion. She also suggested
   consideration for the use of the Pavilion as ‘swing space’; in this way the Pavilion space could
   address high priority need to vacate Dulie Bell. Unfortunately Pavilion can’t be vacated until
   Francis and Scoates’ renovations are complete (estimated 1.5-2 years).
The CBE voted to have an open competition for the Pavilion space with the Deans and Vice Presidents. A letter to the President will be prepared to outline this consensus decision.

B. Land transfer agreement from COALS to Recreational Sports

Co-Chair Watson updated the CBE on a land transfer agreement between the College of Agriculture & Life Sciences and Recreational Sports/Athletics. The 12.5 acre transfer is necessitated by the upcoming expansion of athletic facilities to the West impacting existing soccer and track facilities. New athletic facilities will displace fields that currently support recreational sports; new recreational sports fields will be constructed on the transferred land. Vice President Weber, Vice Chancellor and Dean Hussey and Athletics Director Hyman signed the request and state it is an arrangement that “will benefit all parties.”

C. Sub-Council Review Processing

1. Resubmission of Requests – Recently, requesting parties with a significant change to their request have gone directly to the Sub-Councils for an updated review. Dr. McClendon advised Sub-Council Chairs that the resubmission of a request received directly needs to be returned to the requesting party. These resubmissions need to go to the Co-Chairs for (re-)assignment.

2. Incomplete Requests – Dr. McClendon reiterated the importance of the CBE process and reaffirmed the Co-Chairs’ support for Sub-Councils to postpone review (while continuing to work with requesting parties) in cases where sufficient detail for a report was lacking.

D. Capital Plan Update – B.J. Crain

Ms. Shelly Janac provided a handout with Summary Information on the Texas A&M Capital Plan (attached). Key points on the update:

1. Multi-Species Research Facility – construction for a 30,000sf facility capable of housing multiple species of animals used in biomedical research was added. This facility will replace the current ALRR support area which is inadequate in size and scope for current needs.

2. Renovation of first and second floors of the 72W Chemistry Building, lab and office space added.

3. Student Health Center Building project removed.

4. Corp Dorm Renovation projects updated and expedited.

5. Kyle Field to be updated following the BOR meeting in May.

6. Student Rec Center Addition – increased to $35.5M

The plan is due to the System on 4/10. Janac stated that any expenses from $4-10M can be done at the University level, but these need to appear on the Capital Plan (CP). If funding is 50% or more from PUF, the request does not have to go on the CP but does require Board of Regents’ (BOR) approval. Co-Chair Watson announced there is a process to get projects added to the CP; it is done formally, every year with requests forwarded to the BOR each August. A Program of Requirements (POR) has to be submitted in order to add a project to the CP. If you have a funding source and a POR, when the BOR approves your construction request, you have 10% automatically approved for start-up construction activities. On the question of timing, Watson stated that when a request goes to the BOR outside the Capital Plan, it is a more streamlined process; in these cases a POR is sufficient.

The CBE process for the CP has not been engaged for a few years. Watson stated that a ‘wish list,’ or waiting list, to suggest a priority for which buildings are slated for construction next does not exist.

Related issues: The process to handle construction requests when cash is available may vary in some respects.
IV. Presentations by Sub-Councils
   None

V. Miscellaneous
   A. Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon opened discussion to address space needs, campus facility priorities and ideas to define CBE processes.
      1. Process Question
         a. What are the next most important things for the CBE to do?
         b. What [additional] process is needed? Should the CBE develop a process to identify needs and prioritize them?
      2. Lack of Space Issue (every unit needs space) What do the Council members see as the biggest problems/issues/ideas for space?
         a. Consolidation of office(s) – reduce duplication of functions/staff by having multiple locations for an office/functions.
         b. Recruiting issues – faculty decline offers based on lack of space or suitability/competitiveness of available space.
      3. General Services Complex 2 (GSC2)
         a. The original design included a second building to house safety, security, parking, UPD, and other offices which could include:
            i. Student Services/Financial Aid
            ii. Units currently housed in Bizzell Hall
            iii. Admissions/processing offices in Koldus
            iv. EH&S and UPD currently housed in Research Park
      4. Need to reduce external leasing in the community; move people back on campus
         a. reduce cost in renting
         b. renovations done on leased properties does not come back to the department
      5. Need to release space back to academic units
      6. Big issue/space needs on campus
         a. Wet lab space
         b. Teaching labs (to meet anticipated enrollment increases)
         c. More modern space for biological sciences with proximity to imaging and research support
         d. Lab space to promote interdisciplinary research
         e. Classroom space to facilitate new kinds of instruction and innovations in teaching
         f. Technology upgrades/annual budget for technology in the classroom needed
         g. Performing Arts Center – present on all major university campuses
         h. Venues that can address an over 250 capacity demand
      7. Demolition plans need to be executed
      8. Identification of swing space (to avoid relocation to off campus sites)

   B. Co-Chairs will plan a CBE Retreat this summer
      1. Agenda will include task to draft a list of priorities for CBE Action
         a. what input is needed?
         b. what process will be designed for ongoing management of priorities?
      2. Invitation list will be vetted through CBE and provide for inclusive participation. Participants with knowledge/representation in: construction; funding potential (government, donors, public-private monies – e.g. Bright Horizons option for childcare space; can double capacity with partner funds); Council of Deans’ research priorities; VPSA/student life; athletics; FP&C; infrastructure (roads, sidewalks, etc.); others?
         i. participants in retreat will need to consult constituencies for ideas
ii. one page/white paper to identify needs
iii. data collection to define a process; look at maintenance schedule as an example; review peers’ processes, etc.

3. Process draft considerations
   i. should FURsc draft a process?
   ii. adhoc committee be named?

C. The College of Architecture has a 12’x9’ 3-D map of the Texas A&M Campus. Next month Professor Miranda will display the map and offer a powerpoint presentation.

V. Meeting adjourned at 2:18 p.m.

Next Meeting: May 14, 2013 - 1:30 – 3:00 p.m. - 410 Rudder Tower, unless otherwise noted