Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of the
Council for the Built Environment
September 10, 2013, 1:30-3:00

I. Attendance
   A. Voting Members
      1. Present: José Bermúdez; Brittany Bounds; Pierce Cantrell; Bill Dugas*; Paul Hardin;
         José Solís; Tom Swanner; Brandon Valenta*; Joe Weber*.
      2. Absent: N.K. Anand; Glen Laine; Joe Newton; Holly Scott
   B. Non-voting Members
      1. Present: Emil Straube; Erin Simmons
      2. Absent: Amanda Mathers
         *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: Rodney McClendon; Bob Casagrande; B. J. Crain; Matt Fry; Lilia Gonzales;
         Kevin Hurley; James Massey; David Morrison; Tom Reber; Deborah Wright;
      2. Absent: Karan Watson; Ralph Davila;
      3. Guests: Merna Jacobsen; Shelly Janac; Marty Scholtz

II. Updates  Call to Order: Co-Chair McClendon
   A. Co-Chair McClendon called the meeting to order at 1:35 and welcomed everyone to the
      first meeting of the academic year. He facilitated introductions of new members and to
      help initiate the new representatives in attendance, offered a brief history and overview
      of the Council for the Built Environment.

      Established in 2002, the CBE is charged with making recommendations to the president on
      all aspects of the campus’ built environment. The CBE has ten voting and nine non-voting
      members. Co-Chair McClendon emphasized: the Council’s role is advisory; following
      review of requests, the CBE sends recommendations to the President. Four Sub-Councils,
      critical to the process, review requests submitted through the appropriate Dean or Vice
      President, and report their findings and recommendation to the CBE for a vote. The Sub-
      Council membership includes representatives from students, faculty, staff and
      administrators with expertise and perspective on issues ranging from design review,
      facilities utilization, maintenance and technical issues. All questions, comments and
      discussion are welcome and respected. After the vote is recorded, the recommendation is
      sent to the President who will accept, reject or send back the recommendations.

   B. Minutes were approved as submitted
      Action Item: upload the August Minutes to the CBE website.
      Responsible Party: CBE Administrative Coordinator

   C. Information item: Engineering request to rename the Graphics Services Building to the
      Engineering Innovation Center. The building has been renovated to establish a design
      testbed to promote interdisciplinary design projects. The name change more accurately
      reflects the use of the building. This item is brought to the group as an advisory item;
open to the Council to determine if there are any concerns administratively. No concerns were offered, the Co-Chairs approve the name change.

**ACTION:** Co-Chair McClendon’s office will advise FCOR of the name change in order to have maps, etc., updated.

**Responsible Party:** Co-Chair McClendon

D. Request withdrawn from COALS and CVM for Large Animal Facilities at the Riverside Campus. This request was submitted prior to the approval of the Riverside Campus Master Plan and revisions to the College of Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Science’s District Plan. With the subsequent adoption of these plans, the items in the request have been attended and are no longer relevant.

E. COALS request for Cater Mattil Roof Repairs and Fire Suppression – Maintenance Sub-Council (Msc) chair was represented by Ms. Shelly Janac who advised that the Msc voted unanimously to provide half of the expenses for these repairs from deferred maintenance (DM) funding, as requested. Co-Chair McClendon noted that COALS had provided helpful information on the condition of the facility, including notice that the building is vacant which makes the repairs administratively more efficient to complete the repairs.

III. Presentations by Sub-Councils

A. Psychology Awning – the interim department head of the Psychology Department requests installation of an awning to mitigate flooding into the building. In heavy rains, inadequate drainage results in water entering the Vivarium through the exterior door from the loading dock entrance. This problem was noted as a deficiency on an Institutional Animal Care and Use (IACUC) inspection of the facility. Construction of the awning and redirecting rain spouts from the roof has been determined as the best solution to prevent continued flooding. The cost of the awning is $42,500; funding from deferred maintenance was requested.

1. Design Review Sub-Council – approved construction of the awning over Psychology Building loading dock area with the following caveats; although a long-term solution is preferred, the DRsc recognizes that funds may not be available for this option. It is recommended that the design team concurrently explore a more permanent solution to the drainage problem. This will allow the design team to provide a cost estimate for comparison in order to determine the differential between the two and allow for implementation if additional funds are made available; colors and specific design details of the awning should be coordinated with the DRsc Chair given the awning’s visibility from the Trigon area.

2. Maintenance Sub-Council – recommends approval of the awning and approved DM funding of $42,500 to cover the costs.

3. Technical Review Sub-Council – supports the proposed construction and recommends approval, provided the following concerns are addressed and funded:

   - **Utilities & Energy Services:** UES supports the addition of the awning but requests a more detailed view into the design engineering to ensure that the storm water issues will be resolved, and that no existing utility systems in the area will be impacted.
University Police Department: adequate lighting is needed under the awning.
Facilities Services: Facilities Services project team is investigating the existing storm drainage system around the building to see if a better or less expensive solution is possible. The storm sewer will be surveyed by camera for obstructions.

Capital Financial Planning: this request included a request for deferred maintenance to fund; the maintenance sub-council would have to make that recommendation.

Action/Recommendation: The CBE voted unanimously to request the President’s approval to install an awning in the loading dock area of the Psychology Building. A memo will be sent to the President recommending approval. 
Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

B. Engineering Request for Skylight Window Glazing
The Vice Chancellor and Dean of Engineering requested permission to add glazing to the replacement skylights in the catwalk area of the Hi-Bay Laboratory #0140 of the Wisenbaker Building #0862.

1. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc) – recommends approval of the request to replace the skylights at the Wisenbaker Building with the following caveats:
   • Acrylite Satin Sky glazing is approved to replace the existing skylights in the catwalk area of the Hi-Bay Laboratory and the Bronze glazing should be used on the bridge portion of the skylights.


3. Technical Review Sub-Council – supports the project and recommends approval. 
Sub-Council members had no issues or concerns related to the project.

Action/Recommendation: The CBE voted unanimously to request the President’s approval for the glazing of the skylights at the Wisenbaker Building Hi-Bay Laboratory catwalk with the Acrylite Satin Sky glazing.  
Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

C. Engineering Request for Spin Pit Test Facility
The Vice Chancellor and Dean of Engineering requested permission to install a temporary building for flywheel testing at the University Services Building (3400). The building will be a small slab on-grade metal building measuring 24’ x 40’ and will be used to assemble the heavy components and conduct tests at low speeds above ground; as the speeds increase, the system will be lowered in the pit for high-speed tests. Funding for the construction is provided through sponsored research from the Department of Energy. The facility’s planned use includes future funded research projects from other sources. The location of the test pit can be viewed above the building or at the ground level on the east side of the building. At the end of the ten-year period, disposal of the metal building and other metal structures will be through surplus policies and will include material recycling.
1. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc) – recommends approval of the request as presented with the following caveat: Facility color selection is to be coordinated with the DRsc Chair.

2. Technical Review Sub-Council – supports the project and recommends approval, provided the following concerns are addressed and funded:
   Facilities Coordination: ensure that all users at the University Services Building are aware of the Spin Pit Test Facility and that they have no concerns with its installation.

CIS Networking: the proposed facility would be located on the west side of the building (#3400) near a temporary building on the northwest corner of the concrete apron extending from the building. There is currently very limited network and telephone connectivity in an adjacent temporary building that could be used as needed by personnel operating equipment at either proposed test facility. We recommend that the existing network connectivity be evaluated by the proposing groups in conjunction with TAMU Networking to determine if the network performance and access are sufficient for their project. If not, improved network connectivity can be placed to one of the structures in a way that all buildings share access to the data network, VOIP and TAMUlink wireless (if needed). That would involve placing fiber from building #3400 to the Spin Test Facility or the existing “temporary” building. The cost would be minimal if it coincided with the installation of electric utility service.

Utilities & Energy Services: The excavation of the pit to safely house the flywheel will require utility locates to ensure safety and rule out any utility interference. Policies for utility locate procedures and utility service connections need to be observed. Request for electrical service will require the project to provide a proposed plan and load for the routing for UES to review, and a meter will need to be installed.

Facilities Services (SSC): Facilities Services supports this project and has the following comments: the building, site, structural and electrical work need to be designed and sealed by a professional engineer registered in Texas. An architect, licensed in Texas, should be consulted (and may be required) to ensure compliance with codes concerning emergency egress and ADA/TAS requirements. Site design needs to include a study of storm runoff to ensure the new work does not increase the rate at which runoff enters creeks.

Environmental Health & Safety:
1. Facility design must be reviewed by Fire and Life Safety
   a. Egress considerations are the primary focus
   b. Given the building interior will consist of one open space that is not subdivided, will be occupied only during testing, and have no restrooms or offices, etc., neither a fire sprinkler system nor a fire alarm system are required. If design/layout changes, F&LS requirements will likely change.
2. The pit will likely be “confined space” requiring permitting for personnel entry.
3. Storm water questions raised at the meeting do not appear to be an issue due to the small size of the metal building.

Dugas expressed the request by one user at the facility to be advised when utilities would be worked on.

Action/Recommendation: The CBE voted unanimously to request the President’s approval to construct a temporary building for spin pit flywheel testing at the University Services Building (3400). A memo will be sent to the President recommending approval. 

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon.

D. Engineering Request for Test Facility for UAV Engine

The Vice Chancellor and Dean of Engineering request approval to place an above-ground culvert on the west side of the University Services Building (3400). The culvert will be used as a safety cage surrounding a small UAV test engine with propeller. The culvert will be located outdoors and behind the building near the Texas A&M University Center for Space Power. No construction costs or maintenance costs will be incurred by Texas A&M University for this test facility. After the primary project testing is completed, other projects may use this culvert in the future for the same type of use. At the end of three years, the culvert will be dismantled and disposal will be through surplus policies which will include material recycling.

1. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc) – recommends approval of the request as presented.

2. Technical Review Sub-Council – supports the project and recommends approval, provided the following concerns are addressed and funded:

   - **Facilities Coordination:** ensure that all users at the University Services Building are aware of the Test Facility for UAV Engines and that they have no concerns with its installation.

   - **CIS Networking:** the proposed facility would be located on the west side of the building (#3400) near a temporary building on the northwest corner of the concrete apron extending from the building. There is currently very limited network and telephone connectivity in an adjacent temporary building that could be used as needed by personnel operating equipment at either proposed test facility. We recommend that the existing network connectivity be evaluated by the proposing groups in conjunction with TAMU Networking to determine if the network performance and access are sufficient for their project. If not, improved network connectivity can be placed to one of the structures in a way that all buildings share access to the data network, VOIP and TAMUlink wireless (if needed). That would involve placing fiber from building #3400 to the Spin Test Facility or the existing “temporary” building. The cost would be minimal if it coincided with the installation of electric utility service.
Utilities & Energy Services: The research will only include a section of concrete culvert placed in an existing parking lot to house the engine test sled and will not include any ground penetration of utility services. UES has no concerns.

Facilities Services (SSC): Facilities Services supports this project and has the following comments: the building, site, structural and electrical work need to be designed and sealed by a professional engineer registered in Texas. An architect, licensed in Texas, should be consulted (and may be required) to ensure compliance with codes concerning emergency egress and ADA/TAS requirements. Site design needs to include a study of storm runoff to ensure the new work does not increase the rate at which runoff enters creeks.

Environmental Health & Safety: noise monitoring should be planned in startup phase to establish appropriate controls. Secondary containment for fuel storage advised. Fencing is not required but advised.

The CBE voted unanimously to request the President’s approval to construct a temporary concrete culvert to be used as a test facility for UAV engines at the University Services Building (3400).

Dugas confirmed that none of the other users of the building have an issue with the request.

Action/Recommendation: The CBE voted unanimously to request the President’s approval to place an above-ground culvert on the west side of the University Services Building (3400). A memo will be sent to the President recommending approval.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

Following the vote, Co-Chair McClendon shared a comment that a number of these types of projects, placement of the UAV engine cage, occur on a routine basis around campus without coming to the CBE for review. In the case of the above request, the project is temporary and in support of research. This type of request can occur frequently. In questions regarding considerations of noise, environmental impact, communications with occupants of a facility where equipment might be placed, Massey stated that in the routine administrative oversight of Facilities Coordination appropriate review and discussion with Environmental Health & Safety, Utilities, etc., occurs. Members discussed the desire to facilitate processes to support efficient installation and placement of these types of equipment will be reported to the CBE, if necessary, but the administrative processes in place will be relied upon to provide the appropriate oversight for safety, etc.

E. OPAS Request for Sculptures to be placed at the main entrance of the Rudder Complex

At its July 9, 2013, meeting the Council for the Built Environment (CBE) discussed a request from MSC OPAS for permission to place a grouping of sculptures in the flower bed located at the main entrance to Rudder Theatre. OPAS defined the sculptures as “a figurative, symbolic representation of the performing arts, reminiscent of the many wonderful performances that have graced the stages of Rudder with a prescient look to the future of the performing arts at Texas A&M University.” The sculptures are to
commemorate OPAS 40th anniversary. Following review, CBE, by a majority vote, recommended that the president decline the request and suggested OPAS offer a redesign of the work, with a jury selection process to determine the most suitable representation for this prime location. Additional information was submitted by MSC OPAS to the President. The President redirected the July recommendation to the CBE sub-councils along with the additional information.

At the September 10, 2013, meeting of the CBE, the Sub-Councils reported on the redirected request with an evaluation of the new information. Following examination of these materials, the Sub-Councils recommendations are as follows:

1. Design Review Sub-Council – upheld its previous recommendation and offers approval with the following recommendations:
   - Consideration of rotating the grouping of sculptures 90 degrees.
   - Consideration of the conductor to be upsized proportionately as the rest of the figures, not just an elongation of the arms and legs.
   - Details regarding the lighting plan be submitted to the DRsc Chair for review.
   - Details regarding the plaque size and exact location be submitted to the DRsc Chair for review. The plaque must be reviewed against the Texas A&M Plaque Policy.

2. Maintenance Sub-Council – noted the subject with no additional comments and recommends approval of the project with the following caveats identified in July:
   - Recommend an endowment is established to provide funding for maintenance.
   - Recommend landscaping is involved to review the planting/landscape design of the site.

3. Technical Review Sub-Council – supports the proposed sculpture and recommends approval, provided the following concerns identified in their July review are addressed and funded:
   - **Environmental Health & Safety**: Ensure that none of the statues have sharp edges which could present a cutting hazard for landscape personnel or members of the public.
   - **CIS Networking**: The only possible network requirement that would be associated with the OPAS request would be if at some point in the future, a need was identified to install video surveillance of the artwork. In that event, depending on camera placement, there may be an additional cost for installing pathways to provide network connectivity to the cameras. Discussions with EHS and UPD deemed surveillance requirements as unlikely and that there is not a need to include any video surveillance costs to the project at this time.
   - **Facilities Services**: Supportive of the project; an electrical engineering with Texas P.E. registration, will be required to design the power needed for the
low voltage lighting inside the flower bed. The scheme for existing flower bed drainage should be investigated so that the installation of the statues will not have a negative effect on the drainage.

The bed is currently hand-watered and will continue to be hand-watered. A request was made that 12 inches be left between the inside face of the bed wall and the closest edge of the statue base to allow for at least one row of plants to be installed. If the statue base is closer than 12 inches to the wall, then there will not be adequate room for flowers in this gap. It is further requested that a funded work request through AggieWorks be submitted for assistance from Grounds Management, Maintenance or Engineering, Design and Construction Services.

In a vote of six ayes to two nays, the CBE recommends the President approve the request to accept the proposed sculpture provided the concerns listed above be addressed and funded. While the request received a majority of votes, some members of the CBE in opposition to the request, among others, continue to be deeply concerned regarding: (i) issues of process raised from the original request and (ii) perceived diversity/gender inequities that may be reinforced with the sculpture grouping and dimensions.

Action: A memo will be sent to request the President’s acceptance of the proposed sculptures, with the stated considerations, to be placed in the flower bed at the entrance to the Rudder Complex.
Responsible Party: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

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