Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of the Council for the Built Environment
October 16, 2013, 1:00-2:30

I. Attendance
A. Voting Members
   2. Absent: Glen Laine, Pierce Cantrell, Holly Scott
B. Non-voting Members
   1. Present: Bill Dugas, Amanda Mather, Erin Simmons
   2. Absent: Emil Straube, Elizabeth Tebeaux, Brandon Valenta
*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; Bob Casagrande; B. J. Crain; Ralph Davila; Matt Fry; Lilia Gonzales; Kevin Hurley; James Massey; David Morrison; Tom Reber; Deborah Wright
   2. Absent: Rodney McClendon
   3. Guests: Janice Epstein, Tell Butler, Rodney Bowersox, Peter Lange, Doug Williams, Debbie Hoffman

II. Call to Order: Co-Chair Watson
A. Co-Chair Watson called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.
B. The following correction was made to the September minutes: Amanda Mather stated she was absent for September CBE meeting, but minutes reflected she was “present”
C. The September minutes were approved unanimously with correction in attendance for Amanda Mather.

Action Item: Modify the September Minutes and upload to the CBE website.
Responsible Party: CBE Administrative Coordinator

III. Updates and Announcements
A. Co-Chair Watson announced new faculty senate rep Dr. Elizabeth Tebeaux who was represented by Janice Epstein at the meeting.
B. Agronomy Field Lab Replacement Windows—Dr. Dugas requested expedited approval to replace the exterior windows of the Agronomy Field Lab as part of the overall exterior rehabilitation FY13 deferred maintenance project. The Design Review Sub-Council reviewed the request and recommended the project proceed. Ralph Davila, Chair of the Maintenance Sub-Council confirmed the request remains within the estimated budget. Co-Chair Watson announced this approval as an informational item to CBE and will notify the dean.

Action/Recommendation: Memo will be sent to Dean to inform of the approval.
Responsible Parties: Dr. Watson
C. AgriLife Request to Raze Quonset Hut—Department of Entomology requested the razing of a Quonset hut located east of Agronomy Rd and west of parking lot 37. The hut is no
longer used for storage and is an eyesore. No trees will be removed with the demolition of the hut. Transportation Services has agreed to raze the facility at their expense and use the land area for needed parking. Co-chair Watson announced the approval of this request as an informational item to CBE and will notify the dean with the additional information provided by Technical Review Sub-Council:

- A package will have to be submitted to the Texas State Historical Commission for review prior to demolition of the building.
- Asbestos and special wastes are a concern. Demolition activities need to be conducted so that no one is exposed to asbestos fibers.
- Project will need to follow all procedures for digging on campus: https://utilities.tamu.edu/digging-campus/
- Project will need to submit the necessary forms for the disconnection of existing utility services. Refer to https://utilities.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Application-to-Disconnect-Utility-Service.pdf

**Action/Recommendation:** Memo will be sent to notify the Dean of the approval, with the additional information provided by TRsc.

**Responsible Parties:** Dr. Watson

**D.** Space Shuttle Simulator Update was provided by James Massey and Dr. Anand. TAMU took receipt from NASA of the space shuttle simulator in August 2012. Facilities Coordination has been working with the Engineering Department since that time to find an appropriate location. The Commissary was recommended, but the ceiling was not high enough. Currently, the shuttle is disassembled and stored at the General Aviation Terminal Complex at Easterwood Airport. Dr. Anand and his team will continue searching for a location, but the two main limitations are funding and finding a large space with air conditioning.

**E.** Engineering District Plan/Zachry Engineering Center Update was provided by Lilia Gonzales. There are two projects within the College of Engineering, yet interrelated: District Plan and Zachry Engineering Center Renovation.

**College of Engineering District Plan**
The district plan for the College of Engineering will provide the framework to meet new campus initiatives and growth not accounted for in the 2004 plan, but will remain true to principles and guidelines of the Campus Master Plan.

The scope of the Engineering district plan:

- Develop enrollment projections and spaces required to meet projection (guidance - vision 2020, 25x25 initiative);
- High level assessment of existing facilities and their use of space to determine if buildings need to be repurposed, expanded with additions, or demolished and new construction;
- Examination of infrastructure systems; circulation—vehicular routes with coordination for bicycle and pedestrian traffic (potential closing of streets or limiting access); connection to campus on holistic level—relation at corridors adjoining districts & boundaries; courtyard spaces; storm water runoff & detention; greenspace & landscape; and parking (CBE recommended approval for 1,500 parking structure—will need to coordinate location);
- Determination of overall boundaries for growth (i.e. 2007 allowed expansion to where ETED is now, but is there a need to go further than this?)

The district plan will include the development of a phased implementation plan, including cost estimates for each phase.

Steering committee and resource groups will include representation from the College of Engineering administration, faculty & staff from engineering, students, Transportation Services, Utilities & Energy Services, SSC, TAMU IT, Environmental Health & Safety, University Police Dept., TAMU TTI, Residence Life, engineering student council groups.

**Zachry Engineering Building Renovation/Annex**

Two initial phases prior to full building design/planning will be the programming and fundraising efforts. The determination of program spaces, including sq. ft., is nearly complete, with input from the faculty, college, etc. Fundraising package will include conceptual site plans, building floor plans, exterior images/elevation.

Zachry was built in 1972—when the total TAMU student population was 15,000 while now approximately 53,000. There are currently five levels—3 above, basement and parking garage. There are approximately 324,400 gsf for classrooms, office, dry and wet labs. The renovated facility known as Engineering Education Complex (EEC) will be an estimated total of 600,000 gsf.

Currently ZACH has 19 classrooms that have an average capacity of 50 students, not including ZACH 102 which has a capacity of over 300 persons. The proposed configuration would have eliminated the 300 person auditorium, but Co-Chair Watson stated that this classroom which seats ~ 300 persons needs to remain—the campus cannot afford to lose large-seating areas. Lilia Gonzales noted she will provide this information to those working on the building design for Zachary.

**IV.** Dr. Watson presented a request from Transportation Services requesting the CBE’s guidance on the “Order and Timing to Build Four Parking Garages”.

Based on the results of a feasibility study completed by a third-party, independent consultants in fall 2012, two garage locations were recommended to meet campus growth demand: Engineering corridor (located on Lot 47/51) and Northside residence area (located on Lot 30 c/d). Transportation Services submitted the request to CBE to build the two garages without an immediate increase in rates. CBE recommended the President’s approval to construct two garages and the President approved on August 6, 2013 with the caveat that no location was approved for either of the garages.

Since the initial consideration by CBE, requests for a structure to support the future west campus dorm project and a garage to support the renovated Kyle Field have been brought to the forefront. The 39 acres proposed for the west campus dorm project will not allow for surface parking, necessitating a large 2600-space parking facility. The Kyle Field garage is being planned for lot 62 adjacent to Kyle Field and situated along Wellborn Road. The Kyle garage would be twin structures to correspond with the renovated Kyle Field façade.
Transportation Services has conducted a pro-forma analysis of two additional parking structures beyond the two parking structures identified in the consultant’s recommendations and previously recommended to the president for approval by the CBE. While Transportation Services’ initial plan was to space the timing of the original garages to have no impact on parking rates, the addition of two garages cannot be accomplished without raising parking permit rates. The size and frequency of the rate increases depends on the timing and order of construction.

The proposed size of the garages is as follows:
- 2600-space garage to support the new West Campus Residence development
- 1068-space facility to support Kyle Field
- 1500-space facility to support the Engineering corridor located on lot 47/51 (previously approved)
- 1200-space facility in the Northside residence area located on lot 30c/d (previously approved)

Based on information provided by Transportation Services’ pro-forma analysis, Dr. Watson provided a spreadsheet showing options of building the different parking garages and the financial parking increases to parking customers. After a discussion where members stated some concerns about the order needing to reflect the parking needs already identified by CBE and issues surrounding the dormitories and stadium, there were two options that surfaced as better options.

CBE unanimously voted to recommend two options for the President’s choice and approval. There were four ayes for each of the two below options to recommend to the President.

Option #5:
- 2015—rate increases 10%
- 2016—build Kyle Field and West Campus garages; rate increases 7.5%
- 2017—build Engineering corridor garage; rate increases 5%
- 2018—build Northside Residence garage

Option #8:
- 2015—rate increases 5%
- 2016—build Kyle Field and West Campus garages; rate increases 5%
- 2017—rate increases 5%
- 2018—rate increases 5%
- 2019—build Engineering corridor and Northside Residence garages

Action/Recommendation: Memo will be sent to the President recommending approval of one of the two above options.
Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

V. Presentations by Sub-Councils

A. Telecommunications Tower Installation—AgriLife Research submitted a request to install a new telecommunications tower. The 95 ft. tall, monopole telecommunications tower will be operated by New Cingular Wireless PCS LLC, acquired by AT&T a few years ago. The tower is proposed to be located on a 50 ft. X 50 ft. parcel of land at the northern corner of System property in Brazos County, just off Finfeather Road. The draft land lease for this
parcel, prepared by System Real Estate, is for a five-year term and stipulates, upon termination and upon our written request, New Cingular will restore the premises to the condition that existed on the signing of the lease. The request was made by Texas A&M AgriLife Research in conjunction with the University’s Telecommunication’s Office, reflecting a coordinated interest to support the project and to provide the needed cellular phone service to the campus.

1. Facilities Utilization Sub-Council (FURsc) – recommends CBE support the request to place a telecommunications tower on university land generally located near our northern property line, near Finfeather Drive.

2. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc) – supports the proposed installation and recommends approval, provided the following concerns/issues are addressed and funded:

   University Police Department: In the past, the Texas A&M University Police Department has received reports of criminal activity, such as criminal trespass, criminal mischief, and theft in this area. When designing this facility, special considerations should be given to exterior security, as well as the security of the structures within the location. These locations contain large amounts of high grade copper wire, which is often targeted for its high market value, so maximum security is important.

   The following is a list of recommendations to help provide maximum security:
   a) The location should include a perimeter security fence. The following guidelines should be followed when installing a security fence:
      ▪ Use a number nine grade or heavier wire that is woven in two inches or less squares.
      ▪ For optimum protection, construct the fence eight-foot high, topped with strands of barbed wire one-foot high creating a nine-foot barrier.
      ▪ Extend the bottom of the fence into firm ground, approximately two inches deep.
      ▪ Design the fence as straight as possible to discourage scaling.
      ▪ It is important to use a top guard. Project it both inward and outward to create a "V" at an angle of approximately 45 degrees.
      ▪ All fencing should be positioned to allow maximum visibility. Ideally, fencing should be located 50-150 feet from the building or objects it’s protecting. At a minimum, a 20 foot clearance should be maintained on either side of the fence. If this is not possible, the height of the fence should be increased.
      ▪ Gates should be designed to prevent scaling and should be secured with a good case hardened steal lock.
      ▪ In order to ensure the effectiveness of a security fence, it is recommended that a maintenance program be developed for the proper maintenance of the fence system, gates, and related access controls.
   b) Security light should be installed around the location to allow optimal visibility for police and security personnel patrolling the area. The lighting fixtures should comply with the Texas A&M University campus standard. Fixture lamps should be of an advanced Metal Halide System, same as primary campus standard. LED wall packs would also be acceptable. I highly recommend having Utilities & Energy Management review any proposed lighting design and photometric layouts to ensure the proposed system provides maximum lighting. The lighting for this
location will need to be well above the campus standard of 1 foot-candle per square foot.

c) Any structures inside the perimeter fence should have high grade security locks on all exterior doors. Door hinges should not be exposed and throw cover plates should be installed to prevent tampering with the locking mechanism. If multiple individuals or departments will be accessing the structure or structures, consider using a card access system. For maximum security, consider installing an intrusion detection alarm system and video surveillance system on any structure that would be considered security sensitive.

d) For maximum visibility, landscaping should be at a minimum to allow maximum visibility. If landscaping is used, the following guidelines should be used:
   - Ensure optimum visibility at all entrances and exits.
   - Locate shrubs 18-24 inches away from all entrances and exits to ensure optimum visibility.
   - Cut hedges at least six inches below window levels and no higher than 18 inches.
   - Tall shrubs and trees should be trimmed from the bottom up to ensure visibility.
   - Separate hedges to prevent hiding.
   - When planning future landscaping, preventative measures should be in place for increased visibility and detection.
   - Avoid planting trees and shrubs within 20 feet from the perimeter fence.

Facilities Services
The development needs to be done in such a way that the storm runoff rate to creeks is not increased. Condensate drainage from air conditioners is typically routed to sanitary drains. Routing this condensate drainage to storm drainage paths needs to have approval from Environment, Health & Safety.

Action/Recommendation: The CBE voted unanimously to recommend the President’s approval of the request by AgriLife Research to install a new telecommunications tower to be operated by New Cingular Wireless PCSA LLC. A memo will be sent to the President recommending approval.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

B. TAMU Storm Ready Designation Signage
The Office of Safety and Security and the Department of Atmospheric Sciences made a request to display a “Storm Ready University” sign in a prominent location near the front (east) entrance to campus or along New Main Drive. The sign was provided to Texas A&M upon achieving recertification as a “Storm Ready University”, satisfying the requirements of the National Weather Service. Achieving and maintaining this designation is a significant achievement and a point of pride for the students, faculty and staff of both departments. The location and mounting are decisions on which the students and faculty would like to have an opportunity to provide input.

1. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc) – members unanimously agreed that the signage is not appropriate for a prominent entry to the campus as it is not directly relevant to the traffic safety and wayfinding of the campus, and recommend that it be placed within five to ten feet of the Oceanography & Meteorology Building. DRsc members commend the requesters for such an achievement and further recommend that they
work with Marketing & Communications to explore other options for advertising the achievement, such a feature on the TAMU website.

2. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc) – members see no technical reason to deny this request, but expressed concerns that campus holds many designations without putting up signage (i.e. the Arbor Day Foundation has designated TAMU a “Tree Campus USA”, but instead of adding signs, Landscape Service promotes that designation via markings on their vehicles and through their departmental marketing efforts). TRsc did comment that if the signage is displayed, the location should be coordinated so it does not interfere with utilities, other signage, traffic or other safety concerns.

**Action/Recommendation:** CBE voted unanimously to recommend the President NOT approve the request to display the “Storm Ready University” sign in a prominent location near the front (east) entrance to campus or along New Main Drive. A memo will be sent to the President recommending he does NOT approve the request.

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

C. Turbomachinery Lab Request for Storage Building—Texas Engineering Experiment Station requested the construction of a storage building located at the Turbomachinery Laboratory. The approximately 1,800 sq. ft. storage building will be located on the southwest corner of the Turbomachinery Lab’s existing lot and will not be visible from the street. Additional storage space is needed, as the current storage space is being converted to possible use as research space and is crowded with test rigs and other research equipment. The total project cost has been estimated to be approximately $280,000, which will be funded completely by the Turbomachinery Laboratory, a division of the Texas Engineering Experiment Station (TEES). The request was signed by Ray Matthews, Facilities Manager of the Turbomachinery Laboratory, and Dean Katherine Banks.

1. Facilities Utilization Sub-Council (FURsc)—conCURS with the need for the space, believes the proposed solution is reasonable and recommends that the CBE support the proposal.

2. Maintenance Sub-Council (Msc)—recommends approval of the request as presented.

3. Technical Review Sub-Council (TRsc)—supports the proposed construction and recommends approval, provided the following concerns/issues are addressed and funded:

   **Energy & Utilities Services:**
   - The Facility will not require new electrical or DCW services. It is our understanding that these services will be provided from the existing building north of the site.
   - Fire service to the new facility will be served via connection to an existing 6" DCW line on the east side of the project site. The project will need to install a valve and backflow preventer in accordance with TAMU UES Specs.
   - Storm water run-off will be dealt with on site with grading to ensure that storm water rates will not increase.
   - The project will need to adhere to TAMU UES Design Guidelines - [https://utilities.tamu.edu/design-standards/](https://utilities.tamu.edu/design-standards/)
   - The project will need to follow the rules regarding excavation on campus - [https://utilities.tamu.edu/digging-campus/](https://utilities.tamu.edu/digging-campus/)
Facilities Services: Facilities Services supports this project. It is our understanding that the project manager is ensuring that storm water runoff and back flow prevention for fire protection water are appropriately addressed for this project.

Safety & Security (EHS): Safety and Security agrees with stated plans to include fire system and fire suppression in the new building.
- The fire alarm system should be connected to the main fire alarm panel in Turbomachinery.
- The FDC (fire department connections) should be placed on the side of the building that is visible from the asphalt drive behind Turbomachinery (i.e., the east side rather than around the corner on the south-facing side).

Action/Recommendation: The CBE voted unanimously to recommend the President’s approval of the request by the TurboMachinery Laboratory to construct a storage building on the southwest corner of the TurboMachinery Lab’s existing lot. A memo will be sent to the President recommending approval.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

D. Athletic Facilities District Plan Final (Amendment to Campus Master Plan)—Lilia Gonzales, Chair of Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc)

The signed Presidential memo dated March 12, 2013, approved Athletics’ request for the development of an Athletic Facilities District Plan. After completion of the district plan, the request was for its inclusion as an amendment to the Campus Master Plan. On May 15, 2013, the DRsc reviewed the district plan at 100% completion. Based on this review, several more conversations occurred with Athletics and resulted in additional comments for incorporation.

The Athletic Facilities District Plan was designed to provide the framework which guides the department’s facility planning. It will act as a resource and guide for decision-making the development of more efficient facility use between sports, athletes, staff, and coaches, and will provide cohesive branding.

The components of the district plan address athletic facilities on the East athletic campus, West athletic campus, and off campus. The plan responds to connections and growth outlined in the Campus master Plan, including intramural influences. One item that deviates from the Campus Master Plan is the growth for new facilities in an area original designated as green reserve. The DRsc carefully considered this, but felt that expansion in this area was appropriate and instrumental in the success for Athletics to reach the benchmarks set with the move to the Southeastern Conference (SEC). The plan also addresses items in relation to the ground plane such as building set-back, paving material, landscape improvements, lighting and signage. Components such as these relate back to the design principles set forth in the Campus Master Plan.

The district plan prioritizes program items for expansion and outlines a phased approach for development. The plan also provides a high level of programming for the various identified facilities.

1. Design Review Sub-Council (DRsc) – recommends approval of the Athletic Facilities District Plan as an amendment to the Campus Master Plan. It is understood
subsequent developments within the district will adhere to this plan and proceed through the review and approval process as established by the University.

Action/Recommendation: The CBE voted unanimously to recommend the President’s approval of the Athletic Facilities District Plan as an amendment to the Campus Master Plan. A memo will be sent to the President recommending approval.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and McClendon

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