Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of the Council for the Built Environment
April 14, 2015

I. Attendance

A. Voting Members
   1. Present: David Lunt, Glen Laine, Tom Reber, Jorge Vanegas, Emil Straube, José Fernández-Solís, Leslie Uptain, Erin Simmons, Brandon Valenta
   2. Absent: Katherine Banks,

B. Non-voting Members
   1. Present: N. K. Anand, Penny Riggs
   2. Absent: Andy Armstrong, Joseph Benigno, Mark Sicilio, Christopher Lyons

C. Ex-officio Members
   1. Present: Karan Watson, Jerry Strawser, James Massey, Lilia Gonzales, Matt Fry, Deborah Wright, David Morrison,
   2. Absent: Ralph Davila, Kevin Hurley, Richard Gentry

D. Guests
   1. Shelly Janac

II. Call to Order: Co-Chair Watson

A. Co-Chair Watson called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

B. The February 2015 minutes were unanimously approved as drafted.

III. Presentations by Sub-Councils

A. Pavagen Tiles

Ilse Nava, Ph.D. Candidate in the Department of Materials Science & Engineering, submitted a request for the temporary display of Pavegen Tiles and if successful, a possible long term installation. Pavegen is a London-based green energy company that specializes in piezoelectric tiles. The purpose of this project is to harness naturally occurring campus energy and raise awareness about an innovative green initiative. (See attached proposal).

Recommendations:

• Design Review Sub-council (DRsc)
   The DRsc unanimously voted to recommend approval of the Pavegen Tile display, with the following caveats:
   ▪ Members are generally supportive of this request, but due to its temporary nature we suggest you work with the appropriate identified partners (Athletics, Transportation Services, etc.) for placement of the tiles. Tile displays should not impair ADA accessibility or create trip hazards or other safety concerns.
• Installation shall be coordinated with TAMU Temporary Outdoor Art Committee and comply with any processes and procedures applicable with this installation.
• Logo usage should be approved by TAMU Marketing & Communications.
• Any requests for permanent application of the tiles should come back to the DRsc for review.

• Technical Review Sub-council (TRsc)  
  The TRsc supports the proposed renovation request for approval to display Pavegen tiles and recommends approval, provided the following issues/concerns are addressed and funded.
  
  • Procurement:  
    It appears the height of the tile is approximately 2.67 inches. The only concern would be if the tiles aren’t installed flush with the surrounding surfaces, would we be creating an unsafe surface. If that issue can be addressed, then Procurement is very supportive of the project.

Discussion:

• What is the duration of the temporary placement?
  • The duration of the temporary placement would be September 2015 – February 2016.

• How is this being funded?
  • Aggie Green Fund will not fund due to the temporary nature of the project and because ADA ramps were not included in the proposal. Tiles are actually being rented which is more costly than purchasing.

• How is the energy being extracted?
  • There is not enough wiring to extract energy nor is this process outlined in the proposal.

• If funding were acquired from another source, would CBE want to approve on a temporary basis?
  • More details would be needed
    • Cost for entire project (ramps, maintenance, etc.)
    • Safety and ADA
    • What is this accomplishing?

• Would CBE want to approve on a permanent basis and purchase the tiles?
  • Who would cover maintenance costs?
  • What are the cost savings?

Action: Due to lack of funding and support, the CBE voted unanimously to recommend the President not approve request for the temporary display of Pavegen Tiles.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and Strawser
B. Continued Use of Riverside 7535

The College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences (CVM) is requesting to continue the use of the Riverside Campus Building by the Veterinary Emergency Team (VET). The building currently houses equipment inventory, which is valued in excess of 1.7 million dollars, and is being proctored by Facilities Services. The use of this building will allow them to properly store and maintain their equipment, thereby providing the VET program continuing support of their efforts in the areas of service, education and outreach. (see attached proposal).

Recommendations:

• Facilities Utilization Review Sub-council (FURsc)
  The FURsc recommends the request by the College of Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences to continue the use of the Riverside Campus Building #7535 until alternative space can be provided or a formalized review can be scheduled in three years.

Discussion:

• Riverside 7534 is an older building but it is in good condition. If this building were vacant, other departments might compete for the office space.
• Riverside 7535 has outdoor space with sheds, barns, etc. and VET is utilizing the facility to its fullest. The accessibility, openness, and the ability to store more equipment, should they acquire more, is more in alignment with their needs. They would like to occupy this space permanently.
• The new CVM building has space for storage, but it would not be in the best interest to use it for VET’s needs. The new facility would be limited in the amount of space VET would receive. The space could be better utilized for additional classroom and laboratory space if needed.
• It was suggested to send a call, sooner rather than later, for the permanent assignment of Riverside 7534. If no one is interested, the space would be assigned permanently to VET. If there is interest, the competition could be finalized before the new CVM building is completed to influence the final design of the storage space in the CVM building.

Action: The CBE voted unanimously to recommend the President allow the Veterinary Emergency Team (VET) to continue to use Riverside 7534 until a vacated space competition is completed by the CBE. Depending on the outcome of the competition, VET would be given a date certain (after completion of the new CVM building) to either vacate Riverside 7534, or be assigned the space permanently.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chair Watson and Strawser
IV. Discussions

A. Space Allocation Process

A call to compete for two separate spaces (one located on the first floor of the Pavilion and the other on the fourth floor of the Academic Building) was sent out to Vice Presidents and Deans and proposals have been received. The FURsc goes through a process before submitting a ranking of the requests to the CBE for recommendation to the President. The current process is as follows:

Overview
- CBE provides notice of vacant space
- Proposals are submitted
  - CBE Consideration
    - Criteria
    - Strategic Need for Space
    - Strategic Priority
    - Fit of the Space with the proposed Utilization
  - FURsc review/recommendation
  - Allocation Recommendation provided to the CBE
  - CBE forwards allocation recommendation to President
- President makes the allocation

Space & Land Use Management
- Space Request and Allocations
  Through appropriate channels, request for space should be forwarded to the CBE which collects and analyzes space requests, and provides recommendations related to requests for additional space to the President. Allocations are based on relative need, the availability of space and other parameters as deemed appropriate by the CBE.
- Requests for Space
  - When space becomes available on campus, the CBE Co-chairs will issue a memorandum to all applicable parties inviting them to request assignment of the vacant space. Requests are submitted in writing to the Co-Chairs, through the CBE Program Coordinator, and typically include the following:
    - name of the division, college, department or unit
    - square footage, number of offices, numbers and types of spaces requested
    - number of faculty, staff, and/or students involved
    - expected renovations/remodeling required
    - expected usage/purpose for space
    - explanation of funding sources available

FURsc Consideration Elements
- Strategic Contribution
- Space Need
  - Quantity
  - Type (Office, Instruction, Research, etc)
- Quality of Existing/Proposed spaces
- Regulatory Requirements
- Space Location/Proximities
- Availability of Technology

Process
- Presentation to FURSc by Proponent
- Open to all
- Deliberation & Recommendation

Discussion:

Concerns were discussed regarding the timing of the moves. In the past, some departments have taken extensive time to leave current space into their newly acquired space. Design and construction issues were not addressed until the acquired space was vacated, thereby staying in their current space for longer than expected. There was no sense of urgency to move which caused delay and frustration on the next department to occupy the soon to be vacated space. Any requests for extension of deadlines to move should be authorized by the CBE rather than the unit.

Action:

FURSc will add a timing element to the protocol and bring back to the CBE for review. The priorities for space requests submitted for the Pavilion and the Academic Building will be presented at the next CBE meeting.

B. New Construction Prioritization Process

The President has requested that the CBE re-initiate the process to prioritize major future construction and renovation projects.

Deans, Vice Presidents, Agency Directors, and Athletic Director were asked to submit their proposal for new building construction or renovations that are in excess of $2 million during the next 5-year planning horizon. These proposals went through an administrative review and then through the CBE. The FURsc developed a draft priority list with input from the other sub-councils for recommendations to the President.

The proposal, as outlined, would include
- Strategic Contribution
  - How the project represents a strategic priority for the University in accordance to the evolving strategic plan
- Space Need
  - How the project addresses a strategic need for space by the requesting unit (including health, safety, and security issues)
- Cost and Funding
  - Estimated cost and expected funding for project
- Location and Size
  - Proposed Location and size of the facility and how the fit of the facility with the campus Master Plan (if applicable).
Funding Categories
A. No University funds are requested for construction, infrastructure, or operation of the facilities; however, unit philanthropy and State resources such as Tuition Revenue Bonds will be requested.
B. No University funds are requested for construction, but University funds will be requested for new infrastructure and operations.
C. University funds will be requested for a portion of the construction as well as the infrastructure and operations.
D. University funds will be requested for the entire project (construction, infrastructure, and operations).

FURsc Review
- Ranking would be based on weight scores by criteria
  - Strategic contribution
  - Space need
  - Current space
    - Condition of current space
    - Maintenance and operation cost
  - Project cost
    - Construction
    - Proforma of O&M
  - Funding source
  - Timing
  - Implementation
    - Primary and secondary benefits of the project
  - Location
- Develop recommendation

Discussion:
The ideal of scoring and weighting projects within the sub-council is for informational purposes for when the projects are brought before the CBE. While the scoring and ranking may seem reasonable, it does not set the decision, however, it will open dialog to discuss whether one project is more feasible than another. Ideally, this process should be run twice a year. It was emphasized that submitted proposals will be no longer than two pages. This process is not for approval for the final project but for setting the priorities.

Action:
FURsc will begin the process of ranking the proposals that were received. The list will be presented to the CBE for further discussion before a prioritized list will be presented to the President.

C. Transfer of Space Inventory between College of Engineering and College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
College of Engineering (COE) and College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (COALS) have entered into a pending agreement for a new building to be built for one of their departments to move from East Campus to West Campus. The agreement would vacate space in Peterson Building which would then be assigned to COE because COE is agreeing to help COALS build the building. However, neither colleges have the full amount. COE will only provide funding if they are guaranteed the space in Peterson. COALS can support a third of the building costs but are requesting COE to cover a third and TAMU to cover the remaining third. The proposal for the building is included in the group of proposals submitted and will be ranked with the rest of the projects.

D. Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Facilities inventory Audit

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) was last at TAMU three years ago to perform a facilities inventory audit. They will arrive next month to do the same. A sample has been pulled which includes 35 rooms and the departments who oversee those selected rooms will be notified of the audit.

The audit is to ensure that what space usage reported to the THECB is still what the space is used for (i.e., if the inventory of record states that the space is a classroom or a laboratory, then it still should be utilized as a classroom or laboratory). This is one of the major reasons that CBE is to be notified about renovations to existing space so that our inventory is correct.

E. Kyle Field North Plaza Reveille Statue Update

DRsc reviewed the proposal for the addition of a bronze Reveille sculpture to be placed on top of the scoreboard on the south side of the Reveille memorial/burial area, located in Kyle Field’s North Plaza. The DRsc members unanimously voted to not recommend approval of the Reveille statue as proposed due to the simplicity of the area and the fact that the plaque already conveyed what the area is memorializing.

Action: The CBE voted to recommend the President not approve request for the placement of the Reveille statue on top of the scoreboard on the south side of the Reveille Memorial/burial area in Kyle Field’s North Plaza.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and Strawser

F. Public Art Policy Revisions

Due to lack of time, the Public Art Policy Revisions have been postponed to next month’s agenda.

V. Meeting adjourned 3:00 p.m.