Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of the Council for the Built Environment
July 6, 2015

I. Attendance

A. Voting Members
      Vanegas, Emil Straube, José Fernández-Solís, Andy Armstrong*, Christopher
      Lyons*
   2. Absent: David Lunt, Leslie Uptain, Erin Simmons

B. Non-voting Members
   1. Present: Penny Riggs, Mark Sicilio,
   2. Absent: Joseph Benigno

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

D. Guests
   1. Shelly Janac

(*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.)

II. Welcome

A. Co-Chair Watson called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

B. The May 2015 minutes were declared approved as drafted.

III. Updates/Announcements

A. CE/TTI Office and Laboratory Building (CVLB) has been renamed as the CE Office and
Laboratory Building to more accurately reflect its occupants. All of the TTI staff
currently located in CVLB will be moving to the new TEES/TTI Center for Infrastructure
Renewal and there will no longer be a TTI presence on main campus. Therefore, omitting
TTI from the building name will help alleviate confusion. The abbreviation of CVLB will
not need to be changed.

IV. Presentations by Sub-Councils

A. Campus Exterior Lighting Improvements
Utilities & Energy Services (UES) is requesting a recommendation and endorsement from the CBE to update the campus exterior lighting standard and proceed with campus exterior lighting improvements using new and retrofitted LED fixtures. The new LED fixtures will be used in parking lots and roadways in lieu of existing "shoebox" fixture. This recommended change in the campus design standard will not impact the pedestrian and heritage fixtures that are approved for use in other applications on campus. LED lighting is already included in the campus design standard, so this change is only for the type of LED fixture to be used, which provides more efficient performance, higher quality lighting, lower fixture cost, and a longer (10 year) warranty. This lighting upgrade will enhance safety and security across campus by improving lighting quality and consistency. An additional benefit will be a reduction in lamp outages as a result of longer lamp life and improving fixture reliability. Lighting mounted on buildings was not included as part of this initiative because of architectural considerations and because the SECO funding requirement that simple payback must be less than 10 years could not be achieved.

Recommendations:

Design Review Sub-council (DRsc)

The proposed high-efficiency LED slim-line design fixtures are a light bronze color. They are half the cost of the current campus standard fixture and include a ten year warranty on the fixture and driver. Existing “shoe box” fixtures will be replaced, except for those in parking lot 54. Those lights have already been retrofitted with LED lights. Existing “fish bowl” and “cobra head” fixtures will be replaced with the proposed new fixtures. Existing bollards, heritage, and pedestrian walkway fixtures will be retrofitted with LED lights. “Hockey puck” fixtures will not be replaced as they are already a high efficiency fixture.

The lighting upgrade is funded through a State Energy Conservation Office (SECO) loan. Currently there are 4,800 freestanding light fixtures on campus. There will only be enough funding to replace 250 of the 600 fish bowl fixtures currently on campus, however it is believed the remaining fish bowl fixtures can be replaced over the next 3-4 years. UES welcomes feedback on the replacement method of the 250 fish bowl fixtures, which can be done by zone or on a case-by-case basis in order to assure a gradual light transition between the light outputs.

Light output of the new fixtures will not be a bright white or blue color, but in between. The light will appear the same as with the existing “hockey puck” fixtures which contain LED bulbs. According to the manufacturer, there have been no issues associated with birds nesting on top of the fixture of any type of bug such as a mud dauber causing issues.

The DRsc unanimously voted to recommend approval of the Campus Exterior Lighting Upgrade project, including the use of the proposed fixture as the new campus standard and the fixture replacement plan as presented, with the following caveats:

- Coordinate location of fish bowl fixture replacement to ensure a gradual transition between the new and existing fixtures as the light output will be different.
o Where a visual connection between new fixtures and shoe box fixtures occurs, ensure that the aesthetics are consistent in appearance.

o If possible, coordinate with projects currently in design or in construction to incorporate the new LED fixtures.

o If financially feasible, the remaining 350 fish bowl fixtures shall be replaced within the next 3-4 years.

Technical Review Sub-council (TRsc)
The TRsc supports the proposed request for the campus exterior lighting improvements and design standard updates and recommends approval, provided the following issues/concerns are addressed and funded.

o Environmental Health and Safety is to be contacted as soon as possible regarding coordination of disposal of old lights and ballasts.

o There is to be a formal plan to replace the remaining fixtures that are not part of this plan over the next two to four years.

o The project and design team will need to follow the TAMU UES Design Standards where applicable - https://utilities.tamu.edu/design-standards/.

Discussion

It was asked if solar lights were considered for use and they weren’t. CBE would like to take the opportunity to explore the economic impact, both long and short term that solar powered lights would have. After further discussion it was decided that UES will provide a quote on investment and impact to the Co-Chairs. CBE members will authorize the Co-Chairs to decide whether to bring the project back to the Council if both the immediate and long term costs could warrant the use of solar powered lights.

Action: The CBE voted unanimously to recommend the President’s approval, with noted caveats, the Campus Exterior Lighting Improvements with the understanding that should solar powered lights be of economic benefit, the project will be returned to CBE for further review.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chairs Watson and Strawser

B. Expansion of Shop Area at Transit

Transportation Services requests permission to expand the Transit shop area serving the transit and heavy equipment maintenance needs of the university. The current four-bay shop was constructed in 1983 to accommodate a fleet of 35 buses; the transit unit will operate 90 buses in the fall. As the university has grown, so has the demand for other large vehicles and heavy equipment used by Utilities & Energy Services and others. Continued enrollment increases will place additional demands for buses and other services that rely on this facility for maintenance. The addition of 5,887 gross square feet of shop bay, office space, restrooms and a dedicated space to service batteries is included.

Recommendations:
Design Review Sub-council (DRsc)
The DRsc unanimously voted to recommend approval of the Transit Shop Area Expansion project as presented.

Technical Review Sub-council (TRsc)
The TRsc supports the proposed request for the expansion of Shop Area at Transit and recommends approval, provided the following issues/concerns are addressed and funded.

- Although the project does not appear that it will have any effect on the rate of storm runoff into local creeks, the design team should double check that the project does not increase it.

- The project team should ensure that the facility is designed to minimize, as much as practical, the effort needed for future maintenance. It is preferred that items requiring maintenance be easy to service, be easily accessible from ground or floor level, have generous clearances and be easy to isolate from energy sources with minimal impact to the rest of the facility. Elevated items requiring maintenance that are difficult to service by ladder or lift should have permanent maintenance access platforms with permanent stairs or ladders, built-in fall prevention, and davits for hoisting parts and tools.

- The project and design team will need to follow the TAMU UES Design Standards where applicable https://utilities.tamu.edu/design-standards/.

- The project and design team will need to follow the TAMU policy on digging on campus prior to any excavation - https://utilities.tamu.edu/digging-campus/.

- We recommend the design firm contact UES building automation team to ensure building automation controls are properly designed for overall functionality of the space.

Discussion

The question of parking for buses around the area was brought up. The schematic presented showed almost 2 spaces lost. With the additional buses, has a different location been considered? Transportation services is comfortable with the current location as well as being convenient for student drivers.

Action: The CBE voted to recommend, with noted caveats, the President’s approval of Transportation Services’ request to expand the Transit Shop Area.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chair Watson and Strawser

V. Discussions

A. Proposed Space Utilization

In February of this year, a memo was forwarded to the Deans, Vice Presidents, and Agency Directors to ask those interested to submit a short proposal on their desire for
available space. The FURsc reviewed the requests and met with interested parties. Their recommendations are as follows.

i. Academic Building
The FURsc met to consider the requests by the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Education and Human Development and the combined request of the Center for Geospatial Science, Applications and Technology and the Environment Grand Challenge for assignment of space in the Academic Building that will soon be available for re-assignment.

The College of Education and Human Development would house several new hires whose work focuses on the area of improving educational achievement in K-12 schools through innovative educational technology and teacher education especially in the STEM and literacy education fields. Space would be needed for 15-20 offices depending on the configuration for faculty, staff and GA’s; 3 larger spaces for collaboration and meetings. There would probably be some limited renovation by creating larger spaces than those currently configured for the testing and collaboration spaces, but painting and freshening the space would be minimal before move in. This cost would be covered with start-up funds.

The College of Liberal Arts would use this office and research space to house an Entrepreneurship presidential hire; consolidate people and activities already supporting the Strengthening Democracy Grand Challenge (e.g., faculty in sociology and communication and the Aggie Agora, a new initiative aimed at bringing students, staff, and faculty together to enhance civil discourse, encourage civic engagement, and understand democratic principles in action.); provide meeting/collaboration space for existing and emerging GC participants (e.g., PPRI, departments of Economics and Political Science as well as Sociology and Communication, and nearby interdisciplinary programs); and enhance research support for these areas by providing space for graduate assistants, postdoctoral fellows, and other research staff.

The combined request of the Center for Geospatial Science, Applications and Technology and the Environment Grand Challenge would utilize the space to accommodate: 1) Office space for the director, administrative staff, project managers and students; 2) Conference room to permit planning, management and project meetings; Faculty and students will participate in project, proposal planning and progress reviews, corporate engagement, and center meetings (such as executive committee meetings, team meetings and assessments, and proposal development, among others); 3) Geovisualization rooms/space for interactive analysis presentations and remote interactions; Faculty and students will utilize geovisualization walls and cyberGIS to facilitate visual interactive analysis of geospatial data and interactively interpret analysis and modeling results with faculty, students and outside entities not present in the GEOSAT Center; and 4) Functional research & contract workspace to permit synergistic interaction among faculty; this space will facilitate collaborative research, workshops, and contract work and will support 10-20 people on a daily basis. The collective space will enable secure administrative, management and research functionality.
for approximately 40 individuals. This space will be primarily utilized for research, and other GEOSAT space on campus (e.g. O&M 807) will be used for education related projects and other GEOSAT programs.

Major renovations will be required in order to make the space operational for GEOSAT. This includes ceilings, floors, air conditioning, lighting, electricity, internet connectivity, removal of walls and general reorganization of space. And it is also requested that the university provide a 10Gbyte internet connection to the building to promote the TAMU HPC and research infrastructure that is being established via GEOSAT.

The Environmental Grand Challenge requests 6 offices and a common meeting space in the Academic Building that would be used for the Grand Challenge Director, two Project Leaders, an Engagement and Communication Coordinator, a Research Manager, 4 graduate students, and a common meeting space with little or no renovations required to the space assigned.

The Facilities Utilization Review sub-council agreed that each of the proposals had merit; however, concerns were expressed regarding the need of the GEOSAT/Environment Grand Challenge to do major renovations in the Academic Building space which may be at odds with the need to do a comprehensive renovation of the building. It was also noted that some use of the space for this proposal would be for second offices for faculty.

Elements of the College of Liberal Arts request generated concerns about duplication of program areas and services existing in other departments. It was also noted that some use of the space for this proposal would be for second offices for faculty.

The College of Education and Human Development proposal was deemed to be most suitable by giving office space to new hires.

**Recommendation**

The Facilities Utilization Review sub-committee (FURsc) recommends that the CBE support the request by the College of Education and Human Development for assignment of the space under consideration in the Academic Building.

**Discussion:**

Dr. Watson reported that the prospective hire that the College of Education and Human Development’s proposal was centered around declined their offer. She asked if the College presented their proposal with the knowledge that the prospective hire turned down the offer but they did not. This now affects FURsc’s recommendation.

The College of Liberal Arts request was ranked 2nd on FURsc’s list of recommendations. However, their concern is the replication of some programs
and duplication of office space for faculty. The Provost confirmed there is not any program replication taking place, however, the duplication office space for faculty is a valid concern.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the College of Liberal Arts request for assignment of the Academic Building.

Action: The CBE voted to recommend the President’s approval to reallocate the south half of the fourth floor of the Academic Building to the College of Liberal Arts.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chair Watson and Strawser

ii. Pavilion

The FURsc met to consider the requests by the College of Architecture, the University Libraries and the combined request of the Study Abroad Program and International Student Services for assignment of space in the Pavilion that will soon be available for re-assignment.

The College of Architecture would convert the space to provide a centrally located permanent facility dedicated to the teaching of design and art studio courses for the campus at large. Initially, the bulk of the course offerings will come from majors within CARC. The College's long term vision is to offer more of the very popular art studio courses to the overall student body. The pavilion offers a convenient “hot” design and art studio space. The overarching vision is to teach design and art studio courses in the renovated large configurable studio spaces 4 days a week, and in addition, make some of the space available on Friday, Saturday and Sunday on a first-come, first-serve basis, affording students space needed to work outside of the formal class time.

The University Libraries would expand student space and engagement through the creation of a Library Graduate Annex space. Recently, the University Libraries have been working to refine and focus on services to graduate students, who often have different needs than undergraduates. The need for this area is consistent with feedback received in LibQual+ results and consistent with the recent hire of a graduate student focused Learning & Outreach Librarian. The Libraries would like to create something similar to the GPS (Graduate & Professional Student) Zone at the Medical Sciences Library on central campus. The proximity of the Pavilion to the Evans Library/Library Annex complex and the layout of the space offers an opportunity to implement this on a near term basis. Space could be configured as some dedicated use space for study and outreach events and for possible expansion of programs and targeted activities for Graduate Students, including meeting and event space. This would help address growing needs on the part of OGAPS and the University Writing Center who use Library event/meeting spaces for many of their outreach and engagement programs.
The combined request of the Study Abroad Programs Office and International Student Services makes a strategic use of space to better serve students on campus, remove permanent occupants from Bizzell Hall, which continues to have significant deferred maintenance concerns, and combine student services within Academic Affairs and Academic Services into a combined location with Scholarships & Financial Aid. Currently, ISS and SAPO occupy most of the ground floors and part of the second floor of Bizzell Hall East and West in addition to some storage space in the basement. While the current assigned space between these two offices is in excess of the available 7600 square feet, the moving of these two offices could be accomplished within the available space and better meet the needs of each of the offices and the students they serve. Both offices currently have inadequate reception areas for the volume of traffic in these offices. With this space, ISS and SAPO would create a combined reception area that would create further efficiencies for the university. Both offices work very closely with the Office of Scholarships & Financial Aid, which occupies the top floor of the Pavilion. The shared conference room space would also allow Scholarships & Financial Aid to convert room 106 into needed advising space to address student debt needs.

The Facilities Utilization Review sub-council agreed that each of the proposals had merit and recognizes the recommendation gives precedence to functions that are less academic in nature. The opportunity to vacate Bizzell, once Nuclear Engineering moves out, was critical in the decision. The many issues that the building has related to accessibility and environmental quality and the fact that the building has been identified to be demolished due to excessive maintenance costs were paramount.

The sub-council recommends that, under normal circumstances, Bizzell not be reoccupied. The subcouncil notes that should a proposed project, which would include the demolition of Cain Hall, come to fruition it may cause all of the recommendations to be voided if the space in the Pavilion is needed for use by Cain Hall occupants.

Recommendation

The Facilities Utilization Review sub-committee (FURsc) recommends that the CBE support the request by the Study Abroad Program and International Student Services for assignment of the space under consideration in the Pavilion.

Discussion

The decision to demolish Cain Hall is not known at this time. CBE decided to recommend assigning the available space in the Pavilion to International Student Services and Study Abroad Programs Office.
Action: The CBE voted to recommend the President’s approval to assign the available space in the Pavilion to International Student Services and Study Abroad Programs Office.

Responsible Parties: Co-Chair Watson and Strawser

B. Campus Master Plan Update
The DRsc is looking to update the Campus Master Plan. Contract negotiations have begun and the goal to begin the update at the end of the month. The planning effort will be a year-long process and will comprise of seven (7) phases.

- Main Campus
- West Campus
- Riverside
- Health Science Center
- Hensel Park
- Research Park
- The area of campus which includes Veterinary Medicine, Agronomy Road, and the other side of F&B Road which encompasses the Rollins Center and Equine Center.

The intent of the update is not to redefine the foundation of the 2004 Campus Master Plan in regard to its goals and principles, but rather re-evaluate the development framework to support TAMU’s strategic planning priorities and anticipated growth. This update will consolidate all formally adopted district plans into one plan and evaluate any proposed plans for incorporation. The areas that will be included as part of the update are the main campus, west campus, Riverside, Health Science Center, Hensel Park, Research Park, and the northern part of campus which includes Veterinary Medicine, Agronomy Road, the other side of F&B Road which encompasses the Rollins Center and Equine Center. The update effort will focus on (6) elements:

1. Development Framework Plan

A review and analysis of existing planning efforts undertaken by the University since the adoption of the 2004 Campus Master Plan. This will include the adopted and proposed District Plans, Vision 2020, current Academic Plans, current Strategic Plan(s) and other planning efforts provided by TAMU. This will include a basic, high-level space assessment by college and/or primary unit to inform potential space needs based on student, faculty and staff growth projections provided by TAMU.

The Development Framework Plan will consider student activity on campus including a basic assessment of dining and housing to identify capacity constraints and potential location of new facilities. Similarly campus edge conditions and connections to the broader College Station community will be reviewed and recommendations included in the framework.

2. Preservation / Adaptive Reuse Plan
The current list of heritage campus buildings will be reviewed to identify necessary additions or deletions to the list and will be coordinated with facilities indicated for potential demolition in the 2004 Campus Master Plan and adopted District Plans. Current Heritage Building Guidelines will be reviewed and recommendations made for revisions including the option for additional policies and protocols in addressing both heritage buildings and heritage places on the campus.

3. Circulation and Transportation Plan

The planning effort will evaluate current campus access and circulation including:
- Campus gateways and connections to the immediate surrounds
- Review and recommend enhancements to improve the pedestrian experience on campus
- Incorporate recommendations from the bicycle study
- Review and recommend locations for future parking garages
- Coordinate current and future transit options
- Identify and recommend options for resolving pedestrian and vehicular conflicts.

4. Sustainability Plan

Develop a set of sustainability guidelines that will inform the planning effort and the Development Framework Plan. Identify both planning and building best practices relevant to TAMU sustainability strategies. Incorporate standards into a set of Sustainability Guidelines.

5. Signage Plan

Utilizing TAMU brand guidelines, develop a signage and wayfinding master plan. This effort will produce a graphical package for wayfinding systems which include: directional, identification, and orientation signs to facilitate campus navigation and identity.

6. Design and Landscape Guidelines

Review and recommend additions, deletions or modifications to the current 2004 Campus Master Plan guidelines for architectural and landscape components.

As stated before, this is a yearlong process. There are many milestones and seven different phases proposed. By the fall, there will be meetings occurring that allows for input and direction. The hope is to begin working with the planning firm in July so that information can be gathered during the summer. The intent is to have a kick-off goal setting meeting in late August and at that time, identify levels of engagement and committees which will be identified at a later date.

Discussions:

How was the planning firm selected?
The DRsc hosted a solicitation for request for qualifications. There were nine submissions. The committee created a short list of four and, from the interviews that were held, and one firm was selected. Negotiations are ongoing and once they are complete, the firm will be publicly identified.

VI. Meeting adjourned 4:20 p.m.