

Minutes
Council on the Built Environment
May 5, 2005

Attending: Carol Cantrell (for Kem Bennett), Jim Calvin, Russell Cross, Shelly Janac, Clint Magill, James Massey, Raye Milburn, David Parrott, Bill Perry, Nancy Sawtelle, Charles Sippial, Max Summers, Dick Williams, Tom Regan, and Joel Wixson.

1. Campus Lighting Standards

Sippial explained that the lighting units that are now used on campus will no longer be manufactured. As a result, Physical Plan personnel are evaluating new campus lighting standards and will recommend appropriate models for CBE consideration at a later date.

2. Questions Regarding Phase 2 Recommendations
(From a list of questions updated 4/28/05)

Item 1, "Regarding Agricultural Communications"

- a. Can we find lease space? Cross responded that space in the Galleria office building had been identified.
- b. Where is final destination? Cross responded that the final destination had not be determined, but asked that the topic be considered at an upcoming SWAT meeting.

Item 2, "Regarding "Flip Plan" of GSC-1"

Sippial introduced the question. Regan asked whether a source of funding had been determined. Sippial responded that it had not, but it would be included in the overall Phase 2 budget. Regan stated that he did not believe that the faculty would support a second new building to house administrative personnel when the expressed purpose of faculty reinvestment was to provide quality space to support the faculty, particularly the new faculty, and questioned whether a "flip plan" of the GSC-1 is a wise investment. Summers agreed, saying that the funds should be directed to new facilities for faculty. Sippial reminded the Council that the motive for a "flip plan" of GSC-1 was to move administrative personnel out of the academic corridor in order to make room for faculty.

Regan said that he believes there is a lack of communication between the people who are making the decisions about Phase 2 and the deans and the faculty as a whole. He has heard deans and faculty members express concern about the perceived difference between "new space" and "renovated space." A number of Council members agreed, voicing frustration concerning the university's ability to construct new buildings in the academic corridor in a timely fashion, and various ideas for expediting the construction process were raised. Regan suggested that the university seek ways to decrease the time required to construct new buildings in the academic corridor.

Wixson said that the driving force seems to be time, and asked if the schedule for Faculty Reinvestment could be extended. Various Council members responded that extending

the schedule would destroy the university's credibility among current and potential faculty and the public for achieving its stated goals.

Other Council members asked if there was a way to incorporate academic programs into the "flip plan" building, or in another way demonstrate an academic advantage for the building.

Sippial asked D. Williams to develop a presentation for an upcoming CBE that illustrates the time frames for the various phases of the construction process. In addition, Wixson asked for illustrations of the difference in the standards for a one-hundred year building and lesser standards.

Regan moved that the CBE ask the Research Council to consider the issue of using current indirect cost return to support the cost of space. Summers seconded. The consensus of the CBE was that this was a good idea.

Regan asked if the university was still planning to engage a space planner to review all aspects of Phase 2, including the long-range implications of scrubbing and for moving departments and functions into renovated space.

Calvin suggested that the CBE should share all of the Phase 2 questions with the Research Council, suggesting that the collective perception of the members of that committee would provide a useful sounding board.

Returning to the list of questions, item 2, "Regarding "Flip Plan" of GSC-1," Sippial noted that the university is in the process of extending the utilities for GSC-1, and added that it would not be difficult to add capacity for a "flip plan" building, too. He also noted that the planners have considered parking issues, and staggered workday schedules in order to handle the traffic on Agronomy and F&B Roads. He added that if the building is built, it would not be ready for move-in until September or October of 2007.

Regan moved to table further planning for a flip plan of GSC-1.

Item 3, "Regarding the decommissioning of two classrooms in Reed McDonald," the concept is still be considered.

Item 4, "Regarding the TTI Building," There was no additional information.

Item 5, "Regarding the Research Park," there is space available in the Research Park, but more detailed discussions with Harold Strong would be necessary before a decision can be made.

Item 6, "Regarding the Research Foundation," Mark Smock and the Research Foundation staff are looking for appropriate available space. At current prices, if lease space can be found, it is estimated to cost about \$500,000 per year. Calvin said that Smock had sent a

letter to the Council through Bill Perry, reporting on the availability of lease space and the cost implications of leasing space.

Item 7, “Regarding the Graphics center non-office space,” Cantrell reported that Kem Bennett is leaning toward modifying the existing building rather than razing the existing building and constructing a new one. Time and an appropriate source of financing are the primary issues.

Item 8, “Regarding Administrative/Service Moves,” there was no discussion.

Item 9, “Regarding classroom conversion,” there was no discussion.

Item 10, “Regarding costs, a. should deans contribute from new indirect cost?” the question will be sent to the Research Council for consideration.

Item 11, “Regarding having space available on faculty arrival, a. Do we have a method in place to coordinate?” There is not a process yet.

Item 12, “Regarding To Do List, a. Get office visitor counts (for Student Financial Aid and Student Business Services).” This has not been done.

Regan suggested that the Council modify the vetting process for modifications to the Phase 2 plans, such that decisions made in the SWAT were brought back to the full CBE before being sent to other groups for consideration. Perry agreed.

3. Phase 2 Discussion

- International Program Office Emails. Perry reported that he met with the Student Senate on Wednesday night, May 4, to discuss the issues related to moving international services, student financial aid services, and student business services to a General Services Building on Agronomy Road. Following discussion the Student Senate passed a resolution saying that these services should stay in the academic corridor and that additional service points should be established.

Regan moved that the International Programs Office should not be moved out of the academic corridor. Parrott seconded. Following discussion the motion was amended to read that convenient access to international services, student financial aid services, and student business services should be maintained in the academic corridor. The motion passed unanimously. Perry said that we would send out a bulk email through the NEO system to all students and employees in Brazos County, informing them of the CBE’s decision. Perry asked Sawtelle to vet the message with Emily Ashworth, Arnold Trejo, and Bob Piwonka before sending it to the campus community.

Wixson suggested that we establish trial off-campus service points to evaluate the amount of use they receive.

4. Other Business
 - Update on NMR Facility—Perry called the Council’s attention to the email from Marty Sholtz that was an attachment to the agenda. The email stated that the A/E selection team met earlier in the week to recommend a short list of 5 firms to invite for full proposals and presentations, and summarized the process as proceeding in a timely fashion.
5. The meeting adjourned shortly after 10 a.m.