

**Minutes  
Council on the Built Environment  
February 1, 2006**

Voting Members Attending: Kem Bennett, Bobby Bisor, Ralph Davila for Russell Cross, Clint Magill, David Parrott, Chuck Sippial, and Joel Wixson.

Non-Voting Members attending: Shelly Janac, James Massey, Chris Meyer, Raye Milburn, Mary Miller, Tom Regan, Nancy Sawtelle, and Dick Williams.

Guests: Ron Sasse and Charney Rydl.

Chuck Sippial chaired the meeting in Bill Perry's absence.

Residence Life District Plan

Ron Sasse presented a draft campus housing master plan. He noted that Residence Life is still in the information-gathering stage and would return to CBE once they are ready to present a final concept.

Sasse stated there are several sites for campus housing opportunities, including three clusters of sites on main campus and one area on west campus—an area that includes Hopgood, Cater-Mattil, and other one story buildings that the Campus Master Plan suggests be demolished at some future time.

Residence Life plans to renovate and replace on-campus housing over a 25 to 30 year period. Features most desired by students are apartment-style accommodations, with private bedrooms, shared baths, and amenities found in privately-owned facilities, such as convenient parking, convenience stores, and dining services.

Regan suggested that the Council have written guidelines on what the CBE considers a district plan and Sippial agreed. Regan added that if CBE is looking at district plans similar to the way building projects are considered, it should be determined how much detail the plan should have before it comes to the Council for approval.

Concern was expressed about residence halls being located on the west side of campus near the railroad tracks. Meyer noted that there is hazardous material transport and the University does not have control of the train speed through campus. Wixson suggested that the west side district plan be considered separately from the other housing district plans.

Sasse said the first district plan to be proposed would be in the north area and is a 30 year plan. Overall there will be approximately 7,800 beds, which does not include Corps housing.

Sippial noted that the list of proposed buildings to be demolished are listed in the Campus Master Plan and appropriate notice would be given to the occupants of the buildings once other uses for the area are determined. Regan suggested that units requesting areas for district plans provide

time projections for completing their plans, since it would not be fair to have the property underutilized when others might have a need for it.

### TRB Update

Bisor stating the process for submitting a Tuition Revenue Bond (TRB) request is underway. Any TRBs the University wishes to submit must be sent to the System by February 17. Last session, \$100M was requested for the ETED building (and not received) and Bisor asked if the Council would like this project to stay on the list, or submit another project(s). He noted that in an earlier CBE meeting the Council suggested the following projects if funding were available:

1. Renovate the YMCA Building (\$10M)
2. Construct a classroom building (\$25M)
3. Construct the second half of the ETED building (\$50M)
4. Invest in energy capital costs with a two to five year payback
5. Incentivize HSC to move medical research toward the center of campus

It was noted that if a request for TRB funding was submitted for a classroom building, then good justification would need to be included and a detailed plan for taking current classrooms off-line.

Sippial suggested submitting a TRB for capital renewal, or a combination of capital renewal with another project. If more than one capital renewal project is submitted, the projects must be prioritized. He noted both Academic and YMCA are in need of capital renewal.

Bisor stated that TRBs are generally funded to universities that do not have PUF available, and TRBs are viewed more favorably if the University matches the funds requested. Also, since it will not be known for another year whether the TRB request is approved, it is not in the University's best interest to ask for funding for the ETED building since \$50M has already been identified for construction and asking for additional funds would delay the entire project.

If the University decides to submit a TRB for capital renewal, Sippial suggested that the deans be polled for priority of needs. He also asked Meyers and Williams to look at the capital renewal needs of older buildings and indicate those with major fire and life safety issues.

Regan asked about the practice of both the Registrar and departments assigning classrooms and questioned who would control the classrooms if TRB funding was received for a classroom building. However, if a classroom building is not reasonable to submit for TRB funding in light of our current classroom usage, then the deans need to be aware that that is not a viable option.

Bisor will contact Chilcoat and ask him to coordinate communication among the deans about their priorities for a TRB. Bisor will provide an update at next week's Council meeting.