

Minutes
Council on the Built Environment
March 1, 2006

Voting Members Attending: Bobby Bisor, Dick Chilcoat, Ralph Davila for Russell Cross, Clint Magill, David Parrott, Bill Perry, Chuck Sippial, Max Summers and Joel Wixson.

Non-Voting Members attending: Shelly Janac, James Massey, Chris Meyer, Clay Hanks for Raye Milburn, Joe Powell, Tom Regan, Nancy Sawtelle, and Dick Williams.

Design Review Board Process

Regan reviewed a proposed approval process for major building projects which include Design Review Board (DRB) input. He reminded the Council that the DRB process is only for projects which are \$2 million or more and are handled by FP&C. Projects for less than that amount would be reviewed by the Campus Planner and would not require DRB input, except in unusual circumstances.

Regan suggested that at certain levels there be DRB subcommittee participation, with full DRB beginning at the preliminary design phase. It was noted that the CBE will help to ensure that certain master plan criteria, such as size and height of a facility, are met when the project is reviewed in concept, and also at the CFPC stage.

The process proposes that the DRB have subcommittee review after CBE makes a recommendation to President Gates. However, the Council thought it important to include in their recommendation to Gates some acknowledgement of DRB review. Indeed, the provost and president should receive an independent report from the DRB.

Once the project is initiated and is in the preliminary design phase at FP&C, the Council discussed whether the DRB should have some approval process. The consensus was that DRB should review and provide comments and feedback to the president and provost, but would not have an approval function. Thus, review and recommendation to the president and provost are important functions of the DRB.

The DRB will convene for the first time tomorrow and Regan will share the Council's input with the group at that time. This topic will be discussed again at next week's Council meeting.

Graphics Space

Sippial stated there is also a need for about a 1,000 SF area to display mock-ups of the labs and offices of the Interdisciplinary Life Sciences building. The area could be needed for a year or more, beginning this month. A suggested area has been the east side of the Graphics Building. To make the space usable, however, a temporary wall and ramp need to be removed. The cost is estimated to be about \$12,500 for both, although if Environmental Health and Safety determine asbestos is in the wall, the cost will be higher. Sippial will determine final cost and come back to the Council.

Other Business

- Parrott stated that when the Law/Purveyer marker was designed, the students did not have enough funds to complete the project and borrowed \$30,000 from Residence Life, which they are still repaying.
- Perry stated Gates recently asked him about the ETED building and the plan for two buildings, with a set forward with respect to the Williams Building. Perry responded to the President that the Council believed it was better to establish symmetry now, with two flanking buildings of smaller size, rather than one building on one side, and waiting for funding for the second building. He added that Dean Bennett believed the location was beneficial for academic partnerships. Also, the Campus Master Plan allows a “build to” line in front of the front edge of the Williams Building, which could allow for future expansion behind the flanking buildings. However, as the project develops the front edges of the flanking buildings may be located at or behind the front edge of the Williams Building.