

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 277

January 3, 1966

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 2 p.m. on January 3, 1966, in the Office of the President. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Other members of the college staff present were Miss Evelyn Clewell, Miss Jerry Kirkwood, Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. O. R. Downing.

The Business Administration Faculty Committee was represented by Chairman Haskell Taylor and Dr. John Binnion. Other members of the Business Administration faculty present were Dean George G. Heather, Dr. Robert Rouse, Dr. Reginald Rushing, Dr. John Ryan and Dr. William R. Pasewark.

The project architects were represented by Mr. Louis Southerland.

3171. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page, Southerland & Page)

The purpose of the meeting which was arranged last December was to put the finishing touches on the application for matching funds under the Higher Education Facilities Act.

Mr. Southerland presented copies of the revised floor plans and the schedule required for the application, showing the net usable and gross square footages by rooms and floors.

He said that the plans, as developed, do not constitute actual, approved preliminary plans, and he is not yet ready to recommend the exteriors. He wants to do much more work on the project, but the information available is sufficient for the application.

The studies to date permitted a cutback to 194,625 square feet and just about all of the "fat" is out of the plan.

The elevations were again studied and discussed, and Mr. Southerland said that it would still be possible to lift the project or to lower it in the next phase of planning. It doesn't matter now, as either can be done later.

The budget includes \$100,000 for utility costs. The cost of \$18 per square foot was used in estimating the cost.

The building is quite compact, with approximately two-thirds of the gross square footage of 194,625 available for assignment.

The fact that the application requires specific percentages of funds to be included for contingencies had been overlooked. The amount of the two required contingencies is \$264,075 and raises the total estimated development costs to \$4,527,000. It was felt by all that the contingencies would not be used in the construction. Although the amount is unavoidably up due to the HHFA requirement, the budget is not materially affected.

Miss Kirkwood said that she accumulated all the refinements and sent them to the architects for use in the plans to date.

It was agreed that the architects would proceed to prepare the preliminary plans. The architects still want additional comments, but would assume that such comments would stay within the scope as generally defined.

3171. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page, Southerland & Page)

Mr. Southerland said that he would leave copies of the developments to date for study and would like to have a deadline of two weeks for comments.

It was agreed to plan for the preliminary plans to be ready by February 10, 1966, for presentation to the Board of Directors on the following day. However, the time is quite short and if the architects cannot do it, they are to let the CPC know by the end of January.

It was agreed that the Business Administration faculty would use one week to study the developments further and get the information to Miss Kirkwood. She will clear the information with the CPC and get it to the architects two weeks from today or sooner if possible.

The question was asked about specifications for such items as light switches, projection screens, etc. Mr. Southerland explained that it is too early for the information now, but engineers will come to the campus and go over each room with the department heads.

The original off-the-cuff estimate of \$500,000 for equipment has been reduced to \$375,000. The amount was approved for the application.

A few specific items, such as the arrangement of columns and department heads' offices were discussed, but it was agreed that such items will be handled in the future.

It was agreed by all present that the plans, as presented, would be used for the application which must be in Austin on January 7, 1966.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 278                      January 13, 1966

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 8 a.m. on January 13, 1966, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Other members of the college staff present were Miss Evelyn Clewell, Mr. O. R. Downing and Mr. John G. Taylor.

3172. Approval of Minutes

On motion by Mr. Urbanovsky, seconded by Mr. Barrick, the Minutes of Meetings Nos. 263 through 276 were approved with the following corrections:

No. 274, page 1870 - Show Mr. O. R. Downing present instead of Mr. R. B. Price.

page 1871 - Item 3168, subparagraph 4, Scheme D, the location should be changed from College and 19th Street to Flint and 19th Street.

No. 276, page 1874 - Item 3170, paragraph 6, the number of students per floor should be changed from 72 to 52.

page 1876A - Third paragraph should read "the first addition would have three towers with a capacity of 572 each, two for women and one for men," instead of two for men.

3173. President's Approval of Minutes

President Goodwin approved the Minutes of Meetings Nos. 270, 271 and 272 on January 5, 1966, and Nos. 273, 274, 275 and 276 on January 7, 1966.

3174. Agricultural Facilities

Horse Facilities

Mr. Downing reported that the footings have been poured and the building is under way.

3175. Biology Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce)

A. Application for Matching Funds

Title I

The application was submitted to the Coordinating Board on January 5, 1966.

Title II

Mr. Taylor is preparing the information for submission to Washington as soon as possible.

3175. Biology Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce)B. Committee

(Mr. Urbanovsky, Miss Clewell and Mr. Felty)

Results of Study on Special and General Space

"On January 6, 1966, at 8:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., Drs. Camp, Kuhnley and Strandtmann of the Biology Department met with Miss Clewell, Mr. Felty and myself regarding the use of space in the Biology Building.

"After some discussion, it was agreed that Dr. Camp would furnish us with other material so that we could evaluate the space properly.

"On January 10, 1966, Dr. Camp provided the information. On January 12, 1966, Miss Clewell and I again met and went over the material provided by Dr. Camp, and are again asking him for other materials to further justify the use of space involved.

"The request for one office for the ecology - Two are shown. This is an office that is assigned to a department but not to a person. It is things of this nature that in checking the research space requested, is more than occupied by the department now. However, it should be kept in mind that approximately 400 increase each year in enrollment of freshmen students for the past three years, but the enrollment in upperclass courses is just holding its own and in a few cases, shows some increase. We realize that this type of space is desirable. It all depends on the graduate program, if you don't have the space you can't teach graduate courses, but we feel this is more than is necessary. We hope to have the final report to the CPC on January 17, 1966."

E. J. Urbanovsky

C. Space Assignment and Usage

The Biology Building was listed as No. 2 on the priority list and is being oversized for the present Biology needs due to the rapid growth of the department and the fact that the arrangement would provide for overall campus relief for space. It was intended that the space not needed for Biology would be used by others. Biology would grow into it as the others grew out and into other space to be constructed on campus.

Any other philosophy at this time will require an immediate re-evaluation of the philosophy, the priority list and the size and scope of the proposed building.

It might be well to mention that the space in new buildings is not automatically assigned to the department or departments for which the building is designed, but is assigned by Miss Clewell in view of the departmental and college needs.

D. Architects

The architects are to continue with the development of preliminary plans and specifications.



3176. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page, Southerland & Page)

(Miss Jerry Kirkwood entered the meeting.)

A. Application for Matching Funds

The application was mailed on January 5, 1966, to the Coordinating Board and receipt has been acknowledged with the statement that it is necessary to reduce the total matching funds to \$1,500,000 which is the maximum amount. It would cut off approximately \$21,689.

B. Requests from Faculty

1. Suggest that the doors of the west elevator open in the back and the front on the first floor only.

The CPC felt that the suggestion would provide some worthwhile conveniences but they would be outweighed by the problems of construction, economy and safety.

2. Suggested changes in rooms assigned to the Department of Business Education and Secretarial Administration.

Approved.

3. Department head offices - Is it possible to have natural light at D-7 by removing NAF-1 and providing windows in the center of the west wall?

The architects will be requested to study it.

4. Basement Floor Rooms, B-1 to B-16

- a. May we have all doors located at the corner of the room so that there will be a maximum of space for desks or tables in the room?

Approved.

- b. Pilasters (columns) in several rooms - If they remain where they are presently located on the blueprint, will decrease as many as four student stations in some rooms. We are very anxious to maintain student capacity to at least the number designated in our original request.

The architects will be requested to study the problem.

- c. Electric outlets and heat/air conditioning in storage rooms so office machine repairmen can work in the storage rooms.

The architects will be requested to study the problem.

- d. In rooms B-4, B-5, B-6, and B-12, the acoustics should be very good. Students will be taking dictation and they must be able to hear every word the teacher dictates.

The architects will be requested to study the problem.

- e. There will be office machines in rooms B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5, B-6, B-7, B-8, B-9, and B-14. These rooms should probably receive acoustical treatment to minimize the noise from the machines.

The architects will be requested to study the problem.

3176. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page, Southerland & Page)

B. Requests from Faculty

4. Basement Floor Rooms, B-1 to B-16 (continued)

- f. The next time it is convenient to do so, will you please name rooms in all of our records and blueprints according to their actual functions:

B-1-L	Business Communications
B-2-L	Business Communications
B-3-L	Business Communications
B-4-L	Electric Typewriting Lab
B-5-L	Electric Typewriting Lab
B-6-C	Electric Typewriting Lab
B-7-L	Transcription-Duplication Lab
B-8-L	Office Machine Lab
B-9-C	Calculating Machine Lab
B-11-C	Methods-Seminar
B-12-C	Dictation Lab
B-13-L	Office Research Lab
B-14-L	Manual Typing Lab
B-15-G	Storage
B-16-G	Storage

*Approved use of Code only*  
 C. Additional CPC Requests

1. Request the architects to eliminate the outside slope, as there can be more site utilization without it, and it will present a drainage problem.
2. Request the architects to study the feasibility and practicality of moving the building 50' to 60' to the south.
3. Restudy the location of the 500-capacity lecture room at different locations, including tying it to the structure at the northeast corner. It was the thought that there could be better integration in relation to the building.
4. Request the architects to see if an improvement can be made by eliminating the proposed setbacks in the exterior wall of the first floor.
5. The student toilet rooms are located in the east end of the structure, and the architects were requested to study the feasibility and practicality of a different distribution.
6. Elevations - The architects were requested to restudy the exterior design, and it is the thought that the architects planned to do so anyway.
7. The contour of the building possibly could be simplified.
8. The building could be more compact.
9. The mechanical plans should be pulled into a penthouse and out of the center of the core in order to improve operation and maintenance.
10. The architects were requested to study the feasibility of providing space at grade level for the use of the heavy IBM equipment rather than on the third floor.
11. Custodial rooms should be added.
12. A place for light bulbs storage would be helpful.

3176. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page, Southerland & Page)

D. Preliminary Plans

The architects are to continue work and try to have the preliminary plans available by February 10, 1966, for presentation to the Board of Directors on February 11, 1966. However, it is quite possible that the schedule is entirely too short and the project architects are to notify the CPC by the end of January if they see the deadline cannot be made.

(Miss Kirkwood left the meeting.)

3177. Chemical Research Building (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps & White)

At the last meeting of the Board of Directors, the decision was made for a restudy by the architects, to be assisted by the CPC and the department, with plans to be developed for maximum space utilization and growth on the basis that not all of the facilities could be built now.

The restudy was discussed at the Building Committee meeting on December 16, 1965. Mr. Budd, representing Pitts, Mebane, Phelps and White, was requested to make additional site studies for more utilization and he said his firm could and would. A copy of Mr. Budd's memorandum on the meeting is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 608, page 1889)

On December 21, 1965, Mr. Bob White called and requested additional information from Dr. Dennis in order to comply with the Board's recommendation and asked for the initial and ultimate needs for the undergraduate, graduate and research facilities, the number of 500-seat lecture rooms and site area. In addition, he discussed the restudy fee in the letter. The letter is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 609, page 1890)

A copy of Dr. Dennis' reply of January 10, 1966, to the request for information from Mr. White is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 610, page 1891)

Mr. White, in the telephone conversation on December 16, 1965, also discussed how the architects might work and be paid. Such work is usually done on a per diem by hours and travel outside of the city, with the making of periodic reports.

Mr. Budd estimated that it would take until the end of January to complete the study, in which case it would tie in with the Board of Directors' meeting on February 11, 1966.

It may be necessary to split the application for matching funds between Title I and NSF and/or Title II. The NSF is averaging about 25 percent of the requests and will allow nothing outside the building proper.

On January 11, 1966, Bob White said he would like for the CPC to define the site location and whether or not the seismograph would be moved.

It was felt that the area between the Chemistry and Agriculture Buildings could be available for the site. Just how far to the west it should go was discussed with the recommendation that the Building Committee and/or the Board would need to pass on it as it involves the seismograph and the underground listening equipment in connection with it as well as the parking lot.

3177. Chemical Research Building (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps & White)

Little research has been made on the number of 500-capacity classrooms needed on the campus. One is scheduled in the new Business Administration Building and another in the new Biology Building. Dr. Dennis suggested that two be included in the proposed enlargement of the project but he did not know that two are planned in other buildings.

It was the consensus that one 500-capacity room be included in the project. (Dr. Dennis concurred.)

Overall college scheduling is made more difficult with 500-capacity classes. There is a need to be sure that departments plan to continue large classes. It was recommended that a study be made before additional rooms of the same are added.

The CPC approved Mr. W. N. Smith as Resident Inspector on recommendation of the project architects.

3178. Classrooms (Temporary)

It will be necessary to take action at the February Board meeting in order to have the temporary facilities ready for next fall. Miss Clewell has estimated that one building more than that originally requested may be needed.

The Board has authorized the Building Committee to work with the CPC on materials and type in an amount not to exceed \$100,000.

The CPC is still of the opinion that the wooden buildings, as recommended, would provide the cheapest space and the most flexibility of use.

3179. Constitutional Building Amendment

As a result of the increase in the discount rate, the financial adviser feels that no large bond issues should be ~~used~~ in the near future and that there is a need to go slow and study the market.

3180. Consulting Architect

Steps are being taken to develop procedures for recommendation to the Building Committee.

3181. Director of College Facilities

The CPC agreed that, in view of the recommendation for a consulting architect, the Director of College Facilities will not be recommended at this time. If future events should indicate an advantage in the position, it would be recommended at that time.

3182. Engineering Survey

Zumwalt & Vinther have been designated as the engineers to make the survey. The contract has been approved by all involved and was sent to the Chairman of the Board of Directors on January 12, 1966, for approval.

3183. Field House

It was agreed that a special meeting will be held with the Committee of the Athletic Council but, first, a statement on the general scope, need and justifications will be requested from the Council.

3184. Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building (CPC No. 79-63)  
(Bennett Construction Company, \$1,104,230)

A. General Contract

All of the necessary documents have been prepared, executed and submitted to the HHFA for concurrence. The next step is authorization from the HHFA to issue the work order.

B. Elevator Contract  
(Hunter-Hayes Elevator Company)

All of the necessary documents have been prepared, executed and submitted to the HHFA for concurrence. The next step is authorization from the HHFA to issue the work order.

3185. Housing

A. On-Campus

Food Consultant

A few minor items need to be ironed out before the formal contract is prepared.

B. Off-Campus

1. O'Meara-Chandler Corporation, 4140 Southwest Freeway, Houston

The project is out of the ground. It looks as if the second floor on one wing is being formed, and the first floor on another wing apparently is pretty well in place.

2. Frenchmen's Creek Group

No information has been heard since the visit in December.

3. University Dormitory Development, Inc., Chicago, Illinois

The City Council, on January 10, 1966, approved the zoning, with some stipulations.

4. University Housing Construction, Ltd., Omaha, Nebraska

Mr. Taylor reported that Mr. Elmore told him that the financing is not complete but they are expecting to complete it today or tomorrow.

5. Additional Off-Campus Units

The CPC was told to go slow on the approval of additional off-campus units until further information is available.

3186. Library (Completion of South Basement and Third Floor)  
(Ed Lampe Building Contractor, Lubbock, \$155,205)

A. General Contract

All information has been submitted to HHFA for concurrence. The next step is the issuance of the work order. A preconstruction conference will be arranged soon.

B. Elevator  
(Hunter-Hayes Elevator Company, Dallas, \$1,746)

All information has been submitted to HHFA for concurrence. The next step is the issuance of the work order. A preconstruction conference will be arranged soon.



3187. Other ItemsA. City of Lubbock Water Easement

The City officials have been notified of the Board's action at the last meeting. The reply has been received that work is being done on the proposed procedures to be presented to the CPC.

B. Concrete Testing

A cost check was made and the report prepared by Mr. Taylor is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 611, page 1892)

It was the consensus that the charges are pretty much standard, the amount spent is in line with good construction procedures and no change in the operation seems indicated.

C. Educational Television (Addition of Room)

Mr. Downing reported that the room cannot be added until summer, as it will be necessary to interrupt the broadcast if it is done prior to that time.

D. Paving Between Bookstore and Doak Hall

Plans are complete, bids will be opened on April 1, 1966, and work to be completed between April 6 and 18, 1966.

E. Paving at the Stadium

In further checking with Mr. Crain, he is still of the opinion that we can pave the north end and have the entrances as suggested by our plans. The work should be done in the summer months because of the 3 and 4 course penetration application of the material to be used.

This is a summer activity and this work could be bid in May at the end of the school term, and work be done any time between June 20 and July 1, 1966.

F. Southwestern Public Service Company Easement

Mr. Taylor has received a reply from the company that they prefer to go along Flint Avenue and not to change to Indiana, due to the fact that it will be a much shorter route for them.

It was agreed to recommend the easement along Flint and that Mr. Taylor will ask a group to work with the Southwestern Public Service Company on the conditions of the easement, with the understanding that the easement is to be without cost to the College now or in the future, and to play as safe as possible in view of the future developments of the College.

3188. Priority ListA. Educational and General

The following is an alphabetical summary of the projects mentioned to date, with a few random remarks:

1. Administration Building 1.5 m m
2. Agricultural Plant Sciences 350 m
3. Architecture Addition 500 m

Mr. Barrick reported that the draft of the program and need is being typed.

4. Chemistry (Undergraduate)

It apparently is now a part of the study of the Chemical Research Building.

3188. Priority ListA. Educational and General (continued)5. Classroom-Office Building 200 m6. Engineering Facilities

There probably is a need for hydrology and testing facilities 350 m in Civil Engineering.

In Dean Bradford's letter of October 9, 1965, he requested consideration for a fluid dynamics laboratory, materials science lab, human performance lab and a nuclear science center.

7. Extension and Correspondence — (included in another list)8. Graduate and/or Research Facilities9. Home Economics - 600 m10. Home Management 200 m11. Law Building 100 m

As Dr. Pearce talked to various prospective deans of law and visited facilities, he kept notes and summarized his findings. A copy of his letter of December 26, 1965, is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 612, page 1893)

It probably will be necessary to wait for a law dean before any work is done on the preparation of the plans and specifications.

Law schools are eligible under Title II for matching funds.

12. Library Addition 300 m13. Men's Physical Education 300 m

Some of the requested and approved facilities were removed from the project last time due to lack of funds.

14. Museum 600 m

While the money is not in sight at the moment, it was felt that it would be possible to recommend architects in time for the meeting of the Board of Directors on February 11, 1966, and to start drawing the plans and specifications. Probably the expenses could be borne from funds on hand until construction is started.

It was agreed that a recommendation for architects and a specific recommendation on the number of square feet to be provided by the College will be made at the February Board meeting.

In view of the legislative or statutory requirements, it will be necessary to have the advance approval of the Governor for the Museum.

15. Music - 400 m16. Physics

Under the date of December 14, 1965, Dr. H. C. Thomas, Head of the Department of Physics, outlined the needs of the Physics Department.

He has reported that there are 20,000 square feet now in use. When the Biology Department moves, the department will have about 12,000 additional square feet and the total will be one-half of the 1975 needs. He suggests that an addition to the Science

3188. Priority ListA. Educational and General (continued)16. Physics (continued)

Building be considered at this time and believes that there should be an academic priority plan with more accent on graduate research. A copy of Dr. Thomas' letter is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 613, page 1894)

17. Physical Plant Addition 200 m

Mr. Downing has developed most of the space requirements.

18. Power Plant 500 m

It will be part of the study by Zumwalt & Vinther.

19. Roads, Walks, etc. 300 m20. Utilities - 1 m m

It, too, will be a part of the original study by Zumwalt & Vinther.

21. Women's Physical Education 300 + swimming pool?

Again, some of the requested and approved facilities were removed from the project last time due to a lack of funds.

The availability of funds, consulting architect, and Board action could provide a trend for development and implementation.

It was felt that there is no advantage in making a specific recommendation at the meeting today, but the projects will be considered again at the February meeting for presentation to the Board on February 11, 1966.

B. Noneducational and GeneralUnion

The Union is involved in the cost and financing of the residence halls through the HHFA.

C. Texas Tech Press Addition

It is included in the study of the Physical Plant Facilities.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Campus Planning Committee  
January 13, 1966  
Attachment No. 608  
Item 3177

PITTS, MEBANE, PHELPS & WHITE  
Architects & Engineers

470 Orleans Street    Beaumont, Texas 77701

TE 2-2567/713

MEMORANDUM TO FILE NO. 16

December 17, 1965

Re:            Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building  
              and Chemistry Research Building  
              Texas Technological College  
              Lubbock, Texas

Chemistry Research Building

On Thursday, December 16, 1965, a conference relative to the subject project was held at Texas Technological College. The purpose of the conference was to determine the direction to be taken by the Architects-Engineers toward the completion of their services on the Chemistry Research Facility project. (Mr. Marshall Pennington had instructed the Architects-Engineers to terminate all work on the project as of December 1, 1965, pending the outcome of the Board Meeting on December 11, 1965.)

Attending this meeting and representing Texas Technological College were the following:

Mr. Harold Hinn  
Member Board of Directors  
Chairman, Building Committee

Mr. C. A. Cash  
Member Board of Directors  
Member Building Committee

Mr. Marshall Pennington  
Vice President for Business Affairs

Mr. John Taylor  
Business Manager

Mr. Nolan E. Barrick  
Supervising Architect

Mr. Elo J. Urbanovsky  
Head, Department of Park Administration,  
Horticulture & Entomology

Dr. Joe Dennis  
Head, Chemistry Department

Dr. Rekers  
Chemistry Department

Memorandum to File No. 16

Re: Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building  
and Chemistry Research Building  
Texas Technological College

Page Two  
December 17, 1965

After discussion and due consideration to the future growth and expansion of the Chemistry Department, the Architects-Engineers were instructed to make a site utilization study of the area between the existing Chemistry Building and the Agriculture Building. This study will take the following considerations:

1. Optimum site utilization considering functional relationships, economy, aesthetics, etc.
2. A minimum four-story construction for laboratory, office, classroom facilities.
3. Relationship of future undergraduate expansion to existing Chemistry Building.
4. Relationship of future graduate expansion to the program presently proposed.
5. Construction of only graduate facilities at this time unless master plan indicated the best utilization of the site to include undergraduate facilities.
6. Possible inclusion of lecture rooms to seat approximately 500, primarily for the use of the Chemistry Department.
7. Possible expansion of the scope of the work to be constructed at the present time.

A fee proposal will be presented to Mr. Pennington by the Architects-Engineers for the above study. Should this study be expanded into a revised construction program, appropriate credit for fees paid for such study will be applied to the fee for the full architectural and engineering service for the revised construction program.

PITTS, MEBANE, PHELPS & WHITE

/s/ James D. Budd

James D. Budd

JDB/mm

Copies to: Mr. Marshall Pennington (3)  
Mr. Nolan Barrick (6)  
Mr. Clarence Gilmore (3)  
Mr. George Smith (1)

LWP RRP RW MHB JDB File

To all Conferees: After reviewing this memorandum, please notify the writer should you find any statements contained therein which are inconsistent with your understanding of the decisions reached.



Campus Planning Committee  
January 13, 1966  
Attachment No. 609  
Item 3177

PITTS, MEBANE, PHELPS & WHITE  
Architects & Engineers

December 22, 1965

Mr. Marshall L. Pennington  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Re: Chemistry: Site Utilization Studies  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

Dear Mr. Pennington:

Pursuant to our telephone conference of yesterday, we wish to suggest that the following approximations or space objectives and confirmation be forwarded to us so that our work in connection with the subject studies might be more accurately tailored to Tech's projected Chemistry Department enrollment and research facility needs:

A. Initial Program

1. Undergraduate Facilities:

- (a) Square feet of laboratory and laboratory service area.
- (b) Square feet of office, seminar, etc., area.

2. Graduate or Research Facilities:

- (a) Square feet of laboratory and laboratory service area.
- (b) Square feet of office, seminar, etc., area.

B. Ultimate Program\*

1. Undergraduate Facilities:

- (a) Square feet of laboratory and laboratory service area.
- (b) Square feet of office, seminar, etc., area.

2. Graduate or Research Facilities:

- (a) Square feet of laboratory and laboratory service area.
- (b) Square feet of office, seminar, etc., area.

C. Number of 500 seat lecture rooms to be provided initially and ultimately "primarily for use by the Chemistry Department," but, presumably, located to be conveniently accessible to other departments. (See Memorandum to File No. 16, dated December 17, copy attached.)

D. Confirmation that the site may exclusively be utilized, with the possible exception of facilities mentioned in "C" above, by the Chemistry Department.

(\*If it can be anticipated that the ultimate program might, after construction of the initial expansion, be accomplished incrementally, any approximation of the incremental scopes would be beneficial to the Architects-Engineers.)

PITTS, MEBANE, PHELPS & WHITE  
Architects & Engineers/470 Orleans Street/Beaumont, Texas 77701

1890A

Mr. Marshall Pennington  
Texas Technological College  
Re: Chemistry, Site Utilization Studies

December 22, 1965  
Page Two

Although we regret the temporary suspension of our service on the Chemistry research facilities, we appreciate the opportunity to assist in the studies you are seeking.

As discussed, we suggest that our service with respect to these studies be done basically on a per diem plus cost of travel and subsistence basis. Site studies which we recently conducted for Shell Oil Company in Norco, Louisiana, and Mobil Oil Company in Beaumont were agreeably and successfully performed on this basis. Enclosed is a time record copy we have prepared for and are currently using in connection with work we are doing for Humble Oil & Refining Company, on this basis. Also enclosed is a copy of our current hourly rates. These rates include all overhead items, including general stenographic service and typing time and profit. Travel expenses would be on a reimbursement basis. Time actually spent in travel is chargeable at the listed rates. We are accustomed to, when working on this basis and once a program has been furnished, submitting an estimate of projected total fee cost to our client, and after work has been authorized and commenced, forwarding periodic accounts of fees earned and approximate percentages of study completion. Accurate time records are maintained and forwarded with our statements.

Upon receipt of your suggestions as to program, we will immediately forward to you our approximation of the charges which might be incurred in our studies. Upon your notice to proceed, we will then immediately commence our analysis.

Best personal regards and wishes for the holidays,

PITTS, MEBANE, PHELPS & WHITE

/s/ Robert White

Robert White

RW/eh(b)  
encls.

PITTS, MEBANE, PHELPS & WHITE, ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS  
470 Orleans Street, Beaumont, Texas - Telephone TE2-2567

SCHEDULE OF HOURLY RATES

January 1, 1965

Senior Principal	\$30.00/hr.
Junior Principal	\$22.50/hr.
Project Architect or Engineer	\$16.00/hr.
Senior Draftsman & Estimator	\$12.00/hr.
Draftsman	\$ 9.00/hr.

PITTS, MEBANE, PHELPS & WHITE  
ARCHITECTS & ENGINEERS  
BEAUMONT, TEXAS

TIME RECORD

Re: Petroleum Products Laboratory  
Consolidation  
Humble Oil and Refining Company  
Baytown, Texas  
Employee \_\_\_\_\_

Period Beginning \_\_\_\_\_  
Period Ending \_\_\_\_\_

HOURS WORKED EACH DAY								HOURS WORKED	
1st week of this period	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.	S.T.	O.T.
S. T. HOURS Worked									
O. T. HOURS Worked									
2nd week of this period									
S. T. HOURS Worked									
O. T. HOURS Worked									
TOTAL S. T. HOURS									
TOTAL O. T. HOURS									

I certify that I have worked the hours recorded above on the dates indicated on the Subject Project.

All hours were worked in the office. ( )

Following dates involved work out of PMP&W office \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_. Travel to \_\_\_\_\_  
on \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_  
Return to PMP&W office \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

Campus Planning Committee  
January 13, 1966  
Attachment No. 610  
Item 3177

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Department of Chemistry

January 10, 1966

Mr. M. L. Pennington  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

Dear Mr. Pennington:

I furnish herewith some information as directed and in connection with memoranda from Pitts, Mebane, Phelps and White.

1. The memorandum dated December 17, 1965, item 2, page 2:  
It is my recollection that as much five-story construction as possible was to be planned.
2. The memorandum dated December 22, 1965:  
I am sending herewith analyses of both undergraduate and graduate space needed. No answer is made in these analyses concerning site to be available to chemistry. Previous conferences on this matter yielded the conclusion that the space between the Chemistry and Agriculture buildings could all be used by Chemistry for future needs, including as much of the parking lot as needed.

You will note that the initial program (undergraduate and graduate) totals 73,628 square feet of usable space.

The "ultimate" program includes 133,080 square feet of usable space.

I hope this information will be useful to the architects.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Joe Dennis

Joe Dennis, Head  
Department of Chemistry

JD:ms(b)

Enclosures

CC: Mr. Harold Hinn  
Dr. R. C. Goodwin  
Mr. Bob White



## NEW CHEMISTRY

## Undergraduate Facilities

(all figures denote usable space)

## A. Initial program

1. Square feet of laboratory area	13,400
2. Square feet of service facilities	1,000
3. Square feet of office space	1,000
4. Seminar room	400
5. Three small classrooms seating 100	<u>3,600</u>
Subtotal	19,400
6. Square feet large classrooms, two seating 500 each	11,070
7. Two preparation rooms for these classrooms	<u>600</u>
Total	31,070

## B. Ultimate program

1. Double items A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, A-5	19,400
2. It is believed now that no additional 500-seat classrooms would be needed	
Total Ultimate	50,470

## NEW CHEMISTRY

Graduate Facilities  
(all figures denote usable space)

## A. Initial program

1. Square feet of laboratory space	26,109
2. Square feet of office space	3,109
3. Seminar and conference room	840
4. Service areas or storerooms (variable, depending on exact plans)	2,000
5. General departmental area (low temperature room, shop, high pressure room, etc.)	2,500
6. Office and research area for Welch professor and his students	<u>8,000</u>

Initial program total      42,558

## B. Ultimate program

1. Double items A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4	32,058
2. Item 5 is highly questionable, depends on exact type of structure	4,000
3. Increase item A-6 by 50 percent	<u>4,000</u>

Ultimate program total      82,616

Campus Planning Committee  
 January 13, 1966  
 Attachment No. 611  
 Item 3187-B

CONCRETE TESTING  
 by Dyess Testing

January 12, 1966

Consolidated Food Service

\$ 1,546.00

Unit Costs

1 concrete cylinder @ \$6.00 (a)  
 1 field density @ \$8.00  
 1 concrete mix design @ \$45.00'

Central Food Facility

2,458.00

Unit Costs

1 concrete cylinder @ \$6.00 (a)  
 1 field density @ \$8.00  
 1 Proctor density @ \$45.00

Men's No. 9 and 10

7,343.21

Unit Costs

1 concrete cylinder @ \$5.00  
 concrete control @ 50¢ per yd.  
 concrete control @ 60¢ per yd.  
 1 concrete mix design @ \$45.00

TOTAL ALL THREE PROJECTS

\$11,347.21

(a) A few cylinders were tested for \$5.00.

Campus Planning Committee  
January 13, 1966  
Attachment No. 612  
Item 3188-A-11

## TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE

Lubbock, Texas

Vice President  
for  
Academic Affairs

December 26, 1965

M E M O R A N D U M

Mr. M. L. Pennington  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
Campus

Dear Mr. Pennington:

There follow some observations on law school buildings gleaned from my visits to ten law schools and conferences with some two dozen law deans, faculty members, and librarians. While opinions differ on the more detailed aspects of a building--and it will be up to our dean and his faculty to communicate their own ideas at the proper time--there is consensus among the persons I have consulted with on these points:

1. The building should be sited and constructed to permit enlargement, vertically and horizontally, in the future.

Those institutions which as late as three years ago constructed law buildings deemed sufficient in size to accommodate their students for a number of years are already facing space shortages. Where no provision was made for enlargement, the problem of expansion is a baffling one. Even those private schools which have contemplated small enrollments, with the expectation that public universities would absorb the increase in student registrations, are feeling the pressure to share the load in legal education.

2. The building should be separate but not remote from the rest of the institution.

The law school is a professional graduate school with an identity of its own, fairly well self-contained, and with a degree of autonomy not common to the undergraduate schools in the university.

3. The law building should be accessible not only to students but to practicing members of the bar.

Members of the bar make use of university law libraries, and contacts between active professionals on one hand and faculty and students on the other are essential.

Mr. M. L. Pennington  
 December 26, 1965  
 Page 2

4. In addition to faculty offices and class and seminar rooms, the building should include:

The law library  
 Courtroom  
 Locker room  
 Faculty lounge  
 Student lounge  
 Facilities for the staff of the law journal

The law library is not only a library as such, it is a laboratory. If faculty offices are located near the library, the need for a faculty library is precluded.

A courtroom, designed as such, is highly desirable. At Vanderbilt, the courtroom is used for classes also.

The locker room is essential; law students' books are many and large, and a majority of students have their own typewriters.

I suggest that a visit be made to the Vanderbilt law building which was constructed in 1962. A number of persons have recommended that anyone planning a new law facility should visit the University of Utah's School of Law.

At some universities, special provisions are made for housing law students in the immediate vicinity of the law school. I was told that from fifty to sixty percent of law students are married, and that where a law dormitory is constructed, it should be designed to house both married students and single students.

Considerable variations in the size of classrooms exist. The largest classrooms--generally tiered and semicircular in plan--depend on the number of students which the school places in the freshman classes or in the sections of its freshman courses. At Texas, freshman sections contain about one hundred and twenty-five (125) students. At another institution I visited, the entering freshman class is limited to one hundred and fifty (150) students; these are divided into two sections, and the largest classrooms seat seventy-five (75) students. I have no idea as to what our dean and his faculty will decide with respect to the entering class size and the size of the various sections. Many of the men we have interviewed have indicated that, when a class contains more than eighty students, all individual contact is lost and communication is impaired.

The information above represents only a portion of what my notes contain with respect to a law school and its operation; this is, however, a summary of the information relative to the construction of the facility.

Sincerely,

/s/ W. M. Pearce

W. M. Pearce  
 Vice President for  
 Academic Affairs

C. Dr. R. C. Goodwin



Campus Planning Committee  
January 13, 1966  
Attachment No. 613  
Item 3188-A-16

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
P. O. Box 4180  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Department of Physics

December 14, 1965

Mr. M. L. Pennington  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
Campus

Dear Mr. Pennington:

The Physics Department has given serious consideration to its plans for development for the next 10 years. We think we can estimate fairly closely the space that will be needed. Further it seems likely that a department which gets additional space in the near future could not expect additional space soon, say in five years or so. If this is so, it would seem wise to plan for the space necessary for the next 10 years.

Our plans for the next 10 years are based on the following data and estimates:

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1975</u>
Faculty	11	25
Graduate Students	27	75-100
Undergraduate Majors (Physics and Engr. Phys.)	150	300
Teaching Load	4600	10,000

Our major growth, we hope, will be in our graduate program. The space requirements for our 1975 load will be about 66,000 sq. ft. of usable space.

We now have about 20,000 sq. ft. of usable space. Equal sharing of the space vacated by Biology with Geosciences and Physics will give us about 12,000 sq. ft. more. This is just about one-half of what we will need by 1975.

I suggest, therefore, that an addition to the Science building be considered at this time. The addition would not need to be built now, necessarily, but plans would need to be made soon.

I am well aware of the needs for more space for many of the departments. I believe, however, that space should be provided in a way that the academic, and specifically the graduate program, at Tech can be improved most rapidly. This calls for an academic priority plan which apparently is not available. I am convinced that the present plan of roughly equal distribution of wealth will leave most if not all departments woefully short of even acceptable graduate status. Naturally, I hoped that physics would be one of the departments chosen as one most likely to succeed and hence one to be pushed, but I am willing to take my chances on that.

I recognize that you may not be in a position to do anything about our needs, but I wanted to put them before you so that, at least, you will be familiar with them.

Sincerely,

/s/ H. C. Thomas

H. C. Thomas

HCT:ch

cc: Dr. R. C. Goodwin  
Dean S. M. Kennedy

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 279      January 13, 1966

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 1:30 p.m. on January 13, 1966, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Other members of the college staff present were Mr. O. R. Downing, Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. Guy J. Moore.

The project architects were represented by Mr. Howard Schmidt and Mr. Bob Messersmith.

3189. Housing

On-Campus

The purpose of the meeting is to review the developments to date, particularly the elevations and perspectives.

Typical Tower

Mr. Schmidt said that, once again, the architects have gone over the typical tower with Mr. Moore, Mrs. Garner and Mr. Lewis of the Housing staff.

He reviewed the following information with the CPC:

Fifty-two student spaces on each floor; 11 residential floors to each tower; room design very similar to that used in the past; the center core stairs, storage, maid rooms, two elevators with space for the third, toilets, hair washing sink, showers, two bathtubs, typing and ironing area, trash chute, air ducts, etc.

It was the consensus that the typical tower is in order.

First Floor

There would be two towers above. The formal carpeted lounge, control points, house phones, kitchenette, fire stair, air duct, elevator lobby, sign-out space, apartments for counselor and assistant counselor, overflow room, Student Government meeting room, dry-cleaning room, snack bar service, trash removal, laundry room service, etc., were reviewed and approved.

Basement

The elevators, electric outlets, trunk storage, linen service, laundry and study room, storage area, TV viewing room, maid facilities, trash accumulation facilities, dumpster-type trash removal carts, utility tunnel entrance, mechanical space, etc., were reviewed and approved.

Commons

First Floor

The dining facilities and the related facilities were again presented and reviewed. Mr. Schmidt said that the kitchen service has been reviewed with Mr. Arthur W. Dana, who has participated in the development of the plans.

3189. HousingOn-CampusCommons (continued)Basement

The preparation kitchen, freight elevator to the serveries, offices, mailroom, snack bar, postoffice, etc., were reviewed and discussed.

It was the consensus that there should eventually be three snack bars in the six towers of the complex.

The architects were requested to study the location of a postoffice on the north side of the commons building.

Streets

The street arrangements were presented and studied and the CPC requested the architects to do additional studies on the street layouts and the pedestrian usage.

Cost

The architects said that the estimated cost is based on the same unit price as that of Men's 9 and 10.

Site Plan

The architects presented drawings of the elevations and perspectives, which were reviewed and discussed in detail.

It was the consensus that the scale and perspectives are good. The architects said that they plan to present drawings from different views for the Building Committee at the meeting on Tuesday, January 18, 1966.

The CPC asked the architects to refine and present the drawings to the Building Committee.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m. The next meeting is to be held with the Building Committee of the Board of Directors at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, January 18, 1966, in room 120 of the Administration Building.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 280                      January 19, 1966

A meeting of the Campus and Building Committee of the Board of Directors and the Campus Planning Committee was held at 4 p.m. on January 19, 1966, in the Office of the President.

Members of the Campus and Building Committee present were Mr. Harold Hinn, Chairman, and Mr. C. A. Cash.

Members of the Campus Planning Committee present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Other members of the college staff present were Dr. R. C. Goodwin, Mr. O. R. Downing, Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. Guy J. Moore.

The project architects were represented by Mr. Howard Schmidt and Mr. Bob Messersmith.

3190. Housing

On-Campus

It was explained that the purpose of the meeting is to review the developments to date. The information is much the same as that presented to the CPC the preceding week, with additional refinements and drawings. The architects are on a very tight schedule and approval of the Building Committee is needed to start detailed working drawings and specifications in order to stay on the schedule.

Site Plan

The architects went over the orientation of the three towers and the commons on the site plan, tennis courts, date pick-up area, street intersections, ingress and egress and all the items presented to the CPC last week.

Residential Floor

The 52 spaces per floor, with one graduate student in charge; bedroom arrangements, core plan, and all the items presented to the CPC last week were discussed.

The corridor design was presented and the philosophy explained. In the past, corridors have been 6' wide with asphalt floor, vinyl walls and well lighted. The new plan is to lower the lighting level to discourage gatherings in the halls and have painted concrete block walls, carpets, etc.

The Building Committee questioned the concrete block walls and were assured that blocks can be attractively handled and successful installations have been observed.

The Building Committee also questioned the room partitions and were told that the use of the double plastered walls in the present system would be continued in order to provide adequate acoustical properties as designed by Bolt, Maroneck and Newman, the acoustical consultants on other projects.

First Floor

The information presented to the CPC last week was presented to the Building Committee.

3190. HousingOn-CampusBasement

The architects reviewed the material presented to the CPC the past week with the Building Committee.

Commons

The central post office had been added to the plan, in keeping with the suggestion of the CPC.

The size of the commons area is 268' x 186'. The architects explained that Mr. Arthur W. Dana had prepared the working arrangements for the kitchens and dining rooms. The entire plan was reviewed.

Elevations

A good many different drawings of the elevations were presented and studied. About the only proposed change from the elevations of other buildings would be the curtain wall under the windows with the explanation that there would be a full panel for review of the Board at the February meeting. The panels would provide economy and faster installation and would be harmonious with other buildings.

Perspectives

Various perspectives in color also were reviewed.

Brochures

The architects presented elaborate brochures of the design, philosophy, budget, time schedule, etc., and the Building Committee requested that copies be mailed to the other members of the Board of Directors.

Working Drawings

The Building Committee authorized the architects to begin detailed working drawings, with the stipulation that all the developments to date be presented to and reviewed by the full Board of Directors on February 11, 1966.

Window Plans

It was agreed that more time is needed to study the window plans and the panel is to be set up for review by the Board at the February meeting, if at all possible.

3191. Chemical Research Building (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps & White)

The developments since the change of plans at the meeting of the Board of Directors on December 13, 1965, were reviewed and discussed.

The Chairman reported that Mr. Bob White of the project architects had called and said that the study would cost between \$2,300 and \$3,000. Twenty-three hundred dollars would be the minimum and the \$3,000 would allow for a few alternates and contingencies and would be the maximum. If the study should go very well and cost less than \$2,300, the College would pay the actual amount.

3191. Chemical Research Building (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps & White)

The estimated time required is about three weeks. It would crowd the architects to have the study completed by February 11, 1966, but they will keep it in mind. The study would be a "comprehensive analysis which would culminate in schematic drawings, indicating the program outlined by Dr. Dennis to provide the optimum site utilization."

The Building Committee authorized the architects to proceed, and the Chairman of the CPC is to notify them.

500-Capacity Classroom

Only one 500-capacity classroom is to be included in the project, and the Chairman of the CPC is to notify the architects.

Site Utilization

The architects had raised the question as to the site available. The Building Committee was of the opinion that the seismograph should not stand in the way of the development of a permanent building.

Budget

There was a good bit of discussion on how much of the proposed project could be constructed in the first phase, with the decision being deferred for a later date when more information is available.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m. The next meeting of the Campus and Building Committee and the Campus Planning Committee is to be at 1:30 p.m. on February 11, 1966.



TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 281      February 8, 1966

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 1 p.m. on February 8, 1966, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Other members of the college staff present were Miss Evelyn Clewell, Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. Bill Felty. Mr. O. R. Downing was unable to attend, as he was in New York.

3192. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of Meetings Nos. 277, 278, 279, and 280 were approved.

3193. President's Approval of Minutes

President Goodwin approved the Minutes of Meetings Nos. 277 on January 19, 1966, 278 on February 5, 1966, 279 on January 19, 1966, and 280 on January 31, 1966.

3194. Agricultural Facilities (CPC No. 93-64)

Horse Facilities (\$59,000)

Cold weather has delayed the pouring of concrete, but work will start again as soon as the weather is warm enough.

3195. Biology Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce)

A. Application for Matching Funds

Title I

The request is on the Agenda for consideration of the Coordinating Board on February 14, 1966. In view of the fact that the Business Administration Building has the higher priority, it is very doubtful that matching funds will be approved for the project at the meeting.

The funds available to the Coordinating Board for allocation amount to approximately \$7.2 million, but the requests total in excess of \$19 million.

Title II

Mr. Taylor reported that he, Mr. Felty, and the architects are shooting for February 15, 1966, as a deadline for filing the application for matching funds for the research and graduate portions of the project under Title II.

B. Committee

After a good bit of consideration, the tabulation of the space survey prepared by the special committee comprised of Miss Clewell, Mr. Urbanovsky, and Mr. Felty, and compiled by Miss Clewell was adopted.

Some reservations were expressed on the proposed use of general space in areas 14, 16, and 17 in the basement which is designed for the E M laboratories and training.

The report is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 614, page 1905)

3195. Biology Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce)

C. Preliminary Plans and Specifications

It was agreed to recommend the presentation of the preliminary plans for consideration of the Board of Directors at the meeting on May 28, 1966. The complexity of the building necessitates a longer planning period.

3196. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page, Southerland & Page)

A. Application for Matching Funds

The request is on the Agenda for the meeting of the Coordinating Board on February 14, 1966. Texas Tech probably will be most fortunate if the entire \$1.5 million requested is approved from the \$7.2 million available.

B. Preliminary Plans

Mr. Louis Southerland called on January 26, 1966, in keeping with the arrangement, to let us know before the end of January whether or not the project architects could have the equivalent of preliminary plans available for the Board Meeting on February 11, 1966.

Mr. Southerland said that he had received the last information from Miss Kirkwood which included the CPC's comments for a number of changes. He said that much of the information had been put into the plans by them but some are pretty major and he feels that it would be impossible, without rushing more than would be sound, to have the plans ready by February 11, 1966.

For instance, the move of the mechanical equipment from the place where it was originally shown to the penthouse would be a major move. He plans to bring two schemes when he next comes to the campus. He thinks that there will be some undue complications in having to add another story to provide the penthouse for the installation of the equipment. He was told that it would be in order not to present the information to the Board of Directors on February 12, 1966, as it would not be in the best interest of the College to attempt to complete the plans in such a hurry.

He is to let us know when he is ready, and will come for a meeting with the CPC before any of the plans are put into final form.

It looks as if it will be necessary for the Building Committee to meet prior to the April 23, 1966, meeting of the Board of Directors for approval of the preliminary plans and specifications, in order that the architects can stay on the time schedule.

3197. Chemistry Research Building (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps & White)

Study by Architects

Approval of the Building Committee for the study was conveyed to the architects on January 24, 1966, and Mr. Robert White summarized it in a letter of the same date. The letter is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 615, page 1906)

On February 7, 1966, Mr. Bob White called again and said that the architects will be unable to complete the study for the Board Meeting on February 12, 1966, but they will continue the study as expeditiously as possible.

3198. Classrooms and Offices (Temporary) (CPC No. 102-65)

The Campus Planning Committee agreed to accept Miss Clewell's recommendation for eight temporary classroom buildings and two faculty office buildings for a total of ten buildings.

It looks as if it would be possible to build the ten buildings for approximately the \$100,000 stipulated by the Board.

On reconsideration, it was agreed that the wooden buildings still seem to be the most economical and feasible means of providing the temporary classrooms and faculty offices needed. Another advantage is the ease with which the buildings can be moved if and when necessary.

It was agreed that it probably will be necessary to secure an architectural firm to draw the plans and specifications, help with the building, and to supervise the construction.

It was recommended that the Campus Planning Committee be allowed an opportunity for additional study before recommending architects.

The tentative site would be to the west of the Library. However, with the aid of the architect, it would be wise to study other locations before deciding finally. There could be some advantages from the use standpoint in placing the buildings in more than the one site. From the economy of construction standpoint, the one site would be preferable.

It was agreed to recommend that the Building Committee be authorized to approve the commissioning of architects and the site.

If at all possible, bids would be presented to the Board of Directors for approval at the April 23, 1966, Board Meeting.

3199. Constitutional Building Amendment

No additional information has been received.

3200. Consulting Architect

Information is expected at almost any time on the proposed definition, duties, functions, fees, etc.

3201. Engineering Survey (CPC No. 100-65) (Zumwalt & Vinther, \$10,000)

The letter prepared by Mr. Jack F. Roberts of Zumwalt & Vinther under the date of February 8, 1966, summarized the developments to date and a copy is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 616, page 1907)

3202. Field House

The request of the Campus Planning Committee at the last meeting was conveyed to the Athletic Council for information on the general scope, need and justifications for the project.

3203. Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps & White)

A. General Contract

A preconstruction conference was held on February 3, 1966, and was considered satisfactory by all present.

(Mr. Bill Felty left the meeting at 2:25 p.m.)

The basic excavation is just about finished.

3203. Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps & White)

A. General Contract (continued)

Mr. Wendell Smith, the Resident Inspector, started on the project on February 3, 1966.

All of the additional information requested by the HHFA has been sent with the request that if it is in order, the Notice to Proceed be issued.

Mr. Ron Hamm has been requested to prepare for groundbreaking ceremonies and is working with the departments. He needs to be posted on developments.

B. Resident Inspector

It was agreed that it would be wise for the Resident Inspector to be a college employee if it is possible to work out the arrangements. Mr. Barrick and Mr. Taylor agreed to check with other institutions and the architects on the feasibility.

C. Elevator Contract Status

With the exception of the approval by the Attorney General of the Performance and Payment Bonds, all the necessary instruments have been prepared and forwarded to the HHFA.

3204. Housing

A. On-Campus

As the architects have progressed in the rapid development of plans, some apprehensions have developed on their part over the estimated construction cost of \$7,842,000 and they have recommended that the application of the College be amended to increase the amount by \$158,000 to a total of \$8 million, the maximum allowed under the HHFA procedure.

The CPC recommended the procedure as it is in keeping with Board approval and would provide a safeguard.

The architects have urged the College, if possible, to name the three towers in the new complex for reasons very well set out in Mr. Schmidt's letter of January 31, 1966, a copy of which is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 617, page 1908)

The CPC concurred in the recommendation.

If the presentation of the architects to the Building Committee on February 12, 1966, can be construed as preliminary plans and specifications, it will be unnecessary to present preliminary plans at a later date. To stay on schedule to award a construction contract at the May Board Meeting, it will be necessary for the architects to have final plans and specifications in time for approval at the April 23, 1966, meeting or to be substantially completed to the extent that approval can be obtained.

There may be some financial complications up the road as set out in the excerpt from the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, which is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 618, page 1909)



3204. HousingB. Off-Campus1. O'Meara-Chandler Corporation, 4140 Southwest Freeway, Houston

The project is still going up and the representatives continue to state that the facilities will be ready for occupancy in September, 1966.

2. Frenchmen's Creek Corporation

It was agreed to present the request from the Corporation to the Board of Directors for approval of 1,060 spaces on College Avenue between Tenth and Main Streets, with the understanding that 300 spaces would be ready in September, 1966, and the other spaces will be completed during the school year if the Board of Directors approves the request by mid-February.

3. University Dormitory Development, Inc., Chicago, Illinois

The firm continues to have zoning problems but the representatives are still hopeful that the project can be started soon.

4. University Housing Construction, Ltd., Omaha, Nebraska

The representatives reported on February 3, 1966, that they will have 1,012 spaces ready by September of this year and have assured us that they can and will have them.

5. Nonapproved Off-Campus Housing

A new element has entered the picture with resulting complications. Groups that have not requested Board approval are announcing purported college housing.

An example is the so-called "Tech Housing, Inc.," and its announcement in the paper on January 29, 1966.

The CPC recommended that corrective measures be taken by the Board of Directors to clarify such possible misrepresentations in order to protect the groups which have cleared with the Board and been approved.

There seems to be chaos in the offing.

3205. LibraryA. Completion of South Basement and Third Floor (CPC No. 101-65)  
(Ed Lampe Building Contractor, Lubbock, \$155,205)

The preconstruction conference was held on February 3, 1966.

All of the information has gone to the HHFA for the Notice to Proceed.

Mr. Lampe, the contractor, plans to start construction on February 9, 1966, whether or not the Notice to Proceed from the HHFA has been received by that time. He has the College's blessings to start.

It doesn't look as if much of a groundbreaking ceremony will be possible but some public cognizance would be made. It was recommended that Mr. Hamm prepare a suitable news release.

B. Elevator (Hunter-Hayes Elevator Company, Dallas, \$1,746)

All instruments have been prepared with the exception of the Performance and Payment Bonds, which are at the Attorney General's office.

3206. Museum

It looks as if it will be necessary to have some expert advise-ment on the proper method to proceed, since there is a prohibition against additional museums. This would not exactly be an additional museum. There is a question of interpretation of funds which would require the Governor's approval of the architects, and there is another interpretation in the Coordinating Board bill which stipulates that "anything other than educational and general buildings must be approved by the Governor."

Additional clarification will be attempted prior to the meeting of the Board of Directors on February 12, 1966.

3207. Other ItemsA. Water Easement, City of Lubbock

Nothing new has been heard.

B. Southwestern Public Service Company Easement

Representatives of the College, Southwestern Public Service Company, and Zumwalt & Vinther agreed on January 17, 1966, that it would be better to wait for the completion of the survey before doing additional work on the terms of the easement.

3208. Priority List

In view of the uncertainties of future projects, it was agreed that there is no particular advantage in recommending additional projects for implementation at the moment, and time for additional study is necessary. Recommendations made at the April meeting will be early enough for a request for matching funds.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.



1905

Campus Planning Committee  
February 8, 1966  
Attachment No. 614  
Item 3195-B

A COMPLETE STUDY OF THE BIOLOGY BUILDING  
WITH SUMMARIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Recommendation of the Biology Building

After studying very closely and very much in detail the Biology Building, I would like to recommend:

1. Consideration of moving Graduate Student Offices in the Basement to the 6th floor and use this space in Basement for five classrooms. Space for these Graduate Offices would be the space on the 6th floor, designated by Biology Department as probably not used or needed at the time the building is occupied.

Student traffic would be facilitated by using basement space for classrooms.

2. Relocate on the 4th floor the Micro Labs (Rooms 331 - 332) from 3rd floor. These labs are not being used immediately. This would make available two or three classrooms on 3rd floor which would be a better location than on 4th floor because of student traffic.

The space listed for general use is the same amount as designated by the Biology Department as probably not needed for their use at time building will be occupied. It may not be feasible to make changes as listed on the attached Summary Sheet.

The Summary Sheet will show the additional facilities which could be available at the time the building is occupied and used until Biology grows into the building.

#### Additional General Use:

4 Faculty Offices

Space for 126 Graduate Students (Additional 36 spaces)

15 Additional Classrooms (Space for 778 students)

**BIOLOGY BUILDING**  
The Summary of Each Floor with the  
Number of Rooms, Labs, Etc. and Square Feet

Floor	Faculty Offices		Graduate Offices		Classrooms		Undergraduate Labs		Graduate Labs		Research Labs		Clean-Prep Storage		Miscellaneous, Coll.-Dark Rooms	
	Biology Request	Proposed General Use	Biology Request	Proposed General Use	Biology Request	Proposed General Use	Biology Request	Proposed General Use	Biology Request	Proposed General Use	Biology Request	Proposed General Use	Biology Request	Proposed General Use	Biology Request	Proposed General Use
<u>Basement</u>																
No. Rooms	6	4	28	12	1	6	-	-	-	-	3	2	12	9	6	5
Sq. Ft.	1028	643	3021	1280	5473	9093	-	-	-	-	501	350	5065	4015	4212	3919
<u>First</u>																
No. Rooms	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	8	-	-	-	-	4	4	-	-
Sq. Ft.	-	-	-	-	-	-	8984	8984	-	-	-	-	1088	1088	-	-
<u>Second</u>																
No. Rooms	13	11	-	1	3	6	4	2	-	-	8	6	9	9	2	2
Sq. Ft.	2410	2138	-	358	3152	5946	4276	2138	-	-	4545	3803	1525	1525	316	316
<u>Third</u>																
No. Rooms	4	6	6	-	0	5	3	0	2	2	6	3	9	9	2	2
Sq. Ft.	602	1132	649	-	-	5428	3898	-	1724	1724	2201	790	1968	1968	345	345
<u>Fourth</u>																
No. Rooms	6	6	2	2	1	1	3	3	1	1	10	10	3	3	2	2
Sq. Ft.	818	818	264	264	505	505	3274	3274	505	505	3160	3160	710	710	1279	1279
<u>Fifth</u>																
No. Rooms	6	7	0	2	-	-	3	2	7	6	5	4	7	7	5	5
Sq. Ft.	784	1053	-	1447	-	-	2825	1845	2656	2191	1937	1668	1439	1439	1479	1479
<u>Sixth</u>																
No. Rooms	5	11	-	4	1	1	1	1	4	3	6	3	7	4	24	20
Sq. Ft.	711	1503	-	2309	297	297	787	787	1776	1220	2187	1248	2817	1483	2205	1933
<u>Total No. Rooms</u>																
Rooms	40	44	36	22	5	20	22	16	14	12	38	29	51	45	41	36
<u>Sq. Ft.</u>																
Sq. Ft.	6353	7287	3934	5658	9427	21269	24044	17026	6661	5640	14531	11019	14612	12228	9836	9271
<u>% of Sq. Ft.</u>																
% of Sq. Ft.	7	8	4.4	6.3	10.5	24	26.9	19	7.5	6.3	16.3	12.3	16.4	13.7	11	10.4

Total Square Feet: 89,398

## SUMMARY OF GENERAL AND NEW FACILITIES

<u>Facilities</u>	<u>What Biology had (no.)</u>	<u>What we Proposed (no.)</u>
Classrooms	5	17
Graduate Student Offices	36 (80)	19 (86)
Research Labs and Research Rooms	34	29
Prep, storage, dark rooms, etc. . .	58	50
Faculty offices	33 (34)	32 (34)
Labs	22	16
Graduate Labs	21	12

## SUMMARY OF THE BIOLOGY BUILDING WITH SQUARE FEET

BASEMENT

- 2 - Prep Rooms - 377 sq. ft.
- 2 - Storage Rooms - 1618 sq. ft.
- 5 - Classrooms - 3644 sq. ft.
- 12 - Graduate Offices for 26 people - 1346 sq. ft.
- 2 - Research - 349 sq. ft.
- 6 - Dark Rooms, etc. - 218 sq. ft.
- 3 - Faculty Offices for 4 people - 444 sq. ft.
- 1 - Auditorium - 3721 sq. ft.

FIRST FLOOR

- 8 - Labs - 8970 sq. ft.
- 4 - Prep Rooms - 288 sq. ft.

SECOND FLOOR

- 3 - Faculty Offices - 664 sq. ft.
- 1 - Graduate Offices - 358 sq. ft. (7)
- 6 - Research Labs - 3801 sq. ft.
- 3 - New Classrooms - 2793 sq. ft.
- 3 - General Classrooms - 3152 sq. ft.
- 4 - Prep Rooms - 1084 sq. ft.
- 2 - Labs - 2136 sq. ft.
- 6 - Supplies, Storage, etc. - 731 sq. ft.
- 2 - Faculty Offices - 340 sq. ft.
- 5 - Secretary Offices, Conference, etc. - 828 sq. ft.

THIRD FLOOR

- 5 - Faculty Offices - 859 sq. ft.
- 3 - Research Labs - 789 sq. ft.
- 5 - Classrooms - 5435 sq. ft.
- 1 - Graduate Office for 6 people - 272 sq. ft.
- 2 - Graduate Labs - 1723 sq. ft.
- 6 - Prep Rooms - 1367 sq. ft.
- 4 - Storage, etc. - 740 sq. ft.

FOURTH FLOOR

- 6 - Faculty Offices - 818 sq. ft.
- 10 - Research Labs - 3553 sq. ft.
- 1 - Classroom - 505 sq. ft.
- 1 - Graduate Lab - 504 sq. ft.
- 3 - General Labs - 3273 sq. ft.
- 2 - Graduate Offices for 5 people - 264 sq. ft.
- 2 - Collection Rooms - 1077 sq. ft.
- 2 - Storage, etc. - 437 sq. ft.

FIFTH FLOOR

- 11 - Faculty Offices - 1896 sq. ft.
- 2 - Graduate Offices for 12 people - 734 sq. ft.
- 6 - Graduate Labs - 2186 sq. ft.
- 4 - Research Labs - 1668 sq. ft.
- 2 - Labs - 1843 sq. ft.
- 6 - Storeroom - 1438 sq. ft.
- 5 - Light Rooms, etc. - 1479 sq. ft.

SIXTH FLOOR

- 3 - Graduate Offices for 30 people - 2916 sq. ft.
- 5 - Faculty Offices - 711 sq. ft.
- 1 - Collections Room - 221 sq. ft.
- 4 - Research Labs - 1406 sq. ft.
- 2 - Storage - 796 sq. ft.
- 15 - Control, Cold Rooms, etc. - 1253 sq. ft.
- 4 - Prep Rooms, Dark Rooms, etc. - 881 sq. ft.
- 3 - Graduate Labs - 1220 sq. ft.
- 1 - Lab - 769 sq. ft.
- 1 - Reading Room - 297 sq. ft.

## SUMMARY OF THE BIOLOGY BUILDING

BASEMENT

Classrooms A - 1211 sq. ft.  
 B & C - 980 sq. ft.  
 D - 727 sq. ft.  
 E - 726 sq. ft.  
 Auditorium - 5473 sq. ft.  
 Offices: 12 Graduate Offices for 26 people  
 4 Faculty Offices  
 1 Storage Space  
 1 Shop  
 1 Training and Prep Room

FIRST FLOOR

8 Freshman Labs  
 4 Prep Rooms

SECOND FLOOR

Classrooms 2A - 657 sq. ft.	Classrooms 2D - 2054 sq. ft.	
2B - 1069 sq. ft. General	2E - 671 sq. ft. Classrooms	
2C - 1069 sq. ft. Classroom	2F - 427 sq. ft. That are already	
Offices: 1 Graduate Office - 358 sq. ft.	on Blueprint	
2 Faculty Offices		
Department Head Office: 2 Faculty Offices		
1 Conference Room		
3 Secretary Offices		
3 Graduate Physiology Labs		
3 Research Labs		
2 Advanced Botany Labs		
7 Prep and Storage Rooms		

THIRD FLOOR

Classrooms 3A - 764 sq. ft.  
 3B - 764 sq. ft.  
 3C - 966 sq. ft.  
 Offices: 1 Graduate Office for 6 people  
 5 Faculty Offices for 6 people  
 2 Micro Labs  
 2 Graduate Labs  
 3 Micro Research Labs  
 3 Clean and Prep Rooms  
 4 Storage Spaces  
 2 Graduate Micro Labs

FOURTH FLOOR

Classrooms 3D - 1119 sq. ft.  
 3E - 1107 sq. ft.  
 Offices: 6 Faculty Offices  
 2 Graduate Offices for 6 people  
 1 Vertebrate Lab  
 10 Research Labs  
 1 Seminar Room - 504 sq. ft.  
 2 Collections Rooms  
 3 Prep and Storage Rooms

FIFTH FLOOR

General Office Space - 1750 sq. ft.  
 2 Undergraduate Labs  
 5 Prep and Storage Rooms  
 5 Graduate Labs  
 7 Research Labs

SIXTH FLOOR

Faculty and Graduate Office Space - 3083 sq. ft.  
 Research and Labs will be as they are shown now



The following table reflects the changes of the Biology Building to our General Proposed Use. Only the rooms that were changed are listed.

## BIOLOGY BUILDING

<u>FLOOR</u>	<u>ROOM NO.</u>	<u>SQ. FEET</u>	<u>ULTIMATE BIOLOGY USE</u>	<u>PROPOSED GENERAL USE</u>	<u>REMARKS</u>
Basement	4	831	Cytology Research	Classroom A	All of these rooms will make up the proposed Classroom A and will have a capacity of 85.
	5	97	Clean Room	Classroom A	
	6	122	Clean Room	Classroom A	
	7	<u>161</u>	E M Faculty Office	Classroom A	
		<u>1211</u>			
	28	96	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classrooms B & C	All of these offices will make up the proposed Classrooms B & C and each will have a capacity of 35. Move all the offices to the 6th floor.
	29	96	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classrooms B & C	
	30	103	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classrooms B & C	
	31	103	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classrooms B & C	
	32	103	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classrooms B & C	
	33	103	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classrooms B & C	
	34	188	Office for 4 Graduate Students	Classrooms B & C	
	35	<u>188</u>	Office for 4 Graduate Students	Classrooms B & C	
		<u>980</u>			
	37	167	Lectures Coordinators Office	Classroom D	All of these offices will make up the proposed Classroom D and will have a capacity of 50. Move all offices to the 6th floor.
	38	167	Lab Coordinators Office	Classroom D	
	43	103	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom D	
	44	103	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom D	
	45	94	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom D	
	46	<u>93</u>	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom D	
		<u>727</u>			

<u>FLOOR</u>	<u>ROOM NO.</u>	<u>SQ. FEET</u>	<u>ULTIMATE BIOLOGY USE</u>	<u>PROPOSED GENERAL USE</u>	<u>REMARKS</u>
Basement	39	167	Student Counseling Office	Classroom E	These offices will be used as Classroom E with a capacity of 52. Move all offices to the 6th floor.
	40	167	Student Counseling Office	Classroom E	
	41	93	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom E	
	42	93	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom E	
	47	103	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom E	
	48	<u>103</u>	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom E	
		<u>726</u>			
	14	151	E M Faculty Research	General Faculty Office	Recommendation
	16	197	E M Training	General Faculty Office for 1 or 2 persons	Recommendation
	17	96	Dark Room	General Faculty Office for 1 person	Recommendation
This leaves in the Basement 12 offices for 26 Graduate Teaching Assistants.					
First	--	--	-----	-----	Satisfactory
Second	203	358	Plant Physiology Research	Office for 7 or 8 Graduates	All three of these spaces will make up Classroom 2A and will have a capacity of 40
	208	384	Plant Pathology Research	Classroom 2A	
	209	136	Plant Pathology Office	Classroom 2A	
	210	137	Plant Physiology Office	Classroom 2A	

<u>FLOOR</u>	<u>ROOM NO.</u>	<u>SQ. FEET</u>	<u>ULTIMATE BIOLOGY USE</u>	<u>PROPOSED GENERAL USE</u>	<u>REMARKS</u>
Second	222	1069	Advanced Physiology Botany Lab	Classroom 2B	This area will become Classroom 2B.
	225	<u>1069</u>	Mycology-Plant Pathology Anatomy Lab	Classroom 2C	This area will become Classroom 2C.
		<u>3153</u>			
Third	304	146	Office for 3 Graduate Students	Classroom 3A	The three offices and one-half of Room 307 will be made into Classroom 3A.
	305	89	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom 3A	
	306	89	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom 3A	
	307	889	Advanced Microbiology Research Lab	$\frac{1}{2}$ Classroom 3A $\frac{1}{2}$ Classroom 3B	
	308	89	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom 3B	The three offices and one-half of Room 307 will be made into Classroom 3B.
	309	89	Office for 2 Graduate Students	Classroom 3B	
	310	146	Office for 3 Graduate Students	Classroom 3B	
	311	272	Microbiology Research Lab	Office for 6 Graduate Students	
	316	258	Microbiology Research Lab	Office for 4 Graduate Students and 2 Faculty	Recommendation
	328	<u>966</u>	Advanced Microbiology Undergraduate Lab	Classroom 3C	Recommendation
		<u>3033</u>			
Recommendation: Relocate 331 & 332 (General Microbiology Labs) on 4th floor as a lab.					
Fourth	429	1119	Anatomy & Physiology Lab	Classroom 3D	Recommendation
	431	1107	Comparative Vertebrate Anatomy Lab	Classroom 3E	Recommendation
Recommendation: Labs on 4th floor (429-431) be interchanged with 331-332 Labs on 3rd floor so that the space used for classrooms--namely, Lab 429 will become Classroom 3D and Lab 431 will become Classroom 3E.					

<u>FLOOR</u>	<u>ROOM NO.</u>	<u>SQ. FEET</u>	<u>ULTIMATE BIOLOGY USE</u>	<u>PROPOSED GENERAL USE</u>	<u>REMARKS</u>
Fourth	424	<u>129</u>	Ecology Office	General Faculty Office	
		<u>2355</u>			
Fifth	528	982	Animal Physiology-Development embryology Lab	Office space	Recommendation
	529	465	Graduate Invertebrate Zoology Lab	Office space	Recommendation
	531	<u>268</u>	Invertebrate Zoology Research	Office space	Recommendation
		<u>1715</u>			
Sixth	603	273	Contagious Animal Quarters	Office	Recommendation: All of these should become offices.
	605	379	Radiation Prep Research Lab	Office (Graduate)	Statement: The Ultimate Biology Use for these facilities may eventually be relocated where some of the general classroom space will be currently used.
	606	382	Radiation Prep Research Lab	Office (Graduate)	
	607	157	Counting & Instrumentation Room	Office	
	608	13	Isotope Vault	Office	
	609-610	102	Dark Rooms	Offices	
	611	973	Radiation Prep Lab	Office (Graduate)	
	639	159	Cytogenetics Research Lab	General Office	Recommendation
	640	89	Prep Room	General Office (Faculty)	Recommendation
	641	<u>556</u>	Graduate Cytogenetics Lab	General Office (Graduate)	Recommendation
		<u>3083</u>			
					Recommendation: The area designated as Graduate Student Offices will be relocated on the 6th floor in the following spaces which are listed on the left hand side of the following page.

1905J

<u>FLOOR</u>	<u>ROOM NO.</u>	<u>SQ. FEET</u>	<u>ULTIMATE BIOLOGY USE</u>	<u>PROPOSED GENERAL USE</u>	<u>REMARKS</u>
Sixth	603	273	Contagious Animal Quarters		See Page 4 for the recommendations on these rooms.
	605	379	Radiation Prep Research Lab		
	606	382	Radiation Prep Research Lab		
	607	157	Counting & Instrumentation Room		
	608	13	Isotope Vault		
	609	13	Dark Room Vestibule		
	610	89	Dark Room		
	611	973	Radiation Prep Lab		
	612	178	Radio Biology Office		
	613	<u>111</u>	Office for Graduate Students		
		<u>2568</u>			

Campus Planning Committee  
February 8, 1966  
Attachment No. 615  
Item 3197

PITTS MEBANE PHELPS & WHITE  
Architects & Engineers

470 Orleans Street      Beaumont, Texas 77701

January 24, 1966

Mr. Marshall L. Pennington  
Vice-President for Business Affairs  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Re: Chemistry: Site Utilization Studies  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

Dear Mr. Pennington:

Confirming our telephone conversation of this date, we will immediately proceed with the site utilization studies for the Chemistry Facilities programmed in Dr. Dennis' letter to you of January 10, 1966, a copy of which was forwarded to our office. Also, pursuant to your instruction, we will, and for the reasons you have outlined, include in our studies only one 500 seat classroom to be constructed in the initial program as opposed to the two 500 seat classrooms outlined in Dr. Dennis' letter.

Our service in this study will be charged on the basis outlined in our letter of December 22, 1965. In accordance with our conversations of January 18 and this date, we believe that these charges will ultimately fall between \$2,300 and \$3,000. We will periodically report our estimated percentages of completion and amount of fees earned in reaching such completion percentages.

Thank you again for the opportunity to render this service to you.

Best personal regards,

PITTS, MEBANE, PHELPS & WHITE

/s/ Robert White

Robert White

RW/eh



Campus Planning Committee  
February 8, 1966  
Attachment No. 616  
Item 3201

ZUMWALT AND VINTHER, INC.  
Consulting Engineers

711 Mercantile Continental Building  
Telephone RI 1-3691 Area Code 214  
Dallas, Texas 75201

February 8, 1966

Reply To:  
2109 Avenue Q  
Room 233  
Lubbock, Texas

Mr. O. R. Downing  
Director of Maintenance  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

Subject: Long Range Utility Study

Dear Sir:

On January 21, 1966, we received an executed copy of the contract covering the subject study. We have not yet received an authorization to proceed from the Vice President for Business Affairs; but we have proceeded upon the assumption that such was pending.

We had a preliminary meeting with N. B. McCullough, Carroll Smith, Sam Wahl, and Seymour Evans of the City of Lubbock to discuss the present and future water, sewer and electrical services from the city. In general, the indications were that the present potable water rates would continue and that the city was planning a 24" main somewhere in the vicinity of Indiana to cross the campus and to serve the campus and the southwest portion of the city. The effluent water from the new sewage plant is of excellent quality and would be suitable for irrigation or process use with little or no treatment. The college is the principal source of the sewage entering the plant and will continue to be for the near future. The college has a contract for all the effluent.

Wherever practical all new sanitary sewage should be directed toward the new sewage plant, which is operating at reduced capacity. At this time there is no storm drainage planned which will directly benefit the campus drainage problems. Any change in the roadway on Flint through the campus that will create a drainage problem will have to be solved and paid for by the college. Care must be exercised and all work coordinated with the city where a change from natural drainage is involved.

The present electrical distribution system serving the campus will have additional "back-up" or "reserve" when the sub-station expansion planned at 4th and Detroit is completed and interlocked with the unit at 21st and Indiana. The city offered to provide the underground high voltage distribution system and the building transformers for all new "reasonable size" buildings at no charge to the college and without increasing the present rate structure. The opinion was expressed that the present 4160 volt distribution system owned by the college was not practical for the planned expansion.

Bart Long and Wes Melton of Honeywell presented us with some basic information for the extension of the present data control center facilities and some capabilities of additional new equipment that might provide more useful data and control.

Mr. O. R. Downing  
Long Range Utility Study

Page 2

Doug Galassini and George Bunton of Southwestern Public Service Company met with us also to discuss primarily an easement for their distribution system to cross the campus. Their decision was to wait for final action on their plans until the Traffic Committee could find a solution to the crossing of Flint. They offered their electric service to the college for part or all of the electrical load. They suggested that a generating plant on the campus owned and operated by them and interconnected with their system should be considered as well as an "isolated" or "on-site" plant with no external connection. They indicated that this plant could provide steam as well as electricity for campus use.

C. I. Wall, Manuel Edquist and Pat Kenney of Pioneer Natural Gas Company have talked with us concerning the natural gas supply and we have planned a meeting for this week with Rod Curry for some preliminary data.

Other preliminary data is being gathered. Some rough estimates have been established for certain structures. At this time no conclusions can be drawn, but we still anticipate that the report can be complete within our 120 day estimate.

Yours very truly,

ZUMWALT AND VINTHER

/s/ Jack F. Roberts

Jack F. Roberts  
Vice President

JFR:bm

cc: Mr. John Taylor

Campus Planning Committee  
 February 8, 1966  
 Attachment No. 617  
 Item 3204A

SCHMIDT AND STILES, ROBERTS & MESSERSMITH  
 Architects and Engineers

1619 College Avenue      Lubbock, Texas 79401

January 31, 1966

M. L. Pennington  
 Vice President for Business Affairs  
 Texas Technological College  
 Lubbock, Texas

RE: Coeducational Dormitory and Dining Complex  
 Texas Technological College  
 Phase One

Dear Mr. Pennington:

As discussed briefly during a recent Campus Planning Committee meeting dealing with the referenced project, we would like to urge the naming of the future dormitory towers at the next Board of Directors Meeting, February 12, 1966. This would allow us to use the name of each hall on the working drawings we are now preparing. We strongly feel that this will assist all parties during planning, construction, and occupancy if the permanent identification could be pinned down at the very outset. Past experience in the planning, construction, and occupancy periods on the most recent dormitory project leads us to see many advantages in establishing a permanent identification at this time.

The Housing Staff, the Dormitory Reservation Office, the Campus Planning Committee, the contractor, architects, and the students experienced some confusion in the transition of changing from a construction number to a men's or women's hall number and finally to a name. There have also been additional problems as a result of the duplicate construction numbers for men and women. The upcoming change of "Men's 9" and "Women's 10" adds to the confusion.

Other reasons prompting our request for establishing a permanent identification at this early date are as follows:

Certain advantages in knowing that any room number (and room key number) in a named hall could appear in the bidding documents (working drawings) to be referred to during construction period.

Named hall could be used by the Office of Dormitory Reservations.

Could always be referred to by the students from the day they made their reservations in the spring of 1967.

Permanent name could be recorded in the as-built record drawings on permanent file with the college.

A little less esprit de corps has been observed in a building that has been referred to by number rather than by name.

It is felt that the stature of any building as a part of the campus is not fully realized until it is officially named.

Ground breaking ceremonies could be the official announcement of the selection of the person being honored.

The initial open house ceremonies could further honor the individual selected.

We respectfully request that efforts be made to name each of the three towers at an early date if it is convenient to the administration and to the Board of Directors. A name (not necessarily after an individual) for the entire master-planned complex might also be valuable to orient the general area, identify the post office sub-station, etc. Thanking you for this consideration,

Very sincerely,

SCHMIDT AND STILES, ROBERTS & MESSERSMITH  
ARCHITECTS                      AND                      ENGINEERS

/s/ Howard W. Schmidt

Howard W. Schmidt, A.I.A.

cc: Guy Moore  
Mrs. Shirley Bates

HWS:mec

Campus Planning Committee  
February 8, 1966  
Attachment No. 618  
Item 3204A

EXCERPT FROM  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

Circular Letter No. 3  
February 26, 1966

3. Budget Says College Housing to Be Held at \$300 Million Level.

Proposed 1967 Federal budget reveals no intention on the part of the Administration to increase funding of the College Housing Loan program substantially above past levels for either the current or coming fiscal years. The budget estimates total loans under the program at about \$300 million for college housing, facilities related to housing, and student nurse-intern housing. Demand for the current year is estimated at well in excess of \$1 billion.

The budget message says that for fiscal 1967, which starts next June 1, new legislation will be proposed to wipe out the \$300 million in new loan authorization for that year. At the same time bonds amounting to more than \$800 million in the Federal portfolio will be sold in the private market. But this money apparently will not be made available for new loans. Instead they will be financed, apparently, out of the present revolving fund (well in excess of \$200 million) composed of receipts from repayments of loans, plus new receipts during the year, at about the \$300 million level. Interest rate on the new loans will be kept at 3 per cent as required by Federal law.

What this all amounts to is that the Administration apparently does not intend to do anything to increase the amount of college housing funds to anything like demand, and at the same time proposed to realize \$800 million from sale of the existing portfolio of bonds to apply to next year's budget.

The Administration could make at least \$500 million for College Housing Loans available during the current year, ending next June 30, without new legislation, by using its \$300 million in new authorization plus more than \$200 million in the revolving fund represented by repayments.

For the 1967 fiscal year, it could make considerably in excess of \$1 billion available, by using the new \$300 million authorization for that year, selling off \$800 million of its portfolio, and using this to make new loans (and subsidizing the interest-rate differential between 3 per cent and the private market).

What it apparently plans to do is to hold the program at the \$300 million level during both years, sell college housing bonds to apply to the general budget to the tune of \$800 million, and force colleges to go into the private market--at high interest rates--for the bulk of their loans.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

AGENDA FOR THE JOINT MEETING  
OF THE CAMPUS AND BUILDING COMMITTEE AND CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE  
TO BE HELD AT 1:30 P.M. IN THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
FEBRUARY 11, 1966

1. Biology Building

Consider the approval of the recommendation of the project architects and the CPC that preliminary plans and specifications be presented at the May Board Meeting.

*(B.C. - approved the presentation of preliminary plans & specifications at the meeting of the Bd. of Directors on May 28, 1966)*

2. Business Administration Building

Since the architects could not complete the preliminary plans and specifications in time for this meeting of the Board of Directors and in order to stay on an extremely tight schedule, would the Building Committee be willing to meet between now and the next meeting of the Board of Directors?

3. Chemistry Research Building

As the architects could not complete the study in time for this meeting of the Board of Directors, would the Building Committee wish to meet before the next meeting, perhaps at the time of the Business Administration project?

Would the Building Committee like to consider an amount for the project at this meeting or wait for the completion of the study?

*Wait for the study.*

4. Classrooms and Office Buildings (Temporary)

Consider the recommendation of the CPC for 8 classroom buildings and 2 faculty office buildings to be constructed of wood at the approximate cost of \$100,000.

Consider the recommendation for the Building Committee to approve a recommendation for architects and the final site of the project between meetings.

Consider the recommendation for a construction contract to be presented at the April 23, 1966, meeting of the Board of Directors.



5. Consulting Architect

OK At the time the Agenda was being prepared the final information was not available. It is hoped that a recommendation will be ready by meeting time of the Building Committee, *Building Committee can handle between meetings if worked out OK*

6. HousingA. On-Campus

Consider the presentation of developments to date by the architects, as requested by the Building Committee at the last meeting. ✓

~~Consider the presentation as approval of the preliminary plans and specifications so that the final plans and specifications can be presented at the April 23, 1966, Board meeting in order to stay on the extremely tight schedule.~~ *ADD AUTHORIZED PRESENTATION OF* OK

*9th 10th*  
Consider the recommendation to name the three towers as soon as possible. It would be feasible to name the overall complex and have individual names for the three towers.

*appoint Committee.*

*Committee*  
*McKeeplein*  
*could*  
*amendment*  
OK

*type* Attention is called to the possible financial complications up the road, in view of the uncertainties of the availability of housing funds.

*study like variations -*  
*deserves some study of color texture,*  
*etc. - precast masonry spandrel.*

B. Off-Campus1. Frenchmen's Creek Corporation

Consider ~~request~~ request for 1,060 spaces at College Avenue between Tenth and Main Streets, 300 to be completed in September, 1966 and the balance during the school year.

*Call Mr. Hardy, get letter,*  
*no obligations + tell our one*  
*to go ahead -*

Nonapproved Housing

Consider ramifications of purported college housing by groups which have not requested Board approval.

Museum

A clarification of approval procedures is needed for the project in view of the riders on the Appropriation Bill and the terms set out in H.B. 1. It is hoped that the clarifications can be available by the time of the Board Meeting.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 282      February 11, 1966

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 9 a.m. on February 11, 1966, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. In addition, Mr. John G. Taylor was present.

3209. Museum

The Associated Architects and Engineers of Lubbock completed the preliminary survey and study of the replacement of the present Museum at a new site at Fourth Street and Indiana Avenue. The contract contains a provision that as much as 15 percent credit can be taken on the development of plans and specifications, if the plans follow the study. The credit on the fee could amount to some \$5,000.

The CPC recommended that the Associated Architects and Engineers of Lubbock would be commissioned at a fee of 6 percent to provide the architectural services, subject to applicable credits due on the preliminary work and subject to any additional clearance required.

3210. Consulting Architect

The results of the study to date on the procedures, fees, etc., were discussed and it was agreed that additional work needs to be done before a specific recommendation is made to the Board of Directors.

It was agreed to recommend that that Building Committee be authorized to approve arrangements between meetings.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

## MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 283      February 11, 1966

A meeting of the Campus and Building Committee of the Board of Directors and the Campus Planning Committee was held at 1:30 p.m. on February 11, 1966, in the Office of the President.

Members of the Campus and Building Committee of the Board present were Mr. Harold Hinn, Chairman, Mr. Herbert Allen and Mr. C. A. Cash. Other members of the Board of Directors in attendance were Mr. R. Wright Armstrong, Chairman, Mr. Alvin R. Allison, Mr. Roy Furr, Mr. J. Edd McLaughlin, Mr. Retha R. Martin and Dr. Fladger F. Tannery.

Members of the Campus Planning Committee present were Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Others present from the College were President R. C. Goodwin, Mr. J. Roy Wells, Mr. John G. Taylor, Mr. R. B. Price, and Mr. Guy J. Moore.

The architects and engineers were represented by Mr. Howard W. Schmdit, Mr. Bob Messersmith, Mr. Bernie Johnson, Mr. Paul Nail and Mr. M. L. Stiles.

In order that the results of the meeting of the Board of Directors may be included in the Campus Planning Committee Minutes for record purposes, the action taken at the meeting on December 12, 1966, will follow that of the Campus and Building Committee for each item.

3211. Biology Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce)

Approved the presentation of preliminary plans and specifications at the meeting of the Board of Directors on May 28, 1966.

(The Board of Directors approved.)

3212. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page, Southerland & Page)

Agreed to meet between meetings in order to approve the preliminary plans and specifications so the architects could remain on the extremely tight schedule.

(The Board of Directors approved.)

3213. Chemistry Research Building (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps & White)

Agreed to meet before the next meeting of the Board of Directors, perhaps at the time of the Business Administration project meeting, to receive the study.

The Building Committee preferred to wait for the completion of the study rather than to consider an amount for the project at this time.

(The Board of Directors approved.)

3214. Classrooms and Offices (Temporary) (CPC No. 102-65)

Approved eight classroom buildings and two faculty office buildings to be constructed of wood, at the approximate cost of \$100,000.

Approved a recommendation for the Building Committee to approve the selection of architects and the final site or sites for the projects between meetings.

Approved the recommendation for a construction contract to be presented at the April 23, 1966, meeting of the Board of Directors.

(The Board of Directors approved.)

3215. Consulting Architect

Approved the recommendation that the Building Committee be authorized to approve the arrangements for the consulting architect between meetings, with the understanding that it would be desirable to handle the item at a meeting on the other items also.

3216. HousingA. On-Campus

Approved the preliminary plans and specifications presented by the project architects and authorized the preparation of final plans and specifications to be presented at the April 23, 1966, meeting of the Board of Directors, in order to stay on the extremely tight schedule.

Approval of the preliminary plans and specifications was based on the inclusion of a third elevator.

Chairman R. Wright Armstrong appointed a committee comprised of Mr. J. Edd McLaughlin, Mr. C. A. Cash and himself to recommend names for Men's 9 and 10 and the towers in the proposed complex. A name could be considered for the overall complex in addition to the individual towers.

The Chairman of the CPC called attention to the possible financial complications up the road, due to the uncertainties of the availability of housing funds to the HHFA.

The architects reported that they wish to abandon the exterior curtain wall arrangement and go back to the type used in other construction, as it could save as much as \$2 per square foot or approximately \$250,000 for the entire project.

It was also understood that the architects are to continue to study brick variations and color texture.

B. Off-Campus1. Frenchmen's Creek Corporation

The Building Committee and the Board took no action on the request, and wished to continue the study of the overall off-campus housing condition.

2. Nonapproved Off-Campus Housing

The Building Committee and the Board took no action.

3. Mr. Homer G. Maxey, Lubbock, Texas

The Chairman presented a letter from Mr. Homer G. Maxey which was received in the morning prior to the meeting, to designate the Pioneer and Plainsman Hotels as off-campus housing for men students, effective in September, 1966. A copy of Mr. Maxey's letter is attached to and made a part of the Minutes.  
(Attachment No. 619, page 1914)

The Building Committee and the Board took no action on the request, and wished to continue the study of the overall off-campus housing.

3216. HousingB. Off-Campus (continued)4. University Dormitory Development, Inc.

The Chairman of the CPC reported that Mr. Bernard B. Heilprin, representing University Dormitory Development, Inc., of Chicago, Illinois, reported on the previous day that approval had been received from the City Commission to begin the off-campus housing project at the southwest corner of Nineteenth Street and College Avenue.

The Board expressed concern that the groups which have had their applications for off-campus housing accepted by the Board, may not be properly on record with the College in acknowledging that the College has no responsibility to provide any of the projects with students. The Board agreed to secure an attorney to study the proceedings to date and prepare a letter for use with the firms which have had their applications accepted, and another for any other firm in the future.

Mr. Ken Hardy, working with Mr. Allison and Mr. Taylor, prepared the two letters and sample copies are attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 620, page 1915)

Letters are in the process of being sent to all groups involved.

3217. Museum

Commissioned the Associated Architects & Engineers of Lubbock to provide the architectural services to replace the present Museum at a new site at Fourth Street and Indiana Avenue, as the present Museum Building and site are essential to the development of the academic program and must be used as such.

The architectural fee will be 6 percent less credits due under the terms of the original study by the same architects for the West Texas Museum Association, in keeping with the approval of the Board of Directors at the College.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

---

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

1914

Campus Planning Committee  
February 11, 1966  
Attachment No. 619  
Item 3216-B-3

HOMER G. MAXEY  
P. O. Box 5127  
Lubbock, Texas 79415

February 10, 1966

Mr. M. L. Pennington  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
Texas Technological College  
P. O. Box 4610  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Dear Mr. Pennington:

Mr. Frank Junell of The Citizens National Bank, has asked me to submit to you my letter of application for approval by the Board of Directors, the Pioneer Hotel and The Plainsman Hotel, as off-campus dormitories for men.

As owner and operator of the Pioneer and The Plainsman Hotels, we desire to convert these structures into complete dormitories for men. We will, if approved by the Board, begin a conversion program to meet your requirements for dormitories that will provide facilities second to none for the occupancy of 600 men students. We expect to have complete food service, all rooms will be air-conditioned, with private baths, telephones will be maintained and operated under the supervision of the College.

We will expect to have this conversion made and ready for occupancy by school opening date in September.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Homer G. Maxey

Homer G. Maxey

HGM/cc



Campus Planning Committee  
February 11, 1966  
Attachment No. 620  
Item 3216-B-4

Name  
Street Address  
City

Gentlemen:

It has come to the attention of the Board of Directors that there may be some area of uncertainty on the part of those who are planning to construct off-campus housing for men, including those representing the financial institutions with an interest in such projects, as to the obligations which the College is willing to assume with reference to these projects.

In order to eliminate any possibility of misunderstanding, I have been asked by the Board to remind you of the following points:

1. The parietal rule of the College will be enforced at all times; that is to say, the on-campus facilities for housing single students will be filled before any unmarried student is permitted to live off campus.
2. The College does not promise any particular percentage of occupancy of any off-campus facility and cannot be responsible for furnishing occupants for any off-campus housing.
3. The College will approve in advance the plans and specifications for off-campus facilities but it also reserves the right to withdraw recognition of any particular facility which it feels it not supervised and operated in such a manner as to comply with the regulations of the Board, of which you have previously been furnished a copy, and of which a copy is attached to this letter.

Please be so kind as to acknowledge your receipt of this letter and your agreement with the conditions outlined above.

Very sincerely yours,

M. L. Pennington  
Vice President for  
Business Affairs

Received and Agreed to this \_\_\_\_ day of  
\_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_.

---

Campus Planning Committee  
February 11, 1966  
Attachment No. 620A  
Item 3216-B-4

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Subject: \_\_\_\_\_

Board of Directors  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

Gentlemen:

The undersigned has made an application to you for approval of a proposed multi-unit off-campus residence facility for men students, to be constructed with private capital. In connection with such application, the undersigned agrees as follows:

1. Full compliance with the regulations of the Board of Directors applicable to the approval of multi-unit off-campus residence halls for men students will be maintained at all times. Such regulations are as follows:

- (a) Adequate and sufficient physical facilities must be provided and maintained as determined by the College.
- (b) Working cooperatively with the College, competent supervision must be maintained to insure conditions conducive to good health, good student habits and becoming behavior.
- (c) Full recognition of the parietal rule of the College is acknowledged and its implementation by the College is expected.
- (d) All provisions of the Civil Rights Laws must be complied with.
- (e) If such matters as off-street parking and pedestrian and vehicle traffic are not covered by municipal regulations, they shall be covered by College regulations.

2. It is understood that the College does not guarantee that any students will be housed in such facility.

Yours very truly,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Company

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 284

March 3, 1966

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 11 a.m. on March 3, 1966, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members of the Campus Planning Committee present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Others present from the College were Miss Jerry Kirkwood, Mr. Ray Downing, Mr. John Taylor and Mr. Haskell Taylor, representing the Business Administration Building Committee. The architects were represented by Mr. Louis Southerland and Mr. Madison Mills.

3218. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page, Southerland & Page)

Building location, general shape and design were approved as shown on drawings dated March 2, 1966.

Parking in the area was discussed. Mr. Urbanovsky proposed that faculty and staff parking be handled by the existing reserved lot by the Science Building and the existing lot by the Agricultural Plant Sciences Building. Discussion was given to the possibility of a temporary lot located off 15th Street and near the new structure. Also given some thought was a parking area west of Flint Street with bus service and/or enlargement of the proposed service tunnel under Flint which could serve as a pedestrian passage to and from the central campus.

Following are changes and studies to be made:

1. Provide larger circulation area in basement classroom wing.
2. Possibility that a preparation space needs to be provided in the basement classroom wing.
3. Vestibule areas need to be added at main entryways, especially on the south.
4. Mailroom on first floor may need to be a little wider.
5. Relocate entry at F-1-C and M-5-C in order to provide area for projection booth.
6. Mechanical in academic area to be located in central core on the second floor. Mr. Downing indicated that the individual control system of heating and cooling is preferable.
7. The structural system will be concrete.
8. It was decided that closed circuit television in various buildings will not be practical and the television aids shall be provided by a campus central system. Therefore, conduit and provisions for a future closed circuit television studio have been deleted.
9. Conduit only for a music system will be provided.

The architects were asked to give serious consideration to building materials and to study the design of the building with various perspective views.

Mr. Urbanovsky agreed to furnish the architects with a topography map of the building site.

The architects are to forward information concerning locations and other data required for test holes. They also will forward mechanical and electrical loads required by the building as soon as they are available.

3218. Business Administration Building (Continued)

The following schedule was set forth:

The architects will present plans and a color rendering of the project to the Building Committee of the Board on March 28, 29 or 30, pending arrangements with committee members.

The architects estimate a six-month period for working drawings after Board approval of the preliminaries.

It is expected that bids can be taken in October, 1966, and the contract awarded in November, 1966, allowing approximately six weeks for bidding time. Twenty months is the estimated construction period and anticipated date of occupation is September 1, 1968.

It was suggested to the architects that they utilize the renderings of the Foreign Languages-Mathematics and the dormitories at Flint Avenue and 19th Street in their presentation to the Board.

4,033 square feet have been added to the original 194,625 gross square foot figure upon which the net square feet appearing in the application was based.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

---

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 285

March 29, 1966

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 1:30 p.m. on March 29, 1966, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Other members of the College staff present were Mr. O. R. Downing and Mr. John G. Taylor.

3219. Approval of Minutes

On motion by Mr. Urbanovsky, seconded by Mr. Barrick, the Minutes of Meetings Nos. 281, 282, and 283 were approved.

3220. President's Approval of Minutes

President Goodwin approved the Minutes of Meeting No. 281 on February 14, 1966, and Meetings Nos. 282 and 283 on February 17, 1966.

3221. Agricultural Facilities (CPC No. 93-64)

Horse Facilities (\$59,000)

Mr. Downing reported that the project is 80 percent complete. The paving is lacking, but Mr. Urbanovsky is in the process of setting grades.

3222. Athletics

There seem to be items other than the Field House that the Athletic Council would like for the CPC to study. The Athletic Council has asked its subcommittee on facilities to make a more detailed plan of the needs for a Field House and to report them to the CPC.

The Athletic Council wants to have a meeting with the CPC as soon as the Athletic Council has developed the Field House needs.

A copy of Athletic Director Polk Robison's letter of February 7, 1966, is attached to and made a part of the Minutes.  
(Attachment No. 621, page 1926)

3223. Biology Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce)

A. Preliminary Plans and Specifications

The preliminary plans and specifications are due for presentation at the May meeting of the Board of Directors.

Mr. Barrick reported that two representatives of the firm were here on March 21 and 22, 1966, to go over mechanical portions and minor revisions in the plans with the Biology Faculty Committee, Mr. Downing and Mr. Felty. Mr. Deshayes would like to return about mid-April to present the revised preliminary plans to the CPC before presenting them to the Board of Directors. It was agreed to accommodate Mr. Deshayes when he is ready.

It was the consensus that the plans are coming along very well.

B. Architects' Contract

The revised drafts of the contract were presented.

3223. Biology Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce) continuedC. Consulting Engineers

It was agreed to accept the recommendation of Pierce & Pierce for Lockwood, Andrews, and Newnam, Inc., of Houston as consulting mechanical-electrical engineers for the project, and Mr. Walter Moore of Houston as structural consultant.

D. Application Number

On March 11, 1966, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare acknowledged the application and assigned Application No. 2-1684 to the project.

E. Visit

Dr. Charles G. Bridges, Program Specialist, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., and Dr. Robert W. MacVicar, Academic Vice President, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, will be on the campus April 14, 1966, to review the application under Title II and make an inspection of the present Biology Department facilities.

3224. Behavioral Science Center

A study is currently under way for a Behavioral Science Center at Texas Technological College for the purpose of training professional personnel in a multi-disciplinary approach to service to the physically and emotionally disabled. This Center will be designed to provide adequate professional training for personnel preparing to do either service or research with any of the physical or emotional disabilities. Its scope will include training for service and research in the areas of child and adult.

A planning grant in the amount of \$2,812 has been received from the Hogg Foundation.

The proposal is receiving most favorable responses from all sources.

3225. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)

The Building Committee is to consider the preliminary plans and specifications at the March 31, 1966, meeting of the Building Committee of the Board of Directors to be held at 10 a.m.

3226. Chemistry Research Building (CPC No. 87-74)

The architects have reported that the study is complete and it is to be made at the Building Committee meeting on March 31, 1966. A copy of Mr. Bob White's letter of March 7, 1966, in which he provides a summary statement of the study and expenses to date is attached to and made a part of the Minutes.  
(Attachment No. 622, page 1927)

3227. Classrooms and Offices (Temporary) (CPC No. 102-65)

Some questions developed over the location of the buildings and perhaps the ten proposed will not be enough.

A call was placed to Mr. Sam G. Wynn, Regional Director, Division of Surplus Property Utilization, DHEW, Dallas, Texas, to see if surplus buildings were available and he said he would make a quick check at Camp Hood, Roswell and Amarillo and let us know the results.

More information is needed in very short order to make a recommendation.



3228. Constitutional Building Amendment

There are three offices and one group involved in the preparation of plans to issue constitutional building amendment bonds. The Office of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, is to make the enrollment predictions and the space utilization reports. The State Comptroller is to certify the amount of estimated income and will be involved in the issuance and payment of the bonds. The Attorney General is involved in developing, through an opinion, the method to be used in allocation. A separate group of institutional officers, representing the presidents, is preparing the mechanics with the aid of bond counsel and a financial adviser.

At the moment, the picture is rather complicated. The Attorney General has requested the necessary information from the Coordinating Board and the State Comptroller, in order to make an opinion which would be actual rather than philosophical. The Coordinating Board will make its recommendation at the April meeting. After that, the Comptroller must supply his portion before the Attorney General renders his opinion.

If the time schedule holds, it looks as if it will be impossible to issue constitutional building amendment bonds in early summer, as predicted. The scheduled meeting of the Bond Committee on March 8, 1966, had to be canceled due to an accident involving the financial adviser, and has been rescheduled for April 13, 1966.

3229. Consulting Architect

The needed information arrived during the meeting but additional time will be required for study.

3230. Engineering Survey (CPC No. 100-65) (Zumwalt & Vinther, \$10,000)

In a letter dated March 4, 1966, to Mr. O. R. Downing, Mr. Jack Roberts reported that the time allotted to the study was 120 days. The study began January 10, 1966, and it is planned to finish the study and make the report during the first week in May. Mr. Roberts said the study is on schedule. A copy of the letter is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 623, page 1928)

It is urgent to complete the schedule as soon as possible as some of the needed equipment has a delivery date of 12 months.

The powerhouse will be a critical project and action should be taken as soon as possible.

As matching funds are to be requested, it will be necessary to file a request with the Coordinating Board by July, 1966. (It later developed that such funds can be requested only in connection with specific projects.)

The report prepared by Mr. Taylor on March 22, 1966, is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 624, page 1929)

It was agreed to recommend that Zumwalt & Vinther be authorized to prepare the plans and specifications for one 200,000 lbs. per hr. boiler and one 2,000 ton steam, turbine driven air-conditioning unit, with bids to be taken not later than May 20, 1966. The estimated cost of the one boiler and the one air-conditioning unit would be approximately \$650,000 and the fee for Zumwalt & Vinther would be approximately \$5,500.

It was also agreed that the recommendation will be made to the Building Committee of the Board of Directors on March 31, 1966, in order that immediate action may ensue.

3231. Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building (CPC No. 87-64)A. Status

The basement wall is 50 to 60 percent complete, and the project seems to be coming along nicely.

B. Utility Tunnel

It was agreed that it will be essential to get engineers to design and construct the necessary utility tunnel.

It was agreed to recommend Zumwalt & Vinther under the general terms of their contract to prepare the plans and specifications and proceed with the work.

3232. HousingA. On-Campus1. Contract Award

The architects have predicted that the project could be bid about May 1, 1966, which would allow a contract award at the May meeting of the Board of Directors.

(Mr. Howard Schmidt entered the meeting.)

2. Financing

The financing of the project has yet to jell. With the advent of the 3 percent money through the HHFA, an unprecedented number of requests from institutions was received, and some applications were carried over from the preceding year. So many applications were on hand that HHFA cut off the acceptance of additional applications on January 31, 1966. Texas Tech's application was filed during the last days of December, 1965. An evaluation of the possibilities of securing funds through the HHFA is in the process at the moment. If no funds can be received this fiscal year, the application, perhaps, will have to be revised and submitted for each of the next two fiscal years and some private financing could be involved.

3. Schedule

A copy of the proposed schedule by Mr. Schmidt is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 625, page 1930)

4. Decorator

It was agreed that it would be well to engage a competent decorator. It would be necessary to first develop a job description for the decorator.

5. Clerk of the Works

The services of a Clerk of the Works will be recommended.

6. Furniture and Equipment, Movable

It will be necessary to develop a plan for someone to handle the furniture and equipment. It could be one of the chores of the interior decorator under carefully prescribed procedures.

7. Lighting

As women will occupy the Men's No. 9 this fall, it will be necessary to install the usual street lighting system in order to provide lights from the building to the campus.

Mr. Downing was asked to coordinate the installation and the financing probably will come from the dormitory concessions.

(Mr. Howard Schmidt left the meeting.)

3232. HousingB. Off-Campus1. O'Meara-Chandler Corporation

Apparently the Corporation is still making good progress. The letter requested by the Board of Directors at the last meeting, summarizing and agreeing to the Board's stipulations, was signed and received on March 24, 1966.

A structural framing is about complete and the brick work is starting.

2. Frenchmen's Creek Corporation

By poll, on March 13, 1966, the Board of Directors accepted the application of the Corporation for 1,080 spaces to be constructed between Main and Tenth Streets on College Avenue. The Corporation hopes to have 350 spaces by September, 1966, and to complete the rest during the next calendar year.

The Corporation executed the compliance letter on March 4, 1966, and it was received on March 7, 1966.

3. University Dormitory Development, Inc.

The compliance letter has been executed and was received on February 24, 1966. Zoning was approved some time back, but there seems to be a threat of a law suit by residents in the area which could cloud progress.

In a letter dated March 7, 1966, Mr. Harold E. Strauss reported that the loan application has been approved at all the lower echelons and is now up for final approval.

4. University Housing Construction, Ltd.

The firm has not, as yet, executed and returned the compliance letter.

On the evening of March 13, 1966, Mr. Al Kipper, who works with the organization, informed the Chairman that the financing is not quite yet complete but he thought it would be in a few days.

5. Nonapproved Off-Campus Housing

Other groups are constructing off-campus housing without going through the College, which raises the question of preference on the part of the Board of Directors to those who do. The subject was mentioned at the last meeting of the Board of Directors but no action was taken.

It looks as if some cognizance probably should be taken of the projects being constructed with the unofficial implication that the projects are college unauthorized.

3233. Journalism

It was the consensus that the central chilling station which will provide cooling for the Biology Building will have adequate capacity to accommodate the Journalism Building and any decision should be postponed until that time.

3234. Law School Building

Dean Amandes replied under the date of March 8, 1966, that he will have a fairly extensive outline of the space needs for the Law School by April 15, 1966, and will mail it. He and

3234. Law School Building (continued)

Librarian Jones will be in Lubbock the following week to talk about the needs and help arrange the tours.

There should be an application for matching funds filed by the July date, which means that we will need to move pretty rapidly.

The statement has been made that substantial donations may be available for the School.

Thought should be given to an architect for the project in order that representatives could be present on the inspection tour.

3235. LibraryA. Completion of South Basement and Third Floor (CPC No. 101-65)  
(Ed Lampe Building Contractor, Lubbock, \$155,205)

The work order was issued on February 14, 1966.

It looks as if the contractor is ahead of schedule, and if he can get the light fixtures and other equipment delivered on schedule, within three weeks, it should be wrapped up pretty soon.

B. Elevator (Hunter-Hayes Elevator Company, Dallas, \$1,746)

The work order was issued on February 26, 1966.

The contractor is making progress.

3236. Matching Funds

At the present time, the Higher Education Facilities Act is scheduled to expire in 1968, but there are good possibilities that it will be extended. The President, in his budget proposal, has recommended that it be extended for a number of additional years.

The Biology Building was No. 23 on the approved list of the Coordinating Board at the last award, at which time there were funds available for only the first seven. It looks as if it will be very important to Texas Tech to have as many applications as possible filed by the July closing date and all prospects for funds under Title I and Title II of the Act should be explored.

The Chemistry Building could be a bit of a problem, and it will be necessary to decide how to proceed, presumably at the Building Committee Meeting on March 31, 1966. I believe it is our consensus that Title II is preferable as a source of funds to the National Science Foundation for the graduate and research portion.

Although the quest of matching funds to the fullest extent, as stipulated by the Board of Directors, will take a good bit of time to secure funds, the results are so extremely important that it looks as if every effort should be made to secure the maximum.

3237. MuseumA. Status

The architects are at work on the new project and Mr. Howard W. Schmidt, in a later letter dated March 3, 1966, set out the revised estimated costs, the time schedule and the estimated proportion between the College and the West Texas Museum on the replacement of the present facilities on a square foot for square foot basis. It is estimated that the College's share for approximately 36,000 square feet will be about \$457,200 plus its share of the architects' fees, site development, etc.  
(Attachment No. 626, page 1931)



3237. MuseumA. Status (continued)

A check indicates there is some question of the accuracy of the 36,000 square feet and it will be necessary for the architects to ascertain the correct square footage.

B. Contract

The architects are working on a proposed contract to be made with the College, which would include the West Texas Museum share but would include an escape clause for the College if there were no WTM funds.

No utility lines are needed as the unit is to be self-contained.

## C. Dr. Murray has expressed an interest in converting the present Museum into an Administration Building and would like for the idea to be considered.

D. West Texas Museum Fund

The West Texas Museum Association is contemplating the services of a professional fund raiser, Community Facilities Bureau, for the Museum portion of the funds needed.

3238. Other ItemsA. Water Easement, City of Lubbock

There has been no change since the last report.

B. Southwestern Public Service Company Easement

It has been agreed that no action will be taken until the firm of Zumwalt & Vinther has completed the engineering survey.

3239. Parking

A copy of Dean Jones' letter of February 8, 1966, in connection with the Traffic and Security Commission meeting on February 4, 1966, is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 627, page 1932)

The Traffic and Security Commission requested the Campus Planning Committee to study the following possibilities:

1. Feasibility of a parking building near the center of the campus.
2. Location of a large parking area in the vicinity of 15th Street and Flint Avenue for approximately 2,000 cars.

Parking Building

It was the consensus of the group that a parking building in the center of the campus is not feasible at this time.

Large Parking Area

It was agreed that a parking lot at the vicinity of 15th Street and Flint Avenue would, at this time, be premature for approximately 2,000 cars as requested. The real estate there is extremely valuable and is a potential site for the Law School and other buildings in the near future. With the entry station system being put into effect, it would be possible to utilize the parking space available now to the east and west sides of the stadium.

3240. Priority ListNew Projects

In a recent telephone conversation, Mr. Hinn requested the CPC to prepare a list of the next projects to be implemented, along with the estimated square footage and cost.

Under a request of March 7, 1966, Dean Tinsley estimated that the School of Home Economics would need 54,943 square feet of usable space. A copy of her request is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 628, page 1933)

The request will also be on the Building Committee Agenda for March 31, 1966.

The same information is needed for the Architecture facilities, Plant Sciences, Music, Powerhouse, Utilities, etc. It is very essential that these are the areas of greatest needs.

It looks as if an Administration Building will be added to the list somewhere along the line.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.



Campus Planning Committee  
March 29, 1966  
Attachment No. 621  
Item No. 3222

TEXAS TECH  
ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT  
P. O. Box 4199  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

February 7, 1966

Mr. M. L. Pennington  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
Campus

Dear Mr. Pennington:

Your memo of January 18, 1966 to Dr. J. William Davis has been forwarded to me with a request that I follow through. I will proceed to answer further questions regarding the proposed Field House.

After meetings with all Head Coaches of the various sports and discussions with the Athletic Council regarding the needs of the Department of Athletics, it has been unanimously agreed that our "number one" need is that of a Field House. A Field House, as we construe it for our needs, would be a rather large enclosed area below surface or above surface where "in season" or "off season" work could be done in all areas of sports - football, basketball, track, baseball, swimming, golf and tennis. This facility should be a minimum of approximately 180' x 240' in open area which would include handball courts, 220 yard track, volleying court for tennis, weight lifting machine stations, and open areas that could be used for football practice - baseball batting cage, golf driving area with nylon netting. The area would be used for off season conditioning in all sports. There is a need that this facility also include two film rooms, one that could seat approximately 70-80 people and the other that could accommodate 40-50. These rooms would supplement the present film room which exists in the present office building at Jones Stadium. Due to lack of proper office space we feel that it would be advisable to utilize the present film room, approximately 40 x 30, for additional office area. This would require some partitioning of that area. At present time the basketball coaches are occupying the Business Manager's Office and with increased coaching staff, we are short of office space.

If this facility could be approximately located to our present football dressing area, it would avoid duplication of additional dressing area construction. However, our present dressing facilities in Jones Stadium, including freshman and varsity dressing rooms, which provide approximately 152 lockers are inadequate for our entire needs. We need to include in the new facility dressing areas for our baseball and track teams, each dressing room large enough to take care of 50-60 athletes.

We would also like to think in terms of providing a dressing room area for faculty, whereby members of our faculty that desired, could rent lockers and have the use of our facilities for a physical conditioning program.

These needs have been discussed at length within the Athletic Department staff and the results of our discussions have been presented to the Athletic Council. A committee from the Athletic Council was appointed to meet with the Campus Planning Committee at the earliest time possible for further study and discussion of these needs. At the last council meeting, priorities concerning capital expansion were presented in written form by Dr. Rouse in a report to the council. This field house idea was presented as the number one need.

Mr. M. L. Pennington  
Page Two

If appropriately located, this facility could be used by the Department of Men's Physical Education. The Department of Athletics would have little need of such a facility from 8 a.m. until 2 p.m. At these hours the Department of Physical Education would have the greatest need for such a facility. We see no reason why such a facility should not be jointly used by both departments of Men's Physical Education and Athletics.

We would appreciate an early meeting with the Campus Planning Committee to further pursue this outstanding need of the Department of Athletics.

Sincerely,

/s/ Polk Robison

Polk Robison  
Athletic Director

PR/em(j)

cc: Dr. J. William Davis  
Dr. R. L. Rouse  
Mr. C. I. Wall  
Mr. T. L. Leach

Campus Planning Committee  
March 29, 1966  
Attachment No. 622  
Item No. 3226

P I T T S M E B A N E P H E L P S & W H I T E

Architects & Engineers

March 7, 1966

Mr. Marshall Pennington  
Vice-President for Business Affairs  
TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

Re: Chemistry: Site Utilization Studies  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

Dear Mr. Pennington:

We wish to take this opportunity to advise you of the expenses which Tech has incurred in our development of the subject studies.

Since our last conversation and subsequent written report to you we have developed an additional site utilization scheme which differs from the two which had been developed to that date in that it requires no encroachment on the restricted parking area at the west border of the site. Feeling then that the three basic schemes which we have developed "encompassed" the most feasible possibilities with respect to site utilization for the program furnished us, we initiated the preparation of a written report containing design analysis and reproductions of drawings illustrating our studies. We believe that you will find this report a satisfactory conclusion to the objectives with which we were charged and will accept it as a comprehensive analysis of the use potential for this particular site and for the program being considered.

Our accumulative fees and expenses on these studies and report preparation to date approximate \$2,210.00. We anticipate that additional fees attendant to presentation of the report and expenses incurred will add approximately \$375.00. The total costs for our services will then be \$2,585.00 as compared to the \$2,300.00 - \$3,000.00 estimate which was submitted to you prior to the authorization of this service.

Please do not consider this our request for payment, but, rather a report on expenses incurred to date. We will render our voucher after submission of our drawings and written report at your Building Committee meeting.

Thanking you again for the opportunity to perform this study for Tech, we are

Yours very truly,

PITTS, MEBANE, PHELPS & WHITE

/s/ Bob

Robert White

RW/eh(j)  
cc: LWP MM RRP

1928

Campus Planning Committee  
March 29, 1966  
Attachment No. 623  
Item No. 3230

ZUMWALT AND VINTHER, INC.  
Consulting Engineers

711 Mercantile Continental Building  
Telephone RI 1-3691 \* Area Code 214

---

Ross Zumwalt	R. E. Miller	F. L. McFadden	C. F. Gilmore	J. T. Worley
				P. N. Vinther
				Consultant

March 4, 1966

Reply to:  
2109 Avenue Q  
Room 233  
Lubbock, Texas

Mr. O. R. Downing  
Director of Building Maintenance  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

Dear Sir:

During the negotiations for the contract covering the utility study for the College, we forecast a 120 day period for preparing the report. We were not able to begin any substantial progress until January 10, this year. Our schedule for completing this work has been set up for submitting the report during the first week in May. We are on schedule. There is still much work to be accomplished. Just this past week we have become even more aware of the urgency of completing this survey as soon as possible. During conference with several manufacturers' agents concerning equipment-availability costs, and delivery schedules, we find that some equipment items being considered have a 12-month delivery after approval of shop drawings. We need to meet with you and members of your staff to discuss the impact of this information on plans for plant operation in the fall of 1967.

Currently we are acquiring data on equipment availability, capacity, and performance, installation costs and operating costs and delivery schedules. Boiler and Turbine manufacturers' representatives have met with us and have visited the campus. They are providing us with the information required to establish the most feasible size and type of equipment to be selected. We have prepared a preliminary cost breakdown for utility services to the Business Administration Building. We have checked our cost estimates with local contractors as a precaution. Material and labor costs are on the rise. The supply of skilled labor has become short.

The task of the Lubbock office is to provide the field work, coordination of our efforts with those of the College, and overall collection of site data. Overall responsibility for this project rests with the writer. The Dallas office is advising us on the schemes to be considered, the master plan and is summing up the cost data for conclusion. Our chief engineer, Ross Zumwalt, will write the report with assistance from J. T. Worley.

We are prepared to meet with any of the planning or the designing groups to discuss the utility system and any of the contemplated revisions to it. Although we have not clearly and definitely concluded any phase of this study, we could easily provide sufficient data and logical preliminary assumptions so that these people could proceed with their work without the need for any major revisions in their plans. This data could then be cross-checked again just prior to bid time. Certainly the report will be complete and the College will have determined the best approach for the utility extension prior to that date.

Mr. O. R. Downing

Page 2

March 4, 1966

The most disturbing information we have received is that several of these buildings will be ready for occupancy in September, 1967. It will be most difficult to have any heating and cooling plant in operation by that time. A crash program would be required and equipment selection would be largely governed by that schedule.

Any conclusions by the Traffic Committee concerning the depression of Flint; and any preliminary utility data by the several building architects will be of considerable benefit to us. We are proceeding with our own estimate of the utilities required on these structures.

Yours very truly,

ZUMWALT AND VINTHER, INC.

/s/ Jack F. Roberts

Jack F. Roberts  
Vice President

JFR:bm(g)



Campus Planning Committee  
March 29, 1966  
Attachment No. 624  
Item No. 3230

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

March 22, 1966

ENGINEERING SURVEY

The following people met in Mr. M. L. Pennington's office at 10 a.m., March 22, 1966, to talk about the engineering survey and the urgent need for placing orders for equipment: Mr. Ross Zumwalt, Mr. J. T. Worley, Mr. Jack Roberts, all representing the firm of Zumwalt and Vinther, Mr. Elo Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan Barrick, Mr. Ray Downing, Mr. Howard Schmidt, Mr. Bob Messersmith, and Mr. John Taylor. Mr. M. L. Pennington was called out of town because of a death in his family and was unable to attend the meeting.

Mr. Downing was requested to open the meeting as he is the coordinator of the engineering study. He opened the meeting by explaining the urgent need to decide what equipment would be needed in the new power plant and chilling station so orders may be placed. Mr. Downing explained that the delivery dates on this type of equipment are presently 12 to 14 months and could be longer. He said that we need to order the equipment for the first phase then plan the building to house the equipment.

Mr. Zumwalt was asked what kind of power plant and chilling station he was thinking about or what the study was indicating. He stated that it will be one central heating and chilling plant designed so that equipment can be added as needed and the building expanded to house the additional equipment.

Mr. Urbanovsky asked if the power plant, as presently thought of, would have a smokestack and how high it would be. Mr. Worley stated that it probably would be only a stub stack about 6' high, and a curtain wall would practically hide the 6' section. Mr. Zumwalt explained that the study indicates that the College is now running at capacity with the present boilers and that the new study already shows that we are going to need two 200,000 lbs. per hr. boilers to take care of the College's needs for the next 10 to 15-year period. After considerable discussion, it was finally decided that one 200,000 lbs. per hr. boiler would be ordered in the first phase; however, Mr. Zumwalt stated that the second boiler should be ordered as soon as possible because we could be in trouble if the large boiler should go down. The boilers are a type which can be used for on-site generation of electrical current should the College decide to do so.

The question was raised about the boilers being tied into the present heating system, and Mr. Zumwalt stated that their plans are to tie the new boilers into the old system. There was some discussion about Zumwalt and Vinther's experience with The University of Texas and its problems and how they were solved.

Mr. Urbanovsky asked what size building the engineers were talking about to handle the two boilers and other equipment they are thinking about. The answer was, roughly 26,400 square feet.

The discussion next turned toward two 100,000 lbs. per hr. boilers versus a 200,000 lbs. per hr. boiler. Mr. Worley pointed out that, since most of the equipment for both sizes of boilers would be identical, there is very little difference in cost between the two; and they would definitely recommend the 200,000 lbs. per hr. boiler over the two 100,000 lbs. per hr. boilers.



Next, the discussion turned toward the possibility of trying to get matching funds to cover the equipment and the rest of the power plant. It now appears that we must have a grant before we can let a contract or purchase equipment. Mr. Zumwalt pointed out that in other cases equipment has been ordered then later made a part of the contract with the mechanical contractor of the general contractor. This is a possibility for us.

Mr. Urbanovsky asked Mr. Zumwalt why they were not progressing any faster on their study. Mr. Zumwalt said that he thought they were making progress but that they have spent about two weeks in coming up with their recommendations for the equipment that we need to order now, and it has caused some delay in putting together their report. Mr. Zumwalt mentioned that some of the work cannot be done by additional staff. He and some of the major principals have to do the work, and it just takes time to do everything that is needed.

(Mr. Urbanovsky left the meeting at 11 a.m. to meet a class.)

Mr. Barrick raised the question about the type of specifications it would take to purchase the boilers and other equipment; and Mr. Worley stated that it normally took a performance type of specifications, as the boiler manufacturers do not follow any standards in sizes, capacities, etc., and the performance specifications give them some leeway in their bids. However, this makes it a little difficult in determining the best bid.

A question was raised about the type of building Zumwalt and Vinther is thinking about or the arrangement of the equipment. I believe Mr. Worley answered this question. He stated that they were thinking about a two-story T-shaped building with one floor below ground. This would probably mean that there would be about 40' of building above ground. In one wing of the T-shaped building they are planning the ultimate need of three boilers; in another wing, an ultimate need for three air-conditioning units; and the generation equipment would go in the third wing. In the center of the "T" where the wings would meet would be the offices, control rooms, etc.

The group next turned to air-conditioning equipment needed for the central chilling station. Mr. Zumwalt listed the amount of air conditioning we were now using on campus and the estimated amount that would be needed for some of the projects now being built or planned. They are estimating about 1,700 tons for the dormitory complex, 1,000 tons for the Business Administration Building, 1,000 tons for the Biology Building, and 600 tons for the Chemical Research project. Their recommendation is that we purchase two 2,000-ton units, steam turbine driven. After some discussion, it was decided that only one of the 2,000-ton units would be needed in the first phase.

Some discussion followed as to what they consider would be some savings in the new efficient system they are planning. This will be covered in their report. All the equipment they have recommended can be used with any kind of system the College decides to install.

A question was raised about the availability of the air-conditioning equipment. Mr. Worley stated that the air-conditioning equipment is not as critical as the boilers, but it is still hard to get some of the equipment and that it also should be ordered just as soon as possible.

Mr. Zumwalt mentioned that the cooling towers would be a part of a wall of the building.

Mr. Howard Schmidt next asked what they thought the size of the original building would be to house the first phase, and he was told that it is hard to tell since the boiler manufacturers build different size and shape boilers. It is necessary that the boilers and air-conditioning equipment be purchased before the building can be designed properly.

The group next talked about timing, and someone raised the question about the delivery date of the equipment and could the building be ready by the time the equipment arrives. Mr. Worley mentioned that a portion of the building would need to be ready to receive the larger units and then be finished after the large pieces of equipment were in place. It was decided that the latest date that bids should be accepted for the equipment would be May 20, 1966, as it would take a good week for Zumwalt and Vinther and the

College to decide which bid or bids to recommend to the Building Committee of the Board on May 27, 1966. Mr. Zumwalt stated that to have the plant in operation in August 1967, the equipment must be ordered by June 1, 1966, or earlier; and as it will take about 30 days to prepare the specifications, two weeks for bidding, and at least one week to review the bids, that someone should be working on the specifications right now.

Mr. Barrick brought up the question about contracting the work. He wanted to know if this type of facility is constructed with one contractor, separate mechanical contractors and a building contractor, or other arrangements. Mr. Worley stated that it is done different ways in different places, but they thought it worked best with a separate mechanical contractor and a building contractor.

During the discussions, Mr. Roberts mentioned that since they had spent about two weeks on deciding what equipment should be ordered right away that they would need more time to finish their report. The original schedule was for the report to be ready the first week in May. When asked when the report would be ready, Mr. Zumwalt mentioned that he thought it could be ready by May 15, 1966. Mr. Taylor pointed out that since the Board would be meeting on May 27 and 28, 1966, that date would not give the CPC much time to do anything with the report and take it to the Board in May. Mr. Zumwalt stated that he would try to get the report pulled together sooner and mentioned that he thought this should not be the final step but just the first step in a continuing study and restudy of our needs from here on.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Zumwalt what he estimated the cost would be if they were instructed to prepare the specifications and follow through on the purchasing of the one boiler and one air-conditioning unit. Mr. Zumwalt and Mr. Worley made a rough estimate of \$5,500.

The estimated cost for the one boiler and the one air-conditioning unit would be approximately \$400,000 for the boiler and \$250,000 for the air-conditioning unit.

To summarize the discussion, it was the consensus of those present that one 200,000 lbs. per hr. boiler and one 2,000-ton, steam turbine driven air-conditioning unit should be ordered as soon as possible for the first phase, with possible options on the bidding for the purchase of another boiler and another air-conditioning unit within a certain time. Authorization needs to be secured promptly to have Zumwalt and Vinther or someone else draft the specifications and requirements for advertisement for bids to be opened not later than May 20, 1966, with the understanding that the one boiler and the one air-conditioning unit could run \$650,000 plus and that the fee could be approximately \$5,500.

The meeting adjourned about 12:10 p.m.

John G. Taylor  
Business Manager

cc: Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky  
Mr. Nolan E. Barrick  
Mr. O. R. Downing (2)  
Mr. Howard Schmidt

1930

Campus Planning Committee  
March 29, 1966  
Attachment No. 625  
Item No. 3232-A-3

SCHMIDT AND STILES, ROBERTS & MESSERSMITH  
Architects and Engineers  
Lubbock, Texas

March 28, 1966

The following schedule is being proposed to Texas Technological College.  
Please verify this schedule by phone as soon as you have it in your hands.

Start Construction. . . . . May 30, 1966  
Present bids to Board of Directors. . . . . May 27-28, 1966  
Receive General Construction Bids . . . . . 4 p.m. May 26, 1966  
Announce Low Sub-bidders. . . . . 10 a.m. May 26, 1966  
Receive Mechanical, Electrical, Kitchen  
Equipment, Elevator, and Furniture Bids . 4 p.m. May 25, 1966  
Issue Plans and Specifications to Bidders . . . . . April 28, 1966  
Take Plans and Specifications to H.U.D.  
for Review. . . . . April 22, 1966

The following schedule is proposed among the various offices for coordination:

April 4, 1966: Mr. Dick Fletcher (Mr. Arthur Dana's office) to go to  
Houston for final review of Kitchen Equipment Plans with Bernard Johnson  
and stop by Lubbock on return if any problems exist.  
  
April 11, 1966: Review check in Lubbock with representatives from  
Schmidt and Stiles, Roberts & Messersmith, Bernard Johnson, and  
Terry & Rosenlund - Plans and Outline Specifications.  
  
April 21, 1966: Final check in Lubbock with representatives from  
Schmidt and Stiles, Roberts & Messersmith, Bernard Johnson,  
Terry & Rosenlund - Plans and Final Specification Drafts. Specifications  
will be typed for off-set reproduction with as many carbons as possible.  
  
April 22-26, 1966: Final corrections to drawings and specifications.

1931

Campus Planning Committee  
March 29, 1966  
Attachment No. 626  
Item No. 3237

HOWARD SCHMIDT AND ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS 1619 COLLEGE AVENUE  
LUBBOCK TEXAS 79401 PHONE PO 3-4691 A.C. 806

March 3, 1966

M. L. Pennington  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

RE: New Museum Facilities  
Texas Technological College

Dear Mr. Pennington:

As I mentioned in the meeting with you, Dr. Earl Green, Bob Snider, Mark Hailey, and John Whitcomb, I wanted to verify the discussed cost estimate and the time schedule on the referenced project with the other firms in the Associated Architects & Engineers and then give you the verification. The three firms have discussed the matter and agree that the proposed time schedule can be met. It is as follows:

Board approval of design development stage . . . . . April 23, 1966  
  
Board review of essentially completed working  
drawings giving the architects approval to receive  
bids for construction. . . . . May 28, 1966  
  
Completed plans and specifications issued to  
bidders. . . . . July 15, 1966  
  
Receive bids . . . . . August 15, 1966  
  
Board review of bids . . . . . August 20, 1966  
  
Construction begins. . . . . September 1, 1966  
  
Final inspection . . . . . July, 1967  
  
Occupancy. . . . . August, 1967  
  
Present Museum available . . . . . September, 1967

After reviewing the construction cost estimate which was prepared in April, 1965, the architects believe it should be increased a few percentages to offset the rises we have observed in construction costs since most contractors have been quite busy. The architects desire to raise the total estimate for the main unit to \$650,000. (Copy of April, 1965 estimate attached). By dividing the 51,200 square feet in the proposed main unit into the \$650,000, the average square foot cost comes out \$12.70. If the college agrees to trade square feet for square feet, this then means (if the bids are on the money) that the college would provide 36,000 square feet at \$12.70 or \$457,200 toward the project. The Museum group would then need to raise the balance of \$192,800. It should be pointed out that the construction cost estimate of course does not include the architects' fees nor does it include any site developments, such as paving, walks, drives, entrance steps, raised planting beds, etc.

1931A

M. L. Pennington

-2-

March 3, 1966

We are presently developing a cost estimate for these items to furnish you and Dr. Green since these would be expenses also borne by the Museum organization.

If there is any conflict in the above with what you have in mind, please let us hear from you. The architects have stated they are ready to go to work immediately with the Campus Planning Committee when called for a "kick-off" meeting.

Very sincerely,

HOWARD SCHMIDT AND ASSOCIATES  
A R C H I T E C T S

/s/ Howard

Howard W. Schmidt, A.I.A.

cc: Dr. Earl Green  
Stiles, Roberts & Messersmith  
McMurtry & Craig

Enclosure

HWSmec(j)



## WEST TEXAS MUSEUM ESTIMATE

Industrial Galleries: 14,400 s.f. @ 5.00.. \$ 72,000

## Main Unit:

Basement: 19,200 s.f. @ 11.00 (A/C).. \$211,200: (not A/C)..\$172,800

Ground Floor: (19,200')

6,400 s.f. @ 16.00..... 102,400

12,800 s.f. @ 12.00..... 153,600

Second Floor: (12,800')

6,400 s.f. @ 11.00..... 70,400

6,400 s.f. @ 12.00..... 76,800

Total Main Unit (A/C)..... \$614,400: (not A/C)..\$572,000

Main Unit Less Second Floor (A/C).... 467,200: (not A/C)..\$428,800

Planetarium: 2,000 s.f. @ 1.s. .... 50,000

## Exhibit Galleries:

Court: 6,400 s.f. @ 7.00..... 44,800

Galleries: 33,600 s.f. @ 9.00..... 302,400

Basement: 40,000 s.f. @ 7.00..... 280,000

\$626,200

TOTAL:      \$1,362,600      (1,324,200 basement not A/C)



1932

Campus Planning Committee  
March 29, 1966  
Attachment No. 627  
Item No. 3239

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE

Lubbock, Texas

Office of  
Dean of Student Life

February 8, 1966

Mr. R. Wright Armstrong  
5803 El Campo Terrace  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

The Traffic-Security Commission has held two meetings since the last Board of Directors' meeting. We found ourselves involved in examinations and spring registration periods.

At our last meeting, on February 4, we made the following decisions:

1. to establish an Entry Station System for the inner part of the campus. The exact locations are to be determined at a later date.
2. To make the System effective on September 1, 1966. Many details of the plan will be determined at subsequent meetings of the Commission.
3. To request the Campus Planning Committee to study the feasibility of a parking building near the center of the academic area of the campus.
4. To request the Campus Planning Committee to study the location of a large parking area, approximately 2,000 spaces, for off-campus students to be located in the vicinity of 15th Street and Flint Avenue.

We hope we can make our campus safer for students and faculty and a more pleasant place for the many guests and visitors who find their way to the campus. Needless to say, if we can prevent serious injury or death of one person on our campus, we will be amply rewarded.

Very truly yours,

Lewis N. Jones, Chairman  
Traffic-Security Commission

LNJ:la(j)

Campus Planning Committee  
 March 29, 1966  
 Attachment No. 628  
 Item No. 3240

School of Home Economics  
 Texas Technological College  
 Lubbock, Texas

TO: Mr. M. L. Pennington  
 Vice President for Business Affairs  
 Chairman, Campus Planning Committee

From: Dean Willa Vaughn Tinsley

Date: March 7, 1966

Estimated Space Needed in Home Economics Annex ..... 54,943 sq.ft.  
 Estimate does not include corridors, rest rooms, custodial storage areas.

The requested space is divided among the following academic areas:

Ap. Arts.....21,500 sq. ft.      Home Eco. Ed.....6,000 sq. ft.

Ch. Dev.....16,251 sq. ft.      Home Mgt.....3,832 sq. ft.

Fam. Rel..... 7,360 sq. ft.

Explanations

Applied Arts

Applied Arts now operates at overflow capacity in approximately 9,045 square feet, not including corridors, 9 substandard offices, accommodating 14 full-time and 3 part-time staff.

It is proposed to move this entire department with the possible exception of one laboratory (H2, approximately 1,375 sq. ft.) and 3 offices in the south basement, thus freeing the present space on first and second floors for the expansion of Food and Nutrition and the conversion of two present Applied Arts laboratories to two large classrooms (one, 1,275 sq. ft. and one, 1,000 sq. ft.).

In the Annex, Applied Arts is requesting approximately 21,500 square feet as follows:

12 classrooms @ 1,000 sq. ft. each.....	12,000 sq. ft.
20-25 offices.....	4,500 sq. ft.
1 large Interior Design and Housing Lab	2,500 sq. ft.
Storage.....	<u>2,500 sq. ft.</u>

Total - - - - - 21,500 sq. ft.

Child Development

The tremendous increase in semester hours in this department makes the present Child Development Laboratory totally inadequate for future consideration, except for faculty offices and special testing rooms in research in Child Development.

In the present Home Economics Building, this phase of the Home and Family Life Department has  $7\frac{1}{2}$  staff members occupying 4 substandard offices, one crowded classroom and part of a more adequate classroom.

It is proposed to provide the Child Development laboratories with accompanying service rooms, and a few offices, including the department head's office in the Annex. Other staff offices and special testing rooms are proposed to be located in the current Child Development laboratory without major remodeling of the structure.

In the Annex, Child Development is requesting 16,251 square feet, as follows:

2 Child Development laboratories @ 30' x 50'.....	3,000 sq. ft.
1 Child Development laboratory @ 20' x 45'.....	900 sq. ft.
2 Observation rooms @ 10' x 50'.....	1,000 sq. ft.
2 Observation rooms @ 10' x 30'.....	600 sq. ft.
1 Observation room @ 10' x 45'.....	450 sq. ft.
3 Toilet areas for the children @ 10' x 12'.....	360 sq. ft.
1 Food service room, including storage, cleaning area .....	556 sq. ft.
1 Small isolation room .....	100 sq. ft.
1 Entrance and nurse's station.....	500 sq. ft.
1 Conference room 22' x 25'.....	550 sq. ft.
2 Small conference rooms @ 12' x 18'.....	432 sq. ft.
1 Large storage room 18' x 20'.....	360 sq. ft.
7 Faculty offices, approximately 12' x 15'.....	1,260 sq. ft.
1 Department Head and Secretary's office.....	325 sq. ft.
Departmental storage.....	458 sq. ft.
6 Classrooms @ 900 sq. ft. ....	<u>5,400 sq. ft.</u>
Total	16,251 sq. ft.

Family Relations

In the present Home Economics Building, 2 large classrooms to seat 75-100 each are proposed to be converted from 2 Applied Arts laboratories.

In the Annex, Family Relations is requesting 7,360 square feet as follows:

3 Classrooms to seat 100-150 each, with room dividers	5,200 sq. ft.
12 Faculty offices @ 12' x 15'.....	<u>2,160 sq. ft.</u>
Total	7,360 sq. ft.

Home Economics Education

This department, with the largest number of majors in the School of Home Economics, now operates in one room (525 square feet) plus  $3\frac{1}{2}$  offices accommodating 5 staff members. These 5 staff members in crowded office facilities, do more student counseling in arranging student schedules than other departmental staff in Home Economics.

It is proposed to move this entire department to the Annex, thus freeing one medium size classroom and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  offices, to be used by Home Management, some of which will remain in the present building, and for administrative use.

In the Annex, this department is requesting 6,000 square feet as follows:

1 All-purpose laboratory.....	1,000 sq. ft.
1 Curriculum laboratory.....	600 sq. ft.
2 Classrooms @ 700 sq. ft. ....	1,400 sq. ft.
8 Staff offices of approximately.....	1,400 sq. ft.
3 Secretarial offices of approximately.....	500 sq. ft.
Storage of approximately.....	<u>1,100 sq. ft.</u>
Total	6,000 sq. ft.

Home Management

The one well-equipped Home Management laboratory in the present Home Economics Building will remain, as will the adjacent office.

In the Annex, Home Management is requesting 3,832 square feet, roughly, as follows:

1 Household physics lab., 18' x 24'.....	432 sq. ft.
1 Curriculum laboratory.....	500 sq. ft.
2 Classrooms 25' x 40'.....	2,000 sq. ft.
5 Faculty offices 12' x 15'.....	<u>900 sq. ft.</u>
Total	3,832 sq. ft.

The removal of the above areas from the present Home Economics Building will permit needed expansion of Clothing and Textiles, Food and Nutrition, and administrative services in both classroom space, laboratories, research rooms and faculty offices.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 286

March 30, 1966

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 3:15 p.m. on March 30, 1966, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Other members of the College staff present were Mr. O. R. Downing and Mr. John G. Taylor.

The project architects were represented by Mr. Bob White and Mr. Dan Talley.

3241. Chemistry Research Building (CPC No. 87-74)

Mr. White handed each of those present a copy of the brochure on the study of the Chemistry Building site, in keeping with the instructions of the Board of Directors to make a feasibility study of the area south of the Chemistry Building for the needs expressed by Dr. Dennis and the site defined by the Board of Directors.

Mr. White went over the information and various studies designated as Schemes A, B, C, D, and E. The philosophy, massing, ingress, egress, site utilization, etc., were discussed in some detail.

The estimated need is 116,750 gross square feet for the first phase at an estimated cost of \$25 to \$30 per square foot, a total of \$2.8 to \$3.5 million. The project would be 1.16 times the size of the Administration Building in the first stage and in the final stage would be some  $2\frac{1}{4}$  times the Administration Building.

It was agreed that Scheme C would seem to offer the better solution for the total eventual need.

(The project architects left the meeting at approximately 4:30 p.m.)

3242. Consulting Architect

The steps to date were reviewed and it was agreed that the stage is generally set. The amount to pay the consulting architect will not exceed one percent. Only one major item remains for decision and that is just how far the consulting architect would go in project design. The other questions are quite minor.

It was agreed that the details could be completed in one additional session to explain the developments to the Building Committee at the meeting on March 31, 1966, and to request the Building Committee to allow the Campus Planning Committee to hold an additional session, reach an agreement and convey its recommendation to the Building Committee for approval by phone.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

AGENDA FOR THE JOINT MEETING  
OF THE CAMPUS AND BUILDING COMMITTEE AND CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE  
TO BE HELD AT 10 A.M. IN THE ANNIVERSARY ROOM, STUDENT UNION  
March 31, 1966

1. Business Administration Building

Consider the preliminary plans and specifications to be presented by Mr. Louis Southerland and Mr. Madison Mills.

2. Chemistry Research Building

Consider the report on the study by the firm of Pitts, Mebane, Phelps, and White, the report to be made by Mr. White and Mr. Talley.

3. Classrooms and Office Buildings (Temporary)

The nature of the buildings has changed a bit and it will be necessary to rebid if same procedure is followed. There is a possibility that surplus buildings may be available and the DHEW is making a check at this time. If surplus buildings are available, there is a good possibility that the buildings can be moved in at much less cost.

<sup>was</sup> It is recommended that the CPC be allowed to make a quick check (there is a chance that the buildings will be available at Fort Hood, Roswell or Amarillo, and the information should soon be available) for surplus buildings.

If surplus buildings are not available, it is <sup>was</sup> recommended that the CPC be allowed to rebid in keeping with the refined needs, and the Building Committee award the contract by telephone.

The location is not exact, as the nature of the buildings will determine to some extent the location. It is recommended that the site be part of the telephone recommendation.



#### 4. Consulting Architect

Howard Schmidt has presented a very thorough and comprehensive proposal as requested, and the CPC wishes to recommend that Mr. Schmidt and his firm be approved as the consulting architect, but there has just been insufficient time to check all of the details. There is only one major item for consideration, and that is how far the consulting architect should go in the design of the projects. There are some other items but they would come under the heading of minor technicalities.

The fee will not exceed 1 percent for new construction and could be a bit less, depending on the definition of the work to be done. There are other items such as master planning which will be done on a cost reimbursement basis and there may be requests for the consultant architect to help coordinate major repairs and alterations.

It is recommended that the CPC be given a bit more time to iron out the last remaining items with Mr. Schmidt and that the recommendation be made by phone for approval. A copy of the proposal to date is attached although there will probably be no time to discuss it today.

#### 5. Power Plant

Consider the recommendation of the CPC to commission Zumwalt & Vinther to prepare the plans and specifications for one 200,000 lbs. per hour boiler and one 2,000 ton steam driven turbine air-conditioning unit, with bids to be taken not later than May 20, 1966, with a recommendation for award to be made at the <sup>May</sup> meeting of the Board of Directors. The estimated cost of the boiler and the air-conditioning unit would be approximately \$650,000 and the fee for Zumwalt & Vinther would be about \$5,500.

The reason for the above is the fact that the delivery date for the equipment is some 12 months and the boiler and cooling equipment must be in use by the time the Business Administration Building goes on the line.

Since the above action was taken, the engineers notified Mr. Downing that it is possible that the built-up boiler as recommended above could require as much as 18 months for delivery and installation. Two major companies now make package boilers in the 200,000 lbs. per hour range and only some 9 months would be required for delivery. The package boiler would be 26' lower than the built-up boiler and would provide the same service and potential applications. The package boiler would cost about \$275,000 in comparison to \$400,000 for the built-up boiler.

Consider the recommendation of the CPC that bids be taken for the heating and cooling equipment in time for an award at the May meeting of the Board and the commissioning of Zumwalt & Vinther to prepare the plans and specifications at a cost of approximately \$5,500,

# Review Const. Bldg. Amend. Status

## 6. Financing - Educational and General, Title III

It seems possible to borrow Federal money under Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act at 3 percent and use the funds from the Constitutional Building Amendment for repayment. Further exploration will be made and a report will be given at a later date. It is possible to borrow Federal money at 3 percent interest not to exceed \$5 million per year and still get matching funds under Title I and Title II. The prospects seem fairly favorable at this time. This is just informational at this time.

There is a meeting of the Bond Committee on April 13, 1966, in Dallas.

## 7. Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building

Consider the recommendation of the CPC to commission Zumwalt & Vinther to provide the engineering services for the utility extensions to the project, the fee to be determined by the existing contract with the firm. The extensions must be completed by October, 1966.

## 8. Housing

### On-Campus

#### Financing

It is now definitely established that there will be funds available from the HHFA to finance the project this Federal fiscal year. In a letter received yesterday, the HHFA notified the College that the limit in the future will be \$4 million each year and the college's application is for approximately \$8 million. The letter suggested that the College file an amended application for \$4 million which can be accepted if it is received by April 28, 1966, and could be considered for fund reservation as funds may become available. It seems much to the College's advantage to refile under the terms stated. A \$4 million loan which probably could not be received before July 1, 1966, will leave a need for interim financing. However, there seems to be no alternate at the moment except to refile as suggested. *(a copy of Miss Brown's letter is attached to 4-modest post)* <sup>NO</sup> If the project is to be ready for use in September, 1967, it will be necessary to award a contract by the May meeting, if possible.

The \$4 million in the next Federal fiscal year would not be enough to finance the project until July 1, 1967.

Consider the recommendation that the application be refiled by April 28, 1966, and that a recommendation be developed for other financing by the time of the next Board meeting if possible.



MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 287

March 31, 1966

A meeting of the Campus and Building Committee of the Board of Directors and the Campus Planning Committee was held at 10 a.m. on March 31, 1966, in the Executive Room in the Student Union Building.

Members of the Campus and Building Committee of the Board of Directors present were Mr. Harold Hinn, Chairman, Mr. Herbert Allen, and Mr. C. A. Cash.

Members of the Campus Planning Committee present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Others present from the College were President R. C. Goodwin, Miss Evelyn Clewell, Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. O. R. Downing.

3243. Chemistry Research Building (CPC No. 87-74)

Dr. Joe Dennis and Dr. Robert G. Rekers were present from the Chemistry Faculty Committee. The project architects were represented by Messrs. White and Talley.

Mr. White presented copies of the brochure to the members present who had not previously received copies, explained that the study has been completed in keeping with the request of the Board of Directors, the estimates of need prepared by Dr. Dennis and the site definition stipulated by the Board. Dr. Dennis estimated two stages of needs, one for the present and one for the future, each showing the undergraduate and graduate needs.

Mr. White reviewed the first pages in detail and stated that the architects had prepared five schemes showing the elevation, usage, philosophy, etc. The utilitarian and aesthetic aspects, ingress and egress, inside movement, etc., were discussed at length.

There was discussion of the central services and it was agreed that additional study is needed.

A location of the 500-capacity lecture room was discussed and the architects felt that it would be easier, more accessible from all areas and better to have it located on the inside of the proposed courtyard. The cost would be of little consequence whether it was inside or outside of the courtyard. The inside location would provide easier access and greater utilization of lobby space.

A great deal of study ensued on the presentations.

(Messrs. White and Talley left the meeting at 11:35 a.m.)

The Building Committee members agreed that they would be willing to accept Scheme C or Scheme D, with four floors at one stage or one side, and five for the other, with the auditorium on the inside, and that the architects should be asked to proceed.

The cost was estimated at \$4 million with \$3,250,000 plus 6 percent architects fees, plus \$600,000 for utilities and equipment.

(The meeting recessed for lunch at 12 noon and reconvened at 12:45 p.m., with Messrs. Southerland and Mills of Page, Southerland & Page of Austin, Miss Jerry Kirkwood and Mr. Howard Schmidt present.)



3244. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)

Mr. Southerland presented the developments to date and explained the general philosophy of the building which would accommodate about 6,000 students. He showed how the spaces were arranged according to heavy and light usage and the noise factors.

He said that the project would be located approximately 75' from Flint Avenue. Ingress and egress are available from all four sides. Parking facilities are not being shown as that will be done later.

He explained how the building is designed for the main traffic flow and that 80 to 85 percent would be accommodated on the floor below grade, the ground level and one floor up in order to reduce the climbing distance to a minimum.

The building is designed around a core-type plan.

The detailed facilities by floors were presented.

The Building Committee unanimously authorized the architects to proceed immediately with final working drawings in keeping with the authorization of the Board of Directors.

(The project architects and Miss Kirkwood left the meeting at 1:45 p.m.)

3245. Classrooms and Office Buildings (Temporary)

The nature of the buildings has changed a bit and it will be necessary to rebid if same procedure is followed. There is a possibility that surplus buildings may be available and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is making a check at this time. If surplus buildings are available, there is a good possibility that the buildings can be moved in at much less cost.

It was recommended that the CPC be allowed to make a quick check (there is a chance that the buildings will be available at Fort Hood, Roswell or Amarillo, and the information should soon be available) for surplus buildings.

If surplus buildings are not available, it was recommended that the Campus Planning Committee be allowed to rebid in keeping with the refined needs, and the Building Committee award the contract by telephone.

The location is not exact as the nature of the buildings will determine to some extent the location. It is recommended that the site be part of the telephone recommendation.

A check was made with Mr. Sam G. Wynn, Regional Director, Division of Surplus Property Utilization, DHEW, earlier in the morning after the agenda had been prepared and he said that his organization is really giving the quest an all-out shake but that there was nothing at the moment in the offing, and mentioned possible on-site usage at Reese as there are several buildings there. The College would have free rent but would need to make some sort of arrangements to pay the utilities, etc.; and probably to provide the transportation. He asked if it would be possible.

He said that the same basis of a lease could be arranged at the Amarillo Air Force Base for temporary use if Texas Tech wished to have a branch campus. He said it would be possible from his standpoint.

While talking with Mr. Wynn, he called in Roy Washam, who was working on the request, and Mr. Washam reported that Sheppard Air Force Base has about 25 buildings. Some are single story, 25' wide x 120' long. Most are stripped on the inside. It would be easy to convert them to classrooms and the prospects look pretty good.

Mr. Wynn said that he would pursue the use of buildings at Reese, especially a gymnasium which is available and would handle classes up to 350, as requested by Dr. Murray. The use would have to be on-site and there could be a transportation problem. A call is to be made to Mr. Wynn as soon as the College has an indication of its needs.

(The Building Committee approved the recommendations as presented.)

3246. Consulting Architect

The chairman reported that Howard Schmidt has presented a very thorough and comprehensive proposal as requested, and the CPC wishes to recommend that Mr. Schmidt and his firm be approved as the consulting architect but there has just been insufficient time to check all of the details. There is only one major item for consideration, and that is how far the consulting architect should go in the design of the projects. There are some other items but they would come under the heading of minor technicalities.

The fee will not exceed 1 percent for new construction and could be a bit less, depending on the definition of the work to be done. There are other items such as master planning which will be done on a cost reimbursement basis and there may be requests for the consultant architect to help coordinate major repairs and alterations.

It was recommended that the CPC be given a bit more time to iron out the last remaining items with Mr. Schmidt and that the recommendations be made by phone for approval.

The 1 percent fee for new construction would come from the 6 percent architectural fee now being paid.

It was explained that the consulting architect would never serve as project architect on any of the College projects unless it were small and involved unusual circumstances.

(The Building Committee approved the recommendation of the CPC.)

3247. Power Plant

At the last CPC meeting, it was explained that the delivery date for the heating and cooling equipment is some 12 months and it must be installed by the time the Business Administration Building goes on the line.

As a result, the CPC agreed to recommend the commissioning of Zumwalt & Vinther to prepare the plans and specifications for one 200,000 lbs. per hour boiler and one 2,000 ton steam driven turbine air-conditioning unit with bids to be taken not later than May 20, 1966, with a recommendation for award to be made at the May meeting of the Board of Directors. The estimated cost of the boiler and the air-conditioning unit would be approximately \$650,000 and the fee for Zumwalt & Vinther would be about \$5,500.



3247. Power Plant (continued)

Since the above action was taken, the engineers notified Mr. Downing that it is possible that the built-up boiler, as recommended, could require as much as 18 months for delivery and installation. Two major companies now make package boilers in the 200,000 lbs., per hour range and only some 9 months would be required for delivery. The package boiler would be 26' lower than the built-up boiler and would provide the same service and potential applications. The package boiler would cost about \$275,000 in comparison to \$400,000 for the built-up boiler.

The CPC recommended that bids be taken for the heating and cooling equipment in time for an award at the May meeting of the Board and the commissioning of Zumwalt & Vinther to prepare the plans and specifications at a cost of approximately \$5,500.

Mr. Allen said that package boilers had been perfected to a point that the College should have no hesitancy in acquiring one.

(The Building Committee approved the recommendations of the CPC.)

3248. Financing - Educational and General, Title III

It now seems possible to borrow Federal money under Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act at 3 percent and use funds from the Constitutional Building Amendment for repayment. It was suggested that further exploration be made, with a report to be given at a later date. It is possible to borrow the Federal money at amounts not to exceed \$5 million per year and still receive matching funds under Title I and Title II. The prospects seem fairly favorable at this time.

It was reported that a meeting of the Bond Committee for the Constitutional Building Bonds is scheduled for April 13, 1966, in Dallas, with the bond counsel and financial adviser.

The Building Committee was of the opinion that the possibility of loans should be pursued, although the report was primarily informational.

3249. Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building (CPC No. 87-64)

The Building Committee approved the recommendation of the CPC to commission Zumwalt & Vinther to provide the engineering services for the utility extensions to the project, the fee to be determined by the existing contract with the firm. The extensions must be completed by October, 1966. The option for additional services in the contract rests with the owner.

3250. HousingOn-CampusFinancing

It is now definitely established that there will be no funds available from the HHFA to finance the project this Federal fiscal year. In a letter received on March 30, 1966, from Miss Emma E. Brown, College Housing Operations Officer, the HHFA notified the College that the limit in the future will be \$4 million each year and the college's application is for approximately \$8 million. The letter suggested that the College file an amended application for \$4 million which can be accepted if it is received by April 28, 1966, and could be considered for fund reservation as funds may become available. It seems much to the College's advantage to refile under the terms stated.

3250. HousingOn-CampusFinancing (continued)

A \$4 million loan which probably could not be received before July 1, 1966, will leave a need for interim financing. However, there seems to be no alternate at the moment except to refile as suggested. A copy of Miss Brown's letter is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 629, page 1941)

If the project is to be ready for use in September, 1967, it will be necessary to award a contract by the May meeting if possible.

The \$4 million in the next Federal fiscal year would not be enough to finance the project until July 1, 1967.

The CPC recommended that the application be refiled by April 28, 1966, and that a recommendation be developed for other financing by the time of the next Board meeting if possible.

(The Building Committee approved the recommendation of the CPC that the application be refiled by April 28, 1966, and that a recommendation be developed for the financing by the time of the next Board meeting if possible.)

3251. Priority List

The following list was presented, in keeping with the request of the Building Committee, and the square footages and costs are pure estimates as no steps have been taken to verify actual needs. These seem to be the projects most needed at this time.

Home Economics

Estimated 54,943 sq. ft., net, using 60 percent as assignable space, the gross would be 91,570 sq. ft., using \$18 to \$20 per sq. ft., and architect's fee at 6 percent, equipment at \$100,000, utility extension at \$100,000 and site preparation at \$20,000. The total cost would run between \$1.967 and \$2.154 million.

Architectural

Existing sq. footage, net and excluding temporary facilities, 24,448 sq. ft. Estimated assignable needs now, 68,000; by 1968, 94,300, and by 1973, 116,736.

Using 1973 estimated needs with 70 percent assignable at \$16.50 per sq. ft., plus \$165,092 for architects fees, \$50,000 for equipment, \$100,000 for utilities, the estimated cost is \$3,066,632.

Agricultural Plant Sciences

Estimated assignable footage, 20,000, 60 percent assignable, \$18 to \$24 per square foot cost, fees at 6 percent, equipment at \$50,000 and utilities at \$50,000. Total estimated cost between \$735,000 and \$905,960.

Music

There is no way to estimate the needs without a comprehensive study. The cost could run from \$1.5 million for 75,000 total square feet, plus architects fees, equipment and utilities estimated at \$240,000 for a total cost of \$1.75 million on up.

Dr. Goodwin mentioned that Dr. W. M. Pearce is working on a program for music.

3251. Priority List (continued)

Power Plant and Utilities

The estimated cost of ultimate needs is \$2.75 million.

Chemistry Building

The Chemistry Building was covered under the item handled at the first of the meeting.

After a very lengthy discussion, it was agreed that all of the above projects should be considered and that hydrology needs should be added.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.

Campus Planning Committee  
March 31, 1966  
Attachment No. 629  
Item No. 3250

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
300 West Vickery Boulevard, Fort Worth, Texas 76104

Region V

March 29, 1966

Re: CH-Tex-219(D)  
Texas Tech College  
Dormitories and  
Dining Facility

Mr. M. L. Pennington  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
Texas Technological College  
P. O. Box 4610  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Dear Mr. Pennington:

This is with reference to the subject preliminary application filed by your institution for loan assistance under the College Housing Program. You are undoubtedly aware that applications on file for College Housing funds far exceed the \$300,000,000 available for the whole of FY 1966 which ends on June 30.

Procedures have, therefore, been adopted for the allocation of available funds which give priority to housing projects and include a limitation of \$4,000,000 per campus per year. The above referenced application exceeds this limitation and for that reason its processing has been suspended pending this notification.

This letter is to offer you the option of amending your application to bring it within the \$4,000,000 limitation listed above. If you wish to file an amended application, we will appreciate receiving it within 30 days. It could then be considered for fund reservation as funds may become available. If it is not received by April 28, 1966, it will be considered withdrawn without prejudice and the application forms will be returned to you.

We sincerely regret the necessity for this action. Please feel free to call upon us for whatever assistance we can give.

Sincerely,

Travis Wm. Miller  
Regional Director  
Community Facilities

/s/ Emma E. Brown

Emma E. Brown  
Chief, College Housing  
Operations Branch