

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 346

July 12, 1967

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 3 p.m. on June 12, 1967, in Room 120 of the Administration Building.

Members present were Chairman M. L. Pennington, Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky and Mr. Nolan E. Barrick.

Other College staff members present were Mr. John G. Taylor and Miss Evelyn Clewell.

Mr. Howard Schmidt, Consulting Architect, was present.

Also in attendance were Mr. Berwyn Tisdell of Howard Schmidt and Associates, Consulting Architects, and Mr. R. C. Messersmith of Stiles, Roberts and Messersmith, Architects.

3709. Wiggins Complex, Phase II (CPC No. 114-67)

A. Names of Buildings

In keeping with the action of the Board of Directors at the last meeting, it was agreed that Leidigh Hall would join Coleman Hall on the west; Langford Hall would be the south portion of the west building and Bassett Hall would be the north portion.

B. Decision Requested by the Architects

1. Should any parking facilities west of the Complex be included in the Phase II contract documents?

It was agreed to wait for the traffic survey, as there will be time to make the decision after the information is available.

It was agreed that it will be necessary to estimate the cost for the budget and to be sure that the amount is included in the bond sale.

2. Consider change of sidewalk and terrace finish from plain concrete to another material.

After a good bit of discussion, it was agreed that the architects will do some additional study and could stipulate "to be installed as directed by the architects" if the information is not available early enough.

3. Review sketches of Complex marker and screening fence at sprinkler control piping. It was agreed to see if the piping could be moved some distance from the road in order to decrease the hazard and for it to be screened by plant material rather than masonry.

4. Discussed exact wording of sign of Commons and building plaques.

It was agreed that the plaques within Chitwood, Weymouth, Coleman, Leidigh, Langford and Bassett Halls would be installed exactly in keeping with those in the last halls, but in order to get the entire story of both phases properly reflected in one place, the plaque will be omitted from Phase I of the Wiggins Commons and installed in Phase II when all the information is available. The procedure was felt to be a proper interpretation of Board policy.

3709. Wiggins Complex, Phase II (CPC No. 114-67)B. Decision Requested by the Architects (Cont'd)

4. A credit will be requested for omitting the plaque in Phase I.
5. Considered providing walk-through doors and folding partitions in dining halls. Approved.
6. Discussed changing concrete testing to make the mix design the responsibility of the contractor.

In the past, some of the contractors have felt that the College should not provide the mix and the contractor be required to meet the specified standards. So, it was agreed that the contractor will have the responsibility of the mix design and the College will continue the responsibility for testing.

7. Hardware Allowance - The hardware would include the lock sets, closers and panic devices.

It was agreed to require the contractor to take competitive bids within the owner's approval.

8. Methods of Taking Bids.

A good bit of discussion ensued on whether or not the owner should take bids for subcontracts, such as furniture, where the subcontractor supplies the material and not the installation. Some difficulty has been experienced on Phase I of the Wiggins Complex. It would be possible to have a list of free-qualified suppliers.

It was agreed that the architects will explore the problem further and bring it back again.

9. Temporary Power.

It will be provided by the City through temporary lines.

The City will be allowed to install the temporary lines now, with the understanding that if anything should happen to Phase II, the lines would be removed. Also, the lines should interfere as little as possible with the Agricultural pursuits.

10. Parking Lot for Phase I.

Some discussion ensued on means for the students who park in the Phase I parking lot to get around the construction of Phase II to the residence halls to the east. The best solution possible will be sought.

11. Fencing.

The architects were requested to investigate the use of land by the Agriculture School and how much to fence off and what kind of fencing to use.

It was agreed, in order to be as economical as possible, to use the existing chain-link fence on the south, wire on the west and wood fencing on the rest of the area.

12. The architects were requested to study the detail of the vertical strips as they exist on Phase I as there is an optical illusion which tends to make the strips across the windows and the brick work seem to be crooked.

3709. Wiggins Complex, Phase II (Cont'd)C. Review of Changes From Phase I

1. Interior finishes at formal lounges and Unit L Lobby - The architects proposed the landing with a small balcony for the downstairs, the same as those in Chitwood Hall.  
  
It was agreed to do all three halls in Phase II in the same manner.
2. Additional windows at Snack Bar - Approved.
3. Add stone jamb at exterior windows at Units K and L - Approved.
4. Concrete stairs in lieu of steel stairs in towers - After a good bit of discussion, it was proposed by the architects and agreed by the Campus Planning Committee to take alternate bids.
5. Interior finishes - Change plaster to vinyl on gypboard - Approved.
6. Provide bullnose corners at concrete block corridor walls - Approved.
7. Reduce elevator shaft by 4" in width - Approved.
8. Change basement wall waterproofing - Approved. The estimated cost is approximately \$12,000 but it was felt that it would be worth it in order to prevent water from entering basements through the walls.
9. Use smaller homosote tackboard sheets with wood battens at joints - Approved.
10. Additional exterior entrance at north of Unit G lounge - Approved.
11. Additional exterior entrance at north of Unit L lobby - Approved.
12. Minor revisions to bedroom furniture, windowsill, mechanical furring, jointing, etc. - Approved.
13. Increase height of typical floor elevator lobby ceiling - Approved.
14. Add closet in living room of supervisors' apartments - Approved.
15. Provide acoustical material in typing rooms - Approved.
16. The architects were requested to study the use of glass, or some such treatment, in front of the snack bars to soften the overall effect.
17. The architects are to study the food service operation of the snack bars in view of improving service.
18. The architects were requested to study the need for the sale of nonfood items in the halls.

D. Time Schedule

The architects reported that the plans and specifications are 90 percent complete and are scheduled for presentation at the July 29, 1967, Board meeting for approval to go out for bids.

3709. Wiggins Complex, Phase II (CFC No. 114-67)D. Time Schedule (Cont'd)

It is planned for the month of August to be used to get clearances from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, bidding to take place in September, the contract award to be made at the Board meeting in October, and the issuance of the work order in November.

The schedule was approved, and it was pointed out that it will be necessary to have a loan agreement, bond resolutions, etc. Nothing has been received from the Department of Housing and Urban Development so far on the method or system to be used. Perhaps the approval could be received at the August Board meeting. The Student Union bonds are to be tied in with the bond sale for Phase II and little work has been done on the Union bonds so far.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

---

The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 347

July 19, 1967

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 1:30 p.m. on July 19, 1967, in Room 120 of the Administration Building.

Members present were Chairman M. L. Pennington, Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky and Mr. Nolan E. Barrick.

Other College staff members present were Miss Evelyn Clewell and Miss Jerry Kirkwood.

Mr. Howard Schmidt, Consulting Architect, was present.

3710. Architecture and Arts Facility (CPC No. 106-66)  
(O'Neil Ford and Associates, Architects)

The subcommittee reported that based upon the program prepared by Dr. Bill Lockhart representing the space needs of the Applied Arts Department, this department, as well as the Department of Architecture, may be housed within the originally programmed facility, with the exception that approximately 5,400 additional assignable square feet apparently will be required. In order to fully design the additional square footage, the needs of the department should be determined as plans are developed. The program submitted by Dr. Lockhart has been reviewed by the subcommittee and by Miss Evelyn Clewell and the requests are felt to be justified.

It has been determined that the originally programmed facility would be fully utilized by 1969 with no room for growth.

It was recommended that the facility be designed under one roof as a two-element building in order to afford the maximum expansion for each of the departments in the future.

In order to expedite the project it was agreed that:

1. Mr. M. L. Pennington contact the Coordinating Board in order to establish a clear understanding concerning the academic change in combining the two departments within one facility containing, basically, two elements.
2. The project architects will be invited to the campus to meet with Mr. Howard Schmidt, Consulting Architect, and Mr. Nolan E. Barrick in order that the new approach might be explained.

Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Barrick were requested to report to the Campus Planning Committee the most feasible method determined by this subcommittee and the project architects for expediting the project.

The existing application for matching funds will be refiled on or before August 7, 1967, with a request for additional matching funds based upon the recently revised budgeting by the Coordinating Board.

3711. Biology Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce, Architects)  
(H. A. Lott, Inc., Contractor)

The existing application will also be refiled by August 7, 1967, with a request for additional funds.

3711. Biology Building (Cont'd)1. Tunnels and Utilities Extensions  
(Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., Engineers)

- A. Bids were received on July 11, 1967. The Anthony Company was the low bidder with the base bid in the amount of \$698,750.

The Board of Directors was polled and the award of the contract was approved.

The bid tabulation is attached for information.  
(Attachment No. 729, page 4045)

- B. It was recommended that Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., Engineers, be authorized to supervise the construction under the terms of the existing contract.

Board approval will be sought at the next regular meeting.

3712. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page. Southerland. Page. Architects)  
(J. J. Fritch Co., Inc., Contractor)

Progress of the project has been good. Almost all of the first floor office towers and academic portions of the slab have been completed, as well as two stairwells. All of the sub-basement walls in the octagon portion of the building has been waterproofed to around 8 to 16 feet and the backfill has been accomplished in the areas. All of the mechanical has been roughed in on the first floor and the electrical primary is in. The column steel rising to the second floor slab has begun.

3713. Central Heating and Cooling Plant (CPC No. 105-66)  
(Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., Engineers)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps and White, Architects)  
(Anthony Company, Contractor)

Drums have been set on Boiler Bay No. 1 and one-third of the tubes are erected. Also, all four of the headers are installed. Approximately two-thirds of the basement walls have been poured and although there are some rough spots in the finish, the architects and the contractor are working on the problem and it is felt that a satisfactory solution can be found.

The chiller component has been lifted on Chiller Bay No. 1 and the slab is in the water treatment area and roughing in by the mechanical contractor has begun.

3714. Chemistry Building Addition (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps and White, Architects)

An informal meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held earlier with Mr. Robert White, a principal in the firm of Pitts, Mebane, Phelps and White. Some questions raised by the architects were answered during this meeting but other questions remain to be answered. Of the very detailed questions remaining to be answered, as requested by the architects, it was recommended that the architects make specific and perhaps alternate recommendations for solutions to the ultimate design of the facility for the future review of the Campus Planning Committee.

Miss Kirkwood was requested to so advise the architects.

3715. Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (CPC No. 115-67)  
(Atcheson, Atkinson and Cartwright, Architects)

Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky is the coordinator for the project and he and Mr. Schmidt had not had ample time to review the schematic plans which have been prepared. Therefore, the Campus Planning Committee recommended that the plans be reviewed and a report made to the Campus Planning Committee at a later date.

3716. Foreign Languages - Mathematics Building (CPC No. 79-63)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelos and White, Architects)  
(Bennett Construction Company, Contractor)

There has been no construction progress since June 15, 1967, when the contractor boarded up the job and filed suit against Mr. M. L. Pennington, Texas Technological College and the architectural firm. However, arbitration has been agreed upon, the arbitrators assigned and their judgment is expected on July 19 or 20, 1967.

3717. Home Economics Addition

Due to the combining of the Department of Architecture and the Department of Applied Arts in the Architecture and Arts Facility, the originally proposed addition will need to be reprogrammed. The already approved matching fund grant is still in effect and will not be withdrawn prior to a complete investigation of available funds.

3718. Law School (CPC No. 108-66) (Harrell & Hamilton, Architects)

The architects plan a visit with the Campus Planning Committee on July 21, 1967, to present refined schematic plans.

The results of the meeting will be recorded at a later date.

3719. Museum (CPC No. 65-61) (Associated Architects and Engineers of Lubbock)  
(Stiles, Roberts and Messersmith & McMurtry and Craig, Architects)

The Ad-Hoc Committee has met and requested that the various other committees submit answers to questions needed in order to expedite the project.

3720. Stadium Light Standards, 1967 (CPC No. 110-67)

Work for replacing the damaged standards to their original positions and the lighting level, as originally designed, is in progress. Brown-McKee, Inc., are the contractors and the contract amount is \$35,888.00.

Also, the contract will include the additional bracing of the existing 9 standards. Brown-McKee, Inc., are the contractors and the contract amount for accomplishing the work is \$9,700.00.

3721. Student Health Service Addition (CPC No. 111-67)

Mr. Howard Schmidt is proceeding with the additional feasibility studies for Campus Planning Committee review.

3722. Student Union Addition (CPC No. 112-67)

As requested by the Campus Planning Committee, Mr. Howard Schmidt is proceeding with the feasibility studies.

3723. Snack Bar Remodeling - Student Union

Proposed fees as submitted by Mr. Jack Evans, Interior Designer, and Mr. Arthur Dana, Food Consultant, have been received.

Mr. Howard Schmidt has been requested to secure estimated costs of the work from both Mr. Evans and Mr. Dana.

The costs are expected as soon as they can be compiled.

3724. Tech Press Addition

Mr. Howard Schmidt presented the plan which includes the area which will fill in the southwest corner, west of the Tech Press area. The area is planned for storage only at this time until the plant operation expands into part of the area.



3724. Tech Press Addition (Cont'd)

The addition is 109' x 72' and the estimated cost of construction only is \$59,500.

The Campus Planning Committee felt that an increased operation could feasibly call for additional office facilities which had not been included in the project. Based upon this observation, it was recommended that Mr. Bengé R. Daniel be requested to meet with the committee to discuss a projected plan.

It was also recommended that plans and specifications be developed for competitive bidding procedures and that Davis, Foster and Thorp of El Paso, Architects, be offered the job of developing such plans and specifications as project architects.

3725. Temporary Buildings - Summer, 1967

All of the facilities are on schedule and are expected to be completed for the fall semester, 1967.

3726. Textile Chemical Research Laboratory (CPC No. 116-67)  
(Ralph Spencer and Associates, Architects)

Mr. Schmidt presented the schematic plans developed to date and it was felt that the solution is an economical way to accomplish the work as outlined in the written program prepared by Dean John R. Bradford, Dr. Earl Heard, Dr. William Martin, Mr. Harry E. Arthur and Mr. Charles E. Wilson. It was recognized that the committee had proposed a basement area for storage of cotton bales. However, the Campus Planning Committee felt that the additional cost of an elevator to transport the cotton bales to the basement and the inconvenient transportation for storage was not feasible. In addition, the storage of cotton was not part of the charge and could prove to be in excess of the established budget for construction.

After further observation, in view of projected need for classroom and laboratory spaces, the Campus Planning Committee recommended that structural provisions be made for a second floor to the extent that the original design not be deterred and such provisions not exceed the original budget.

In addition, the possibility of housing the equipment at a basement floor level was considered. It was considered to be an abnormal flow of traffic to have part of the equipment at ground floor levels and the additional equipment at a lower level.

Mr. Schmidt, Consulting Architect, preferred to withhold the construction cost estimate until the project architects could be consulted. However, he felt that the proposed estimate, including the research facility and provisions for a second floor level, could be well within the established budget for construction and professional service fees.

3727. Tunnels and Utilities Extensions - Wiggins Complex, Business Administration Building, Central Heating and Cooling Plant  
(Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., Engineers)

Preliminary final inspection has been held with Mr. O. R. Downing representing the College and a request for final inspection is expected soon.

3728. Wiggins Complex, Phase I (CPC No. 97-65)  
(Schmidt and Stiles, Roberts and Messersmith, Architects)  
(H. A. Lott, Inc., Contractor)

The project is on schedule, the contractor has little doubt that the project will be completed when needed.

The kitchen equipment is arriving on schedule, mechanical installation has virtually been completed and the bedroom furniture has been installed.



3728. Wiggins Complex, Phase I (Cont'd)

In addition, mechanical rooms for Weymouth and Coleman Halls are in the process of being checked out and all primary utilities are connected.

1. Furniture and Furnishings

All furniture and furnishings at a total cost of \$135,413.30 have been ordered in keeping with the approved budget.

2. Temporary Parking

Bids were received on July 11, 1967. Pioneer Pavers, Inc., was the low bidder with a base bid of \$36,400.

The Board of Directors was polled and the award of the contract approved.

The bid tabulation is attached for information.  
(Attachment No. 730, page 4046)

Jerry Kirkwood  
Coordinator

---

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Campus Planning Committee  
 July 19, 1967  
 Attachment No. 729  
 Item No. 3711

TUNNELS AND UTILITIES EXTENSIONS

BIOLOGY TEX. 4-1684 (2-1684)

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE

B I D   T A B U L A T I O N

July 11, 1967  
 3 p.m.

CONTRACTOR	BASE BID	BID BOND	ACKNOWLEDGE ADDENDA # 1 & 2
Anthony Company	\$ 698,750	X	X
B. B. Adams	\$1,111,111	X	X
Phillip Forman Co.	No Bid		
Rountree Company	\$ 728,000	X	X

35 Interested Persons

Campus Planning Committee  
 July 19, 1967  
 Attachment No. 730  
 Item No. 3728

BID TABULATION  
 3 p.m.  
 July 12, 1967

PARKING FACILITIES FOR  
 THE DOSSIE M. WIGGINS DORMITORY COMPLEX

PHASE 1  
 TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
 SCHMIDT AND STILES, ROBERTS & MESSERSMITH  
 ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS

BIDDER	BID SEC.	LUMP SUM BID	
BOB R. HUNTER CONST.	X	\$ 41,800.00	
PIONEER PAVERS, INC.	X	\$ 36,400.00	(Sept. 20) (Lighting)
J. T. "RED" ROBERSON	X	\$ 49,178.30	
W. D. TURNER	X	\$ 45,200.00	
C. W. ZANN & SON	X	\$ 47,708.34	(Nov. 1) (Lighting)

35 Interested Persons

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 348

July 21, 1967

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 1:30 p.m. on July 21, 1967, in Room 207 of the Student Union Building.

Members present were Chairman M. L. Pennington, Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky and Mr. Nolan E. Barrick.

Other College staff members present were Miss Evelyn Clewell and Miss Jerry Kirkwood.

Mr. James R. Russell attended in the absence of Mr. O. R. Downing.

Mr. Howard Schmidt, Consulting Architect, was present.

Representing the Law School Faculty were Dean Richard B. Amandes, Mr. U. V. Jones, Mr. Maurice B. Kirk, Mr. G. W. Shellhaas and Mr. Justin Smith.

Present for the presentation of their developments of the Law School Building to date were Mr. George F. Harrell, Mr. E. G. Hamilton and Mr. Clifton Pine, representing the architectural firm of Harrell and Hamilton.

The purpose of the meeting was to view the design concept as prepared by the project architects based upon the programmed application for matching funds.

3729. Law School (CPC No. 108-66) (Harrell & Hamilton, Architects)

The architects had prepared a color slide presentation which Mr. Hamilton presented.

First presented was the design analysis indicating a comprehensive study in the approach to the solution of the traffic flow in the building.

Schematic plans placing the various elements within the building in direct relationship to each other and their functions which evolved into the schematic concept, and ultimately into the preliminary plans were presented.

The preliminary plan reflects a concept of a basement and 3 floors above grade structure housing 82,000 assignable square feet with a total gross square footage of 116,000. Based upon these figures the building as proposed is 70.6 percent efficient.

Sections through the building showing the vertical relationship to spaces and the massing of the building were presented.

Materials proposed for use are the Texas Tech blend of brick, red tile, bronze glass and bronze hardware. In addition, the architects propose to make basic use of the Texas Tech blend of brick for the interior walls and exposed concrete patterned ceilings where feasible. Red brick pavers are planned for some interior floors and are proposed for exterior walks as well.

The proposed structural system is poured in place concrete and the library stack bays are on an 18' x 30' module.

Slides of a working model reflecting the massing of the building and sketches showing closer details of entrances and interior points of interest were presented.

Mr. Hamilton presented the site plan locating the building at the northwest corner of Flint Avenue and 15th Street. The architects stated that the site is suggestive only of the first indicated possible site and should be open to additional study should the site not be acceptable or determined at this time.

3729. Law School (Cont'd)

The schedule for further development of plans was proposed as follows. Since the permanent facility for the Law School has projected a need for availability in the fall of 1969, the schedule was worked backward from this completion date. Reserving a 14 month construction period indicated that a contract award needs to be made no later than the middle of July, 1968. In addition, allowing the time for proper reviews during the drawing development period, it was considered to be quite beneficial if the Board of Directors could review the preliminary plans at one of the August, 1967, meetings.

It will be recalled that the Law School did not receive the applied for grant, however; the estimated cost filed with the application for matching funds was \$2,076,000 for building construction only. The architects feel the presented design concept is within this budget.

Chairman Pennington asked for comments from those present. The Campus Planning Committee members requested a few days to study the preliminary plans. Dean Amandes stated that he approves of the design concept and Mr. Justin Smith further added that the present plan reflects a very usable building.

It was recommended that the architects leave the scaled preliminary plans and the slides with the Campus Planning Committee in order for additional study to be made by each member on his own. After this review, the Campus Planning Committee will meet to make further recommendations.

The architects, Mr. Urbanovsky, Mr. Barrick and Mr. Schmidt were to visit the proposed site for a further "work session" after the meeting adjourned.

Jerry Kirkwood  
Coordinator

---

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 349

July 31, 1967

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 3 p.m. on July 31, 1967, in Room 120 of the Administration Building.

Members present were Chairman M. L. Pennington, Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky and Mr. Nolan E. Barrick.

Other College staff members present were Mr. John G. Taylor, Mr. O. R. Downing and Miss Jerry Kirkwood. Miss Evelyn Clewell was out of the City.

Mr. Howard Schmidt, Consulting Architect, was present.

3730. A correction to the Minutes No. 334 has been approved by the committee to read as follows:

3699. Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (CPC No. 115-67)

Mr. Schmidt accepted the commission as Consulting Architect under the terms of his contract.

It was agreed to offer the architectural commission to Atcheson, Atkinson and Cartwright, Architects, provided work could begin at once.

(The firm accepted the commission.)

The engineers, as selected by the architects, will be subject to the approval of the Campus Planning Committee.

3670. Textile Chemical Research Laboratory (CPC No. 116-67)

Mr. Howard Schmidt accepted the commission as Consulting Architect under the terms of his contract.

It was agreed to offer the architectural commission to Ralph D. Spencer and Associates, provided work could begin at once. It was further agreed that Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., would be retained by the architects to do the engineering work.

(The firm accepted the commission.)

3731. Architecture and Arts Facility (CPC No. 106-66)  
(O'Neil Ford and Associates, Architects)

Mr. M. L. Pennington, Chairman, has reported that Mr. Ken Ashworth of the Coordinating Board does not foresee any problem in the re-design of the facility to accommodate the Department of Architecture and the Department of Art, providing the total assignable area is not reduced more than 5 percent.

It was recommended that Mr. Howard Schmidt, Consulting Architect, invite the project architects to meet with him and Mr. Nolan Barrick in order that the proposed changes concerning the programmed space be discussed and a recommendation for the most expedient method for proceeding with the project be determined and recommended to the Campus Planning Committee.

Mr. Pennington's report concerning Mr. Ashworth's comments is attached for information.

(Attachment No. 731, page 4052)

3732. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page, Southerland, Page, Architects)  
(J. J. Fritch Co., Inc., Contractor)

Mr. Louis Southerland was on campus on July 26, 1967, to present and discuss proposed exterior building materials. Samples of all materials were viewed by Mr. M.L. Pennington, Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Howard Schmidt, and Miss Jerry Kirkwood. The type of materials was recommended by the Campus Planning Committee and approved by the Board of Directors with the acceptance of the final plans and specifications, and the approval at this time is requested for basic colors and finishes.

Selections were made based upon a request by Mr. Urbanovsky that the architects present larger samples of the materials selected for further review by the Campus Planning Committee.

3733. Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building (CPC No. 79-63)  
(Pitts Mebane Phe te Architects)  
(Bennett Construction Company, Contractor)

The arbitrators made judgment agreeing with the College concerning all items in contention with the exception of the installation of the cap brick. The contractor was back on the job on July 17, 1967.

Under the terms of the agreement between all parties, the project is expected to be completed for occupancy by September 24, 1967.

3734. Law School (CPC No. 108-66) (Harrell & Hamilton, Architects)

Based upon the individual study by each Campus Planning Committee member, it was agreed that several elements of the design concept presented by the architects in the preliminary plans required additional study. Mr. Howard Schmidt was requested to advise the project architects of the concern of the Campus Planning Committee in the various areas which deal principally with the economy of construction, functional planning, and the site location.

Regarding the site, it was recommended that an extensive study be made locating the building west of Flint Avenue as near the Physical Plant Facilities as is feasible.

In addition, it was recommended that a special meeting be held with Dean Richard Amandes as soon as possible after his return to the campus on August 14, 1967.

Work requested of the architects will not affect the programmed spaces or the scheduled completion date, and it is expected that preliminary plans may be presented to the Board at the August 26, 1967, meeting if at all possible and the Board so desires.

3735. Temporary Buildings - Summer, 1967

Physics Facility for an Acceleration Laboratory

The facility was proposed to include a temporary facility at grade level with a concrete basement located below the structure for the housing of the Acceleration Laboratory. Investigations of the requirement have been made and the requested structural design and safety requirements studied and prepared by Mr. Howard Schmidt's office. As Mr. O. R. Downing is responsible for the construction of the temporary facility to be constructed, his office has made an estimated cost of the construction based upon the requirements and drawings accordingly prepared. The estimated cost of the basement construction is \$18,233.00 and the total estimated cost is \$31,033.00.

As Mr. Downing and his staff have all the work which they can do, it was recommended that Mr. Schmidt prepare the plans and specifications adequate for the taking of bids for the construction of the basement only, and that the proposed site receive additional studies in an attempt to locate the facility permanently and perhaps be incorporated as part of a major structure in the future.



3736. Tunnels and Utilities Extensions - Wiggins Complex, Business Administration, Central Heating and Cooling Plant  
(Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., Engineers)

The project was completed on July 5, 1967, in accordance with the contract documents.

The following committee was appointed to conduct a final inspection: Mr. O. R. Downing, Coordinator of the project, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick, Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky and Resident Construction Coordinators: Mr. John McCracken, Mr. Tony Oden and Mr. Lee King.

The inspection will be scheduled and held as soon as possible in order that the field engineer of the Department of Housing and Urban Development may be requested to inspect the facilities in accordance with their requirements.

Jerry Kirkwood  
Coordinator

---

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Campus Planning Committee  
July 31, 1967  
Attachment No. 731  
Item No. 3731

## M E M O R A N D U M

FROM  
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT  
FOR BUSINESS AFFAIRS

Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

TO: Messrs. Urbanovsky, Barrick, Taylor,      DATE: July 25, 1967  
Downing, Schmidt, Miss Clewell and Miss Kirkwood

SUBJECT: Architecture and Arts Building

In view of the combination of the two Arts Departments and CPC considerations of the need for a new look at the design, it was agreed that I would check with Ken Ashworth, who could not be reached until Monday, July 24, 1967.

Ken said that the original need can be programmed into two or more buildings, provided the contract or contracts are signed within thirty days of each other. The buildings would not have to be in the same contract.

If the space should be reduced more than five percent, there would be many complications. If space is increased more than five percent, it could be done without any problem as far as the grant is concerned, but Texas Tech would have to pay for the increase and could not get matching funds. If it is possible to build more space for the same cost, there is no problem as everyone would come out better. Any increase in square footage would not be eligible for a supplemental grant.

The project was originally programmed for a specific amount of space, which was listed in the application. Texas Tech competed with other institutions for matching funds on the basis of the application. The grant award was made by the application of specific points for various items within the application. The original space is the key factor.

A revision of the building plans, as long as the space is not reduced by more than five percent, would still allow the College to ask for supplemental funds under the new ground rules, which changed the maximum. As you all know, Texas Tech will request an increase from the \$1,000,000 grant to \$1,500,000, the new maximum.

Ken felt that there would be no problems with Dallas, but if there should be, he suggested we get him in on the question.

M. L. Pennington  
Vice President for  
Business Affairs

MLP:rd

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 349

July 31, 1967

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 3 p.m. on July 31, 1967, in Room 120 of the Administration Building.

Members present were Chairman M. L. Pennington, Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky and Mr. Nolan E. Barrick.

Other College staff members present were Mr. John G. Taylor, Mr. O. R. Downing and Miss Jerry Kirkwood. Miss Evelyn Clewell was out of the City.

Mr. Howard Schmidt, Consulting Architect, was present.

3730. A correction to the Minutes No. 334 has been approved by the committee to read as follows:

3699. Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (CPC No. 115-67)

Mr. Schmidt accepted the commission as Consulting Architect under the terms of his contract.

It was agreed to offer the architectural commission to Atcheson, Atkinson and Cartwright, Architects, provided work could begin at once.

(The firm accepted the commission.)

The engineers, as selected by the architects, will be subject to the approval of the Campus Planning Committee.

3670. Textile Chemical Research Laboratory (CPC No. 116-67)

Mr. Howard Schmidt accepted the commission as Consulting Architect under the terms of his contract.

It was agreed to offer the architectural commission to Ralph D. Spencer and Associates, provided work could begin at once. It was further agreed that Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., would be retained by the architects to do the engineering work.

(The firm accepted the commission.)

3731. Architecture and Arts Facility (CPC No. 106-66)  
(O'Neil Ford and Associates, Architects)

Mr. M. L. Pennington, Chairman, has reported that Mr. Ken Ashworth of the Coordinating Board does not foresee any problem in the re-design of the facility to accommodate the Department of Architecture and the Department of Art, providing the total assignable area is not reduced more than 5 percent.

It was recommended that Mr. Howard Schmidt, Consulting Architect, invite the project architects to meet with him and Mr. Nolan Barrick in order that the proposed changes concerning the programmed space be discussed and a recommendation for the most expedient method for proceeding with the project be determined and recommended to the Campus Planning Committee.

Mr. Pennington's report concerning Mr. Ashworth's comments is attached for information.

(Attachment No. 731, page 4052)

3732. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)  
(Page, Southerland, Page, Architects)  
(J. J. Fritch Co., Inc., Contractor)

Mr. Louis Southerland was on campus on July 26, 1967, to present and discuss proposed exterior building materials. Samples of all materials were viewed by Mr. M.L. Pennington, Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Howard Schmidt, and Miss Jerry Kirkwood. The type of materials was recommended by the Campus Planning Committee and approved by the Board of Directors with the acceptance of the final plans and specifications, and the approval at this time is requested for basic colors and finishes.

Selections were made based upon a request by Mr. Urbanovsky that the architects present larger samples of the materials selected for further review by the Campus Planning Committee.

3733. Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building (CPC No. 79-63)  
(Pitts Mebane Phe te Architects)  
(Bennett Construction Company, Contractor)

The arbitrators made judgment agreeing with the College concerning all items in contention with the exception of the installation of the cap brick. The contractor was back on the job on July 17, 1967.

Under the terms of the agreement between all parties, the project is expected to be completed for occupancy by September 24, 1967.

3734. Law School (CPC No. 108-66) (Harrell & Hamilton, Architects)

Based upon the individual study by each Campus Planning Committee member, it was agreed that several elements of the design concept presented by the architects in the preliminary plans required additional study. Mr. Howard Schmidt was requested to advise the project architects of the concern of the Campus Planning Committee in the various areas which deal principally with the economy of construction, functional planning, and the site location.

Regarding the site, it was recommended that an extensive study be made locating the building west of Flint Avenue as near the Physical Plant Facilities as is feasible.

In addition, it was recommended that a special meeting be held with Dean Richard Amandes as soon as possible after his return to the campus on August 14, 1967.

Work requested of the architects will not affect the programmed spaces or the scheduled completion date, and it is expected that preliminary plans may be presented to the Board at the August 26, 1967, meeting if at all possible and the Board so desires.

3735. Temporary Buildings - Summer, 1967

Physics Facility for an Acceleration Laboratory

The facility was proposed to include a temporary facility at grade level with a concrete basement located below the structure for the housing of the Acceleration Laboratory. Investigations of the requirement have been made and the requested structural design and safety requirements studied and prepared by Mr. Howard Schmidt's office. As Mr. O. R. Downing is responsible for the construction of the temporary facility to be constructed, his office has made an estimated cost of the construction based upon the requirements and drawings accordingly prepared. The estimated cost of the basement construction is \$18,233.00 and the total estimated cost is \$31,033.00.

As Mr. Downing and his staff have all the work which they can do, it was recommended that Mr. Schmidt prepare the plans and specifications adequate for the taking of bids for the construction of the basement only, and that the proposed site receive additional studies in an attempt to locate the facility permanently and perhaps be incorporated as part of a major structure in the future.

3736. Tunnels and Utilities Extensions - Wiggins Complex, Business Administration, Central Heating and Cooling Plant  
(Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., Engineers)

The project was completed on July 5, 1967, in accordance with the contract documents.

The following committee was appointed to conduct a final inspection: Mr. O. R. Downing, Coordinator of the project, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick, Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky and Resident Construction Coordinators: Mr. John McCracken, Mr. Tony Oden and Mr. Lee King.

The inspection will be scheduled and held as soon as possible in order that the field engineer of the Department of Housing and Urban Development may be requested to inspect the facilities in accordance with their requirements.

Jerry Kirkwood  
Coordinator

---

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Campus Planning Committee  
July 31, 1967  
Attachment No. 731  
Item No. 3731

## M E M O R A N D U M

FROM  
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT  
FOR BUSINESS AFFAIRS

Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

TO: Messrs. Urbanovsky, Barrick, Taylor, DATE: July 25, 1967  
Downing, Schmidt, Miss Clewell and Miss Kirkwood

SUBJECT: Architecture and Arts Building

In view of the combination of the two Arts Departments and CPC considerations of the need for a new look at the design, it was agreed that I would check with Ken Ashworth, who could not be reached until Monday, July 24, 1967.

Ken said that the original need can be programmed into two or more buildings, provided the contract or contracts are signed within thirty days of each other. The buildings would not have to be in the same contract.

If the space should be reduced more than five percent, there would be many complications. If space is increased more than five percent, it could be done without any problem as far as the grant is concerned, but Texas Tech would have to pay for the increase and could not get matching funds. If it is possible to build more space for the same cost, there is no problem as everyone would come out better. Any increase in square footage would not be eligible for a supplemental grant.

The project was originally programmed for a specific amount of space, which was listed in the application. Texas Tech competed with other institutions for matching funds on the basis of the application. The grant award was made by the application of specific points for various items within the application. The original space is the key factor.

A revision of the building plans, as long as the space is not reduced by more than five percent, would still allow the College to ask for supplemental funds under the new ground rules, which changed the maximum. As you all know, Texas Tech will request an increase from the \$1,000,000 grant to \$1,500,000, the new maximum.

Ken felt that there would be no problems with Dallas, but if there should be, he suggested we get him in on the question.

M. L. Pennington  
Vice President for  
Business Affairs

MLP:rd

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 350

August 4, 1967

A meeting of the Campus and Building Committee of the Board of Directors was held at 3:30 p.m. in the Anniversary Room of the Student Union Building.

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

Other members of the Board of Directors in attendance were Mr. Roy Furr, Chairman, Mr. Alvin R. Allison, Mr. Marshall Formby, Mr. Retha R. Martin, Mr. Carl Ernest Reistle, Jr., and Dr. Fladger F. Tannery.

Others present from the College were President Murray, Dr. W. M. Pearce, Dr. S. M. Kennedy, Dean John R. Bradford, Dr. Earl Heard, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Dr. William Martin and Mr. M. L. Pennington.

3737. Biology Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce, Architects)

Tunnels and Utilities Extensions (Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., Engineers)

The Building Committee approved the recommendation that Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., be authorized to begin the Construction Phase (Supervision of Construction) under the terms of the existing contract.

(The Board approved.)

3738. Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (CPC No. 115-67)  
(Atcheson, Atkinson and Cartwright, Architects)

The following report was made to the committee:

The Campus Planning Committee selected the architects and put the project in motion following the instructions of the Board of Directors.

The program outlining the needs has been written by Dr. Keith Marmion and his staff and reviewed by Mr. Howard Schmidt, Dr. Marmion and various members of the Civil Engineering staff. Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky is the coordinator for the project.

Schematic plans have been developed by Mr. Schmidt's office and reviewed by Dr. Marmion and his staff. During the development of the schematic plans, it was established that it is feasible to locate the water and waste water quality control research facilities in the existing Civil and Mechanical Engineering Building, thus introducing a deduction in the possible scope of the new facilities.

The proposed major divisions of the Civil Engineering Department to be housed in the new facility are Fluid Mechanics, Soil Mechanics and Structural Mechanics.

Dr. Keith Marmion has estimated that \$191,000 will be requested for equipment.

Further refinements of the schematic plans will be available for the review of Dr. Marmion and Mr. Urbanovsky next week, in order that a recommendation can be made for the review of the Campus Planning Committee.

3739. Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building (CPC No. 79-63)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps and White, Architects)  
(Bennett Construction Company, Contractor)

Agreement was reached on the settlement of the suit. The arbitrators made judgment agreeing with the College and the architects concerning all items in contention, with the exception of the installation of the cap brick.



3739. Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building (Cont'd)

Mr. Bennett returned to work on July 17, 1967, prior to any settlement, and the completion of the project for occupancy is scheduled for September 24, 1967, under the terms of the agreement.

3740. Funds Available

A detailed presentation was made from the Present and Proposed Building Program Report which is attached to and made a part of the minutes. (A copy had been mailed earlier to all Board members and another copy was attached to the agenda.)(Attachment No. 732, page 4058)

Income:

The 1966-68 Constitutional Tax Bonds in the estimated amount of \$10,730,000 represents all the anticipated income from the 10¢ Advalorem Tax under the constitutional amendment until 1978, except for a small additional amount in 1972.

The Skiles Act permits the institution to take \$5 from the tuition payments, issue bonds and construct buildings. Provisions were made in the legislative appropriation, through the local income estimate, to provide for bonds to be issued this fall under the Skiles Act. Although the Act has been on the books for many years, it had become rather obscure by a good many amendments and a new bill had to be passed by the last Legislature. The bonds will probably be issued for 40 years.

The Building Use Fee Act will allow the College to charge the students a building use fee, issue bonds and construct buildings. A new bill was passed by the last Legislature to clarify past amendments and to permit the 22 state institutions to make use of funds derived from the application of the Act for educational and general buildings as well as others. It is estimated that the term of bonds would be 40 years.

In a further attempt to get as much money as possible for construction, a bill was passed by the Legislature at the last session authorizing Revenue Bonds for the Central Heating and Cooling Plant. It is a rather intricate bit of financing but can be done and will provide more money for the building program. The bonds probably will be issued for 40 years also.

The philosophy adopted at Texas Tech was to move very rapidly at the start of the building program to get the maximum amount of funds available from all sources, including matching funds as possible, under Titles I and II of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. So far, grants have been received for \$4,967,000.

It is now possible to get additional matching funds as the maximum amount for a single project has been increased from one-third or \$1,000,000 to one-third or \$1,500,000. It is possible to receive another \$1,565,000 and applications are being filed accordingly.

Projects:

Page two lists the building projects and shows the changes since June 1, 1967.

In order to get the maximum amount of matching funds, as much of the utility extensions as possible have been shown with the major projects. Therefore, the project amounts are changed from time to time in an attempt to realize more matching funds.

As of June 1, 1967, \$31,262,000 had been approved for various projects. The changes shown in the July 31, 1967, tabulation are as follows:

3740. Funds Available (Cont'd)

- A. The Home Economics Building, with its reduced scope, has been removed from the list at the remaining amount of \$1,900,000. Applied Arts has been removed from Home Economics, and has been combined with Allied Arts. Facilities will be provided within the Architecture and Allied Arts project.
- B. The Textile Chemical Research Laboratory equipment and the Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, each in the amount of \$250,000, have been added, plus \$250,000 for Textile Chemical Research equipment.

The additional \$50,000 which was appropriated at the June meeting of the Board for the immediate purchase of equipment for the Textile Chemical Research Laboratory must come from the Unappropriated Balance as Constitutional Building Amendment money can be used only for new facilities. So, the \$50,000 has been made available from the Unappropriated Balance and does not appear in the report.

Applications for Title I funds will be filed under the Higher Education Facilities Act for the maximum amounts possible for the Textile Chemical Research Laboratory and the Fluid Dynamics Laboratory if sufficient information is available in time. The application date for Title I grants is August 7, 1967, and cannot be met, but it is possible to file by September 7, 1967, although five penalty points are applied to each application.

The total estimated cost of the approved projects as of July 31, 1967, is \$30,743,000 which is a net reduction of \$519,215 from June 1, 1967. The estimated income as of July 31, 1967, is \$29,446,000. So, there is an over-encumbrance of \$1,297,000.

3741. Physics Acceleration Laboratory

(In conjunction with temporary facilities to be constructed, summer, 1967)

The facility was proposed to include a temporary building at grade level with a concrete basement located below the structure for the housing of the Acceleration Laboratory. Investigations of the requirements have been made and the requested structural design and safety requirements studied and prepared by Mr. Howard Schmidt's office. As Mr. O. R. Downing is responsible for the construction of the temporary facility to be constructed, his office has made an estimated cost of the construction based upon the requirements and drawings accordingly prepared. The estimated cost of the basement construction is \$18,233 and the total estimated cost is \$31,033.

As Mr. Downing and his staff have all the work which they can do, it was recommended that Mr. Schmidt prepare the plans and specifications for the taking of bids for the construction of the basement only, and that the proposed site receive additional studies in an attempt to locate the facility permanently and perhaps be incorporated as part of a major structure in the future.

In connection with the proposed acceleration laboratory, Mr. Reistle pointed out that there are many pitfalls and dangers involved and efforts should be taken to be sure that the project will work properly when completed.

The Building Committee authorized the receipt of bids for the construction of the basement structure only and the awarding of the contract by telephone poll.

(The Board approved.)

3742. Priority List of Projects, 1967 (CPC No. 117-67)

There was insufficient time for Dr. Kennedy to present the Priority List of Projects and it is to be presented at the meeting of the Board on August 26, 1967.

3743. Textile Chemical Research Laboratory (CPC No. 116-67)

(Ralph D. Spencer and Associates, Architects)

(Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., Engineers)

This item was handled first on the Agenda. Dr. Earl Heard was presented and asked to introduce those with him and speak on the proposed facility.

Dr. Heard presented Mr. Charles C. Wilson, who is the head of the Textile Engineering Department and the Director of the Textile Chemical Research Laboratory, and Dr. William H. Martin, Assistant Director of the Textile Chemical Research Center.

Dr. Heard congratulated the Board on its courage, foresight and vision and said that if approval is granted tomorrow for the building plans, it will take nine months to build it and he thought they would be in the facilities in May, 1968. He expects five to six months delivery for the equipment and it takes sixty to ninety days to get it on the site and installed. He said that Texas Tech will have a Research Center for the entire world and that they are making big plans.

As for wool and mohair, he said that there was equipment for both when he was head of the Textile Engineering School, all of the equipment is gone now, \$108,690 is needed for wool and mohair equipment, converted equipment will be adequate and could save some money, and the total cost for wool and mohair facilities is \$660,000 to \$700,000.

Mr. Hinn said that unquestionably the Textile Chemical Research Laboratory is the greatest research opportunity Texas Tech ever had and among the greatest that it will ever have. By the end of September, there will be major research in ways to use low micronaire cotton, the Federal Budget will be passed and the equipment will be here.

He had hoped that the building would be ready before May 31, 1968, and he had been dreaming of the best research center in the world with a great kickoff during graduation when the Governor, top state officials, industrial leaders, designers, etc., would all be here.

Mr. Howard Schmidt and Mr. Spencer and Mr. Workman of Spencer, Workman and Booher, were invited into the meeting. Mr. Schmidt presented floor plans which included the new space for the wool and mohair laboratories.

Mr. Hinn said that they must increase the square footage and must have a basement. The estimate for the basement could run as much, Mr. Schmidt said, as \$100,000 to \$130,000 at \$7.85 per square foot.

For approximately 21,000 square feet of space on the ground floor and 12,000 to 15,000 square feet in the basement, the total project could run around \$1,000,000. However, Mr. Hinn said it would be necessary to wait for more developments in connection with the equipment needs and that he would talk to Dr. Heard to see what is needed.

At the Board meeting the next day, Mr. Hinn reported that the Building Committee had approved the enlargement of the project as the original estimate of needs was not adequate and an area of 21,000 square feet of floor space is needed above ground.

3743. Textile Chemical Research Laboratory (Cont'd)

As for the basement, it is a little hard to tell, but, he felt that the outline of the building can be squared up and rearranged. He has been trying to get some information together on the needs, which are not completely settled and it probably would work out to program around 12,000 feet for the basement as it would seem to best fit in. The heaviest machinery could be in the part of the building not over the basement. The 12,000 square feet wouldn't be too much basement, but it would line up as sketched. He said the cost is a critical factor.

Mr. Hinn moved that there be approximately 21,000 square feet above ground and 12,000 square feet in the basement. The motion passed.

When the new figures are available, the amount is to be used in the Building Program Report. Roughly, it will be about \$1,250,000 including equipment, but it is hoped to hold the project to \$1,000,000. There are plans to secure funds from other sources for the project and the other projects on the priority list are to continue in the planning stage as now scheduled and as rapidly as feasible.

As for third floor on the project, Mr. Hinn said that it would seem to provide a bad appearance; however, a look is to be taken at it and if there is a general feeling that it creates a bad appearance, somebody should be ready to defend it.

3744. Wiggins Complex, Phase II (CPC No. 114-67)  
(Schmidt and Stiles. Roberts and Messersmith. Architects)

Mr. Hinn reported that it is not ready now. There will be more information for the next meeting and they will be in a better position to handle it on August 25, 1967.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

---

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Campus Planning Committee  
August 4, 1967  
Attachment No. 732  
Item No. 3740

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

July 31, 1967

PRESENT AND PROPOSED BUILDING PROGRAM  
(Does Not Include Auxiliary Enterprise Projects)

<u>Estimated Total Funds Available</u>	Report As Of June 1, 1967	Report As Of July 31, 1967	<u>Change Since Last Report</u>
1958-66 Constitutional Tax Funds.....	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	
1966-68 Constitutional Tax Funds.....	10,730,000	10,730,000	
Interest on Investment of Tax Funds.....	383,000	383,000	
Estimated Proceeds from Skiles Act Bonds.....	2,750,000	2,750,000	
Estimated Proceeds from Building Use Fee Bonds.....	2,750,000	2,750,000	
Estimated Proceeds from Heating and Cooling Plant Bonds.....	4,440,000	4,800,000	Revised to include bond costs and capitalization of first year interest.
Approved Facilities Act Funds.....	4,822,947(a)	4,967,634	Received Title I Grant (10%) on Chemistry Project (\$144,687).
Possible Additional Facilities Act Funds.....	<u>2,345,299(b)</u>	<u>1,565,637</u>	No supplemental application on Home Economics (\$634,976 and \$144,687 Title I Grant received on Chemistry Project, shown above).
 TOTAL.....	 <u>\$29,721,246</u>	 <u>\$29,446,271</u>	

(a) Does not include Home Economics Grant on supposition the project will be reprogrammed or withdrawn.

(b) Maximum possible grants excluding Law School and a reprogrammed Home Economics Project at an estimated cost of \$1,900,000.

PRESENT AND PROPOSED BUILDING PROGRAM  
(Does Not Include Auxiliary Enterprise Projects)  
Page Two

July 31, 1967

<u>Building Projects</u>	<u>As Of</u> <u>June 1, 1967</u>	<u>As Of</u> <u>July 31, 1967</u>	<u>Change Since Last Report</u>
Previously Completed or Near Completion.....	\$ 491,847	\$ 491,847	
Foreign Language-Mathematics.....	1,391,397	1,391,397	
Heating and Cooling Plant.....	4,439,555	4,800,000	Revised to include bond costs and capitalization of first year interest.
Utility Extensions.....	1,137,651	940,675	Adjusted to actual bids on Biology oversized tunnel plus estimated future construction.
Temporary Buildings.....	250,000	250,000	
Business Administration.....	4,565,000	4,565,000	
Museum.....	500,000	500,000	
Law School.....	3,055,485	3,055,485	
Biology.....	4,669,615	5,136,931	Adjusted to actual bids received.(a)
Chemistry.....	4,327,707	4,327,707	
Architecture.....	4,414,653	4,414,653	
President's Home.....	65,000	65,000	
Sheep and Goat Facilities.....	55,000	55,000	
Home Economics (Reduced Scope).....	1,900,000	-0-	Funds available will be insufficient to cover this project. 10% (\$317,488) to be returned to government.
Textile Engineering Building Addition.....	-0-	250,000)	
Textile Engineering Building Addition Equipment.....	-0-	250,000)	Work is in progress on possible applications for grant funds.
Civil Engineering Laboratory.....	-0-	250,000)	
<b>TOTAL.....</b>	<b><u>\$31,262,910</u></b>	<b><u>\$30,743,695</u></b>	

(a) It was necessary to oversize and extend the length of the utility tunnel for the Biology Building because of the recommendations of the engineers in the utility survey and because of the location of the new Central Plant. An accurate revised cost estimate was not available on June 1.

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

July 31, 1967

Summary of Facilities Act Funds Approved

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Title I</u>	<u>Title II</u>
Library.....	\$ 67,746	\$ 67,746	\$
Foreign Languages-Mathematics...	450,000	450,000	
Business Administration.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	
Biology.....	875,221	324,207	551,014
Home Economics.....	317,488	317,488	
Architecture Building.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Chemistry.....	<u>929,980</u>		<u>929,980</u>
TOTAL.....	\$ 5,140,435	\$ 3,659,441	\$ 1,480,994
Home Economics.....	<u>- 317,488</u>	<u>- 317,488</u>	
TOTAL at June 1, 1967.....	\$ 4,822,947	\$ 3,341,953	\$ 1,480,994
Chemistry.....	<u>144,687</u>	<u>144,687</u>	
TOTAL at July 31, 1967.....	<u>\$ 4,967,634</u>	<u>\$ 3,486,640</u>	<u>\$ 1,480,994</u>

Possible Additional Title I and Title II Grant Funds

	<u>June 1, 1967</u>	<u>July 31, 1967</u>
Architecture.....	\$ 471,551	\$ 471,551
Biology.....	756,483	756,483
Chemistry.....	482,289	337,603(a)
Home Economics.....	740,806	-0-
Possible alternate route on Home Economics refiled at \$1,900,000....	<u>634,976</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Possible total with revised Home Economics Project.....	<u>\$ 2,345,299</u>	<u>\$ 1,565,637</u>

Note: Law School Title II Application was not approved and was also rejected after reconsideration by the government.

(a) 10% grant of \$144,687 shown in schedule of approved grants at left.



TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 351

August 18, 1967

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 2:30 p.m. on August 18, 1967, in Room 120 of the Administration Building.

Members present were Chairman M. L. Pennington, Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky and Mr. Nolan E. Barrick.

Others present from the College staff were Mr. John G. Taylor, Mr. O. R. Downing, Miss Evelyn Clewell and Miss Jerry Kirkwood.

Mr. Howard W. Schmidt, Consulting Architect, was also present.

Present for the discussion of the preliminary plans for the Law School were Mr. Alvin R. Allison and Dean Richard B. Amandes.

3745. Agricultural Facilities

Animal Husbandry Department

Two residences for sheep and goat herdsman are presently located in the area where the future Phase II of the Wiggins Complex will be located.

The Campus Planning Committee considered the request of the Animal Husbandry Department that the residences be relocated.

It was recommended that existing residences remain until the schedule for the future dormitory program can be established. In addition, the committee requested that the basis for the need to furnish such residences be studied and if the houses are to be relocated, recommended that the site be near the new sheep and goat facilities.

3746. Chemistry Building Addition (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps and White, Architects)

At the Campus Planning Committee Meeting No. 347, July 19, 1967, it was recommended that the architects make specific and perhaps alternate recommendations for solutions to the ultimate design of the facility for the future review of the Campus Planning Committee, in order that the schematic plans developed for application purposes might be further developed into preliminary plans as rapidly as possible.

After studying the specific recommendations prepared by Mr. Robert White in his letter of August 3, 1967, the Campus Planning Committee agreed that these recommendations used as design criteria would permit a more flexible and economical facility.

The Campus Planning Committee and the Chemistry Faculty Building Committee should work together supporting the established program and transmitting detailed information, through planning conferences with the architects, as the various phases of the plans are developed.

Mr. Robert White's letter of August 3, 1967, is attached to and made a part of the minutes. (Attachment No. 733, page 4063)

3747. Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (CPC No. 115-67)  
(Atcheson, Atkinson and Cartwright, Architects)

The Campus Planning Committee recommended that Lafayette McKay be authorized to perform the engineering services for the project, as requested by Atcheson, Atkinson and Cartwright, Architects.

3748. Law School (CPC No. 108-66)  
(Harrell and Hamilton, Architects)

1. Preliminary Plans

Dean Amandes was questioned as to the scope of the project considering the some 1,400 seating places, based upon a projected enrollment of 575 students. It was explained that 650 of the seats are in classrooms, 100 of which represents the Moot Courtroom. Dean Amandes further explained that a lesser number of classrooms and smaller classroom capacities would create a scheduling problem. It is understood that other disciplines may be scheduled in the various classes; however, Dean Amandes requests that such scheduling be limited to upper-class levels.

Chairman Pennington called to the attention of Dean Amandes that the necessary operating budget in the future be kept in mind, in order that the School of Law could function properly.

The following items are detailed questions raised by the Campus Planning Committee which were thoroughly explored by all those present at the meeting and the agreed-upon recommendations are recorded.

- A. Approved the inclusion of the Attorney's Room at approximately 300 square feet to be located near the Library.
- B. Approved two Blind Reading Rooms and requested the architects to provide ample space to accommodate two people and one worktable in each room.
- C. Approved a total of 180 carrells with 60 to be provided with locks.
- D. Approved a 600-locker capacity locker room. The architects had been requested earlier to restudy the location and the configuration of the locker room as proposed in the preliminary plans.
- E. Approved approximately 1,000 square feet for the Duplicate Bookroom. Access to the elevator is required and the architects will be requested to restudy the location.
- F. Approved the inclusion of the programmed Duplicating Room.
- G. Approved the faculty library and 2,500 square feet were considered to be ample.
- H. Approved a minimum of 200 square feet for the office of the head librarian. The secretary's office was approved also, but the size can be somewhat less than that of the head librarian. In addition, the offices for Law Journal at the sizes indicated were approved.
- I. Approved the inclusion of the Microfilm Room. (readers)
- J. Approved approximately 180 square feet for the Rare Bookroom.
- K. Agreed that the receiving room is too large, as shown, and should be restudied along with the Workroom and Processing Room toward the reduction of area in all of the spaces. In addition, the architects will be requested to separate the Receiving Room by some means in order that the adjacent areas will be better protected from the weather.
- L. Approved the reception area for the librarian's complex.
- M. Approved approximately 1,025 square feet for the Reserve Bookroom.

3748. Law School (Cont'd)

- N. Approved seats for approximately 243 students at tables in the library stacks and reading areas. Dean Amandes expressed a desire to have the tables scattered throughout the stack area rather than having them concentrated in one area.
- O. Approved the 50 capacity Typing Room.
- P. Agreed that the location and capacities of the various level library areas will be ample for this program and further agreed that the library areas should be located to provide for future expansion, if possible.
- Q. Dean Amandes recommended that the 150 capacity classrooms be designed on a basis of 17 square feet per student, the 50 capacity classrooms designed at 17.5 square feet per student and agreed with the Campus Planning Committee that the 80 capacity classrooms need to be restudied regarding the shape in order that a more effective and functional classroom may result.
- R. Dean Amandes further recommended that the 50 capacity seminars could be designed on the basis of 21.5 to 22 square feet per student. In addition, due to the function of the 30 capacity seminars, 30 square feet per student would be a better design criteria.
- S. It was agreed that the concept of the multi-purpose room location has a great deal of merit; however, the architects will be requested to restudy the concept in conjunction with the eating area. Mr. Allison pointed out that provisions should be made for foods and that the area could well be the showplace of the building. It was further recommended that the architects give consideration to restudying the entire area regarding the feasibility of relating the multi-purpose room to the eating area, as well as the locker room area.

It was pointed out that access to the vending machine areas should be studied in order to eliminate the necessity for service through a major entrance.

It was recommended that the architects avoid the use of open court areas in conjunction with the building as it has been determined that, unless very well designed, such areas are a source of maintenance problems.

In addition, the requests forwarded to the architects earlier were discussed. All agreed that the requests contained in Mr. Schmidt's letter to Harrell and Hamilton, Architects, dated August 5, 1967, have merit and that the architects should proceed as requested.

Mr. Schmidt's letter is attached to and hereby made a part of the minutes. (Attachment No. 734, page 4064)

## 2. Site

The architects had earlier been requested by the Campus Planning Committee to establish the site as far north as feasible on the plat to the northwest of 15th and Flint. After discussing the proposed site, the long-range plan, and the vehicular and pedestrian traffic, it was recommended that the architects be requested to also study the site west of Flint Avenue and directly across the Avenue from the Business Administration Building as well as a feasible site either to the west or east along Indiana Avenue.

3748. Law School (Cont'd)

3. The firm of Gregerson, Gaynor and Sirman, of Dallas, was authorized to perform the engineering services, as recommended by the architects.

3749. Temporary Parking (Dirt lot in the vicinity of 15th and Flint for off-campus student parking)

By a majority vote, the request for the additional parking lot was declined for the present with the stipulation that it be included in the Traffic Consultant's study.

3750. Tech Press Addition

The preliminary plans have been prepared by the Consulting Architect's office and reviewed by the Campus Planning Committee earlier. The committee had recommended that Mr. Bengé Daniel give consideration to including some additional office facilities in the proposed plan.

Mr. Schmidt was asked to work with Mr. Daniel and review the facilities with the Campus Planning Committee.

3751. Wiggins Complex, Phase II (CPC No. 114-67)  
(Schmidt and Stiles, Roberts and Messersmith, Architects)1. Method of taking bids for built-in furniture

It was recommended that the specifications include the built-in furniture as part of the general contract. In addition, the specifications will include precise clauses which will establish the pre-qualifications required of any subcontractor wishing to bid.

2. The architects have complied with the requests of the Campus Planning Committee recorded in the Minutes of July 12, 1967, and the details have been incorporated in the final plans and specifications which are scheduled to be presented to the Board of Directors at the August 25, 1967, meeting.

Jerry Kirkwood  
Coordinator

---

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Campus Planning Committee  
August 18, 1967  
Attachment No. 733  
Item No. 3746

PITTS      MEBANE      PHELPS      &      WHITE

Architects & Engineers/470 Orleans Street/Beaumont, Texas 77701

August 3, 1967

Miss Jerry Kirkwood, AIA  
Campus Planning Committee Coordinator  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Re:      Chemistry Building Addition  
         Texas Technological College  
         Lubbock, Texas

Dear Jerry:

In reply to your letter of July 26 and pursuant to our conversation in your office of July 27, we wish to comment that our "questions" to you have typically related to decisions required on recommendations we have made relative to the subject project. These recommendations have been made verbally in several meetings and are contained in correspondence dated October 8, 1964, August 10, 1965, and July 27, 1966, and numerous project memoranda. Due to the intermittent nature of the project design progress, we feel that recommendations and a basis for such, even though documented in our past correspondence, now need to be reassembled.

Listed below are those recommendations which we have made and which past communication with the Chemistry Department would indicate to us were rejected by this Department. We present them to you, as before, since we feel that the Campus Planning Committee can objectively view the conceptual nature of these recommendations:

1.      Reference: Location of Undergraduate Facilities within the Building

Architects-Engineers - Recommended that undergraduate facilities be located closest to building entries-exits. Per our letter of July 27, 1966: "It seems that the placement of undergraduate laboratories 417 and 418 on the fourth floor places an unreasonable strain on the students involved in that they will have to climb three and a half flights of stairs after coming from a class which may be on the other side of the campus. This problem will probably be accentuated as the College grows. It should be noted that the problem is not critical with respect to graduate students as most of their classes will probably be within the Chemistry Department. We would further suggest that (all) undergraduate students be placed on lower floors near the entrance whenever possible. This location would help alleviate the growing campus circulation problem as well as result in a separation within the building of the noisier, heavier traffic areas and quieter, lighter traffic areas." This would apply to both classrooms and laboratories.

Chemistry Department - Advised the Architects-Engineers throughout the Chemistry Research Project and has indicated in the initial planning of the Chemistry Building Addition Program, that undergraduate and graduate

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

Miss Jerry Kirkwood  
Re: Chemistry Building Addition  
Texas Technological College  
Lubbock, Texas

August 3, 1967  
Page Two

facilities, offices and other related facilities for each sub-department should be in a specific segment of the building (in the case of the Chemistry Research Building), or grouped as a unit on a specific floor of the building (in the case of the Chemistry Building Addition Project). This sub-department facility grouping concept automatically places undergraduate facilities on upper floors or at points relatively remote to the building entrances.

Now Requested - Decision as to which planning concept the Architects-Engineers should follow.

2. Reference: Location of Laboratories (General Objective) within the Building

Architects-Engineers - Recommended that laboratories be totally grouped with the undergraduate laboratories in the most accessible areas of the building and graduate and research laboratories being in relatively less accessible areas. This would afford, providing that these laboratory areas are not interrupted with intermittent office and seminar areas, etc., a maximum flexibility in adjustment of laboratory spaces to future requirements or programs. Per our letter of July 27, 1966: "A primary technique for achieving this flexibility would be the side by side grouping of laboratories. Semi-movable partitions such as cimento board panels on demountable steel framing would allow the shifting of wall locations to accommodate changing space requirements. This side by side grouping would also allow a significant cost savings to be realized through the grouping and shortening of service distribution routes." - "In order to fully realize the benefits of side by side grouping, movable walls, flexible service availability, and semi-movable laboratory furniture, the plan should be developed so that partitions and furniture follow a modular rhythm. This would allow the shifting of furniture and partitions anywhere within this framework without creating cramped or wasted space."

Chemistry Department - See comment item 1 above. Such sub-department facility grouping concept automatically disperses laboratories throughout entire building, introduces interrupting elements in the laboratory areas restricting flexibility and requiring more extensive laboratory service and waste systems.

Now Requested - Decision as to which planning concept the Architects-Engineers should follow.

3. Reference: Location of Offices within the Building

Architects-Engineers - Recommended that offices be located in one area, preferably on an upper floor of the building. If the department offices and related seminar, etc.



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

Miss Jerry Kirkwood

Re:      Chemistry Building Addition  
          Texas Technological College  
          Lubbock, Texas

August 3, 1967  
 Page Three

facilities are grouped, as opposed to being fragmented, into sub-department groupings, a greater flexibility is afforded to any future adjustments in sub-department staff sizes. Under this circumstance no faculty member would feel displaced to another discipline as would be the case under a sub-department segregated facility concept. Granted that the faculty member under this planning concept may travel farther to his instructional facility, this would perhaps be preferable to bringing larger numbers of students farther into the building and into or through segmented office sections throughout the building. Per our letter of July 27, 1966: "The grouping of offices in a slightly segregated area would also have the advantage of creating a quieter and more academic character with a minimum of student interruption." - "The advantages of locating seminar rooms near offices, especially the reception area, should be considered. This relationship allows the seminar room to be conveniently used as a faculty conference room, occasional workroom for preparing teaching aids, lounge, and small periodical library. The library could be supervised by the faculty receptionist and serve students as well as faculty."

With respect to office and research laboratory proximities, we believe that all offices and research laboratories could be accommodated on a single floor of the building allowing for a relatively easy communication. We believe that this proximity relationship has several advantages and no serious loss. Per our letter of July 27, 1966: "The direct relationship indicated on the drawings results in a laboratory which can only be assigned to one instructor whereas a separate nearby lab could be used by several instructors or students, either concurrently or at separate scheduled times. Some of our other clients have also reported that this direct relationship tends to result in a seldom used laboratory. This seems to be due to the temptation created by the more comfortable and inviting office space." This report was furnished to the Architects-Engineers by Texaco following an intensive study made at their Beacon, N.Y., Research Center prior to commissioning our firm to design a replacement \$10,000,000 facility at Port Arthur, Texas.

Chemistry Department - See comment item 1 above. Such arrangement places offices into dispersed locations throughout the building. Direct office-research lab relationships have been requested by the Chemistry Department.

Now Requested -      Decision as to which planning concept the Architects-Engineers should follow.



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

Miss Jerry Kirkwood

Re:      Chemistry Building Addition  
         Texas Technological College  
         Lubbock, Texas

August 3, 1967  
Page Four

4.      Reference: Aisle Widths in Laboratories (General)

Architects-Engineers - Recommended 5'-0" minimum widths for all laboratory aisles. A 10'-0" module is desirable. If only pedestrian access could be considered for single loaded aisles, this width in such locations could be reduced to 3'-5" - however, to afford flexibility for the future, it is recommended that all laboratories and all aisles be designed with the consideration that such might be required to accommodate the passage or placement of equipment as well as pedestrian use. As offered as support for our recommendation in our letter of July 27, 1966, we list the following:

1. "LABORATORY PLANNING FOR CHEMISTRY AND CHEMICAL ENGINEERING, National Research Council, Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York 1962 - recommends aisles from 4'-6" to 5'-6" with aisles of 5'-0" and over being especially recommended for undergraduate use and where apparatus such as gas cylinders, etc., is to be placed in aisles.
2. "Architectural Record," November 1965, page 161, recommends 5'-1-3/4" aisles for average men and 5'-6" for large men with a specific statement that 5'-0" is not enough for large men. These recommendations were the result of a comprehensive study conducted by Britain's Nuffield Foundation in 1960. They are based only on physical movements, but they do indicate that the widely accepted 10 ft. module for scientific laboratories is very often not large enough.
3. LABORATORY DESIGN, National Research Council, Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York 1952 - recommends 5'-0" as a minimum double load aisle with larger aisles up to 6'-0" being desirable."

Chemistry Department - Advised and instructed in past planning conferences aisle widths ranging from 4'-0" to 4'-6".

Now Requested -      Decision as to what minimum laboratory aisle widths shall be adhered to in order to afford future flexibility of laboratory use and modular arrangement of laboratory spaces.

5.      Reference: Auditorium Type of Access - Egress

Architects-Engineers - Among other considerations, the following were outlined in our letter of July 27, 1966, as separate bases for "front" and for "rear" auditorium entrance.

- (a) Entrance from the rear. (1) Students can enter and exit easily without disrupting class.
- (2) Since the student enters high at the rear of the class, there is a natural tendency to cluster there. If the class does not completely fill the

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

Miss Jerry Kirkwood  
Re:      Chemistry Building Addition  
         Texas Technological College  
         Lubbock, Texas

August 3, 1967  
Page Five

auditorium, this results in a loss in teaching efficiency. (3) Special access provisions must be accommodated to allow use of the preparation rooms while the class is in session.

(b) Entrance from the front. (1) Students would tend to cluster around the speaker near the front of the class rather than expend the additional effort of climbing to the rear. (2) The front entrance allows easy, convenient access to the preparation rooms by other instructors while a class is in session. (3) There may be some disruption if students enter while class is in session."

Our letter stated that where we had some preference in the question of front versus rear entrance, no recommendation was being made since a decision should be made on the basis of the College's value placement.

Decision Reached:      The Campus Planning Committee, in meeting on June 24, 1967, did, after such placement of value, instruct the Architects-Engineers that a rear entrance auditorium is preferred.

Our basic concern with respect to the placement of facilities, other than considerations of functional and economical design, is that the design afford both initial flexibility of assignment of spaces to sub-departments or disciplines and future potential of adaption of spaces to changing needs. We know from our experience and observation that when facilities are segmented and obviously contained within a defined physical periphery of one department's function, such facilities are inclined to be totally associated with that department and seldom are utilized by other departments even when their "use factors" decline. A grouping of facilities by type does not associate each space to a specific discipline, as is the case in segmenting by department, and affords a full flexibility in assignment and use. We recognize that the Welch facility may be the exception to our general recommendations, but do feel that even within this special facility an application of the principle of our recommendations would be advantageous. Parenthetically, we believe that the Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building plan arrangement of facilities does, in a simpler application, afford the advantages of the recommendations we have made for the Chemistry Addition project.

In the instance of the Chemistry Research project design phase in August 1965, we were initially directed to design the building according to the Chemistry Department's wishes if such were "physically possible." At this point both we and the Supervising Architect had made exhaustive and unsuccessful efforts to effect a more compromising attitude and acceptance of recommendations on the part of the Chemistry Department in order to permit the design of a more flexible and economical facility. Our letter of August 10, 1965, indicates that we did, even with this directive to capitulate to the wishes of the Chemistry Department, endeavor to develop internal improvements within the floor plan developed by the Chemistry Department.

Again we find ourselves in the situation where we have been furnished floor plan arrangements by the Chemistry Department. These floor plans were developed in the haste of meeting the application deadline of last year and as we have expressed frequently since, we are anxious to meet with the Chemistry Department to improve these arrangements as a part of our next design phase.

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

Miss Jerry Kirkwood

Re:      Chemistry Building Addition  
         Texas Technological College  
         Lubbock, Texas

August 3, 1967  
Page Six

We know, through the experience of having in recent years designed nineteen major laboratory facilities, that the best facility plan can only be derived through a cooperative effort involving our design and technical capability, gained from research and experience, applied to a general program supported with detailed information furnished by the Client. This latter category of detailed information on a building as technical as a laboratory facility is best transmitted through a series of planning conferences where we are permitted to not only receive information but to also render recommendations on even these detailed provisions. We suggest that the Campus Planning Committee render those decisions of a program nature, listed above as being required, which this Committee feels it should, in the interest of overall Campus policy, answer. The remainder of the decisions on our recommendations, we would assume, would be deferred to the Chemistry Department. We would anticipate that we would work on all items of detailed nature directly with the Chemistry Department within the confines of the Campus Planning Committee decisions relating to our recommendations and after the Chemistry Department has been appropriately advised.

We trust that this communication clarifies the fact that we have continuously rendered what we have considered to be recommendations with respect to our design responsibilities. We also trust that the Campus Planning Committee will establish a design direction on the above considerations where it appears that the Chemistry Department's desires and our recommendations are contrary to one another. We feel that a major continuation of our design until such has been done would be premature, but we are hopeful that this can be done soon as we are anxious to continue our design service. As previously offered, we will meet with the Campus Planning Committee to further amplify our recommendations if such would help your deliberation.

Please notify us if we can be of any assistance to you in arriving at your decisions to the above recommendations.

Yours sincerely,

PITTS, MEBANE, PHELPS & WHITE

/s/ Bob

Robert White

RW/eh

cc:      Mr. Marshall Pennington  
         Mr. Nolan E. Barrick  
         Mr. Elo J. Urbanovsky  
         Mr. John G. Taylor  
         Mr. O. R. Downing  
         Miss Evelyn Clewell  
         Dr. Joe Dennis  
         Mr. Howard Schmidt  
         RW JB File

Campus Planning Committee  
August 18, 1967  
Attachment No. 734  
Item No. 3748

HOWARD SCHMIDT  
AND ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS

August 5, 1967

CONSULTING ARCHITECTS  
TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE

Mr. George Harrell  
Harrell and Hamilton  
2400 Republic National Bank Tower  
Dallas, Texas 75201

Re: Law School Facilities  
Texas Technological College

Dear George:

As you have been informed by Miss Jerry Kirkwood, the Campus Planning Committee reviewed your schematic plans on the referenced project and the committee has asked that I transmit their major concerns to you so that you might evaluate them in order to either adjust your planning or be prepared to justify your concepts when we meet as a group with you at a later date.

In addition to some of CPC's concerns, the committee desires to meet with Dean Amandes very soon after his return to the campus in order to better understand several items of Dean Amandes' original program. These items generally concern themselves with the extent of individual student spaces for private lockers and carrels in the library, the rather numerous work stations for the administration staff and secretarial assistance, as well as some questions they have in their mind about the extensiveness of the faculty and main library.

We all, of course, realize that if major changes are made in your present schematics that it would be quite difficult for you to make an adequate presentation to the Board of Directors at their August 26th scheduled meeting and this would simply change the time table you presented when you were here. Please understand that we will do all we can to provide you the necessary information as quickly as it becomes available and we will stay in close touch with respect to a time table for reviews.

The concerns expressed by the Campus Planning Committee mentioned above are attached as a separate list and in addition, please find a rough draft of the proposed Owner-Architect Agreement for your review and comments.

Very truly yours,

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

/s/ Howard W. Schmidt

Howard W. Schmidt, AIA

cc: Mr. Pennington  
Mr. Urbanovsky  
Mr. Barrick  
Dean Amandes  
Miss Jerry Kirkwood

1619 College Avenue  
Lubbock, Texas 79401  
A. C. 806 Porter 3-4691

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN  
INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Comments from the Campus Planning Committee Relative to Schematic Plans  
Dated July 21, 1967, as prepared by Harrell and Hamilton

1. Considerable concern was expressed for the vast amount of cubage within the building and whether or not such space could be provided within the stated budget. The cubage referred to, of course, is that above the multi-purpose and snack area and in the two-level corridor areas surrounding the multi-purpose facility.
2. It was felt that quite a bit of improvement could be made in the seating layout in the 80-seat classroom.
3. A general concern was noted with the excessively complicated perimeter of the building. Recognizing this is a feature of the concept, it would be a deviation from existing campus buildings. Several questions were raised as to how this might affect the heat loss of the building as well as the interior and exterior maintenance of the facility.
4. The question was raised whether or not we may be able to reduce the land coverage still more if the classrooms could be stacked in a three-level arrangement.
5. It appeared to the Campus Planning Committee that the corridor might be excessive in the vicinity of the moot court and main entrance to the library.
6. The schematics indicated the rather thick exterior wall at several locations and CPC will at some point desire a review of the framing system and building materials which will apparently express the reason for these wall thicknesses.
7. The proximity of the distracting clutter of the snack area and the multi-purpose room was questioned.
8. The position of the elevator to serve the faculty as well as the library with a "two-door" type operation was questioned.
9. Whether or not the locker room location suggested would be the best possible position for this room was questioned. It appeared to the CPC that the locker room might be the first area the students entered and that it might better be located near one of the entrances.
10. A covered canopy from the building to the parking area was not felt to be necessary.
11. The CPC agreed that the more appropriate site for the building would be closer to the Physical Plant area to the northern end of the general site that appeared in the program (this was discussed after our meeting with the Project Architect in Lubbock at the site).

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 352

August 25, 1967

A meeting of the Campus and Building Committee of the Board of Directors was held at 4 p.m. in the Anniversary Room of the Student Union Building.

Mr. C. A. Cash, Building Committee member, was present.

Other members of the Board of Directors in attendance were Mr. Alvin R. Allison, Mr. Marshall Formby, Mr. Retha R. Martin and Dr. Fladger F. Tannery.

Mr. M. L. Pennington, Chairman of the Campus Planning Committee, was present.

Others present from the College were President Grover E. Murray, Dr. W. M. Pearce and Dr. S. M. Kennedy.

Dr. Kennedy presented the philosophy of space for a University, reviewed the programs under construction and planning, and cited future needs.

The following reports were made to the Committee:

3752. Architecture and Arts Facility (CPC No. 106-66)  
(O'Neil Ford and Associates, Architects)

The subcommittee and the Campus Planning Committee have reviewed the requirements of the Applied Arts and Allied Arts segments. Mr. Ken Ashworth of the Coordinating Board has established that the facility's configuration can change from that submitted in the application for matching funds, but that any change in assignable square feet greater than 5% of that submitted will not receive financial aid under the grant of \$1,000,000 which has been awarded.

It has been determined that the Department of Arts and the Department of Architecture can be housed within the originally programmed facility, with the exception that approximately 5,400 additional assignable square feet will be required. Based upon the projected enrollments of both departments, the facility as programmed will be fully utilized by 1969 instead of in 1973 as originally anticipated.

Two separate buildings would seem to be a logical procedure in order to provide flexibility for future growth.

An application for a supplemental grant of \$471,551.00 was submitted for consideration on August 7, 1967.

3753. Chemistry Building Addition (CPC No. 87-64)  
(Pitts, Mebane, Phelps and White, Architects)

An effort is being made by the Campus Planning Committee to implement the work of the architects on the preliminary plans.

Recommendations concerning the flexibility and economical structure of the facility have been studied by the Campus Planning Committee.

An application for an additional grant of \$450,194.00 was submitted on August 7, 1967.

3754. Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (CPC No. 115-67)  
(Atcheson, Atkinson and Cartwright, Architects)

The Board has approved proceeding with the Fluid Dynamics Laboratory. The inclusion of Soil Mechanics and Structural Mechanics and elements other than those connected with Fluid Dynamics should be based upon the justification for need, and are being reviewed by Dr. S. M. Kennedy.

Any matching fund applications as are possible will be filed, dependent upon the information furnished by the Civil Engineering Department.



3755. Funds Available

The report entitled "Present and Proposed Building Program" was presented to the Committee and is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 735, page 4068)

The estimated cost of the approved projects totals \$32,662,000 and the total estimated income available is \$29,610,000.

3756. Law School (CPC No. 108-66) (Harrell & Hamilton, Architects)

The final review prior to the development of preliminary plans has been made. It is planned to present the preliminary plans at the October Board Meeting.

3757. Museum (CPC No. 65-61) (Associated Architects and Engineers of Lubbock) (Stiles, Roberts and Messersmith and McMurtry & Craig, Architects)

Methods of implementation, in view of funds available, were discussed. As much of the funds to be realized from the drive will be in the form of pledges over several years, it was agreed that it would be proper to mark time until some indication of the funds available can be received, probably about December 1, 1967.

3758. Priority List of Projects - 1967 (CPC No. 117-67)

Dr. Kennedy's report was presented at the opening of the meeting.

3759. Temporary Buildings - Summer, 1967

Fourteen of the approved 18 buildings are completed and one has been occupied. The office building for the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation for Women is nearly complete.

The remaining two office buildings were not started pending the status of the two-story building at Reese Air Force Base. This building has been declared surplus but will not be available and cleared for moving until the latter part of September, which is too late for our needs.

In light of these circumstances, it was decided to begin immediately to construct one office building in the area of the old Power Plant.

3760. Textile Chemical Research Laboratory (CPC No. 116-67) (Ralph D. Spencer and Associates, Architects) (Zumwalt & Vinther, Inc., Engineers)

The proposed budget is \$1,250,000, including equipment.

Mr. Schmidt is preparing schematic plans including the elements requested, but is hampered by the lack of information concerning the equipment.

The necessary equipment and the flow of processing is the key to the functional design of the facility in this area and in this area of the campus which is tight for land space.

Applications for such matching fund applications, as is possible, will be filed in view of the overall campus needs. However, the opinion of the Campus Planning Committee is that the facility does not qualify for Title I but probably can qualify for a Title II Grant.

3761. Wiggins Complex - Phase II (CPC No. 114-67) (Schmidt and Stiles, Roberts and Messersmith, Architects)

Before taking further action, it was agreed to wait until registration for the fall semester has been completed and to take a look at the status of the residence halls.



3761. Wiggins Complex - Phase II (Cont'd)

After the last meeting, the members of the Board of Directors visited the Wiggins Complex and, as a result, want the Campus Planning Committee to take a good look at the quality of the job, with the statement that it looks rough to them.

Also, the Board wants to know if concrete was poured in cold weather.

Although it was not presented at the meeting but in order that it may be of record, the Architects were requested to prepare a list of expenditures to date in preparation for Phase II of the Wiggins Complex. A copy of the report is attached and indicates an investment of \$1,051,240 at the present time.

(Attachment No. 736, page 4069)

In addition, a commitment has been received for a \$3,000,000 loan through Housing and Urban Development at 3 percent interest which could be lost. The interest rate on the borrowed funds for Phase I is 4.37 percent.

There could be a problem with coverage in future years, as compliance with the coverage requirements are determined on the experience of the last year's operation. The current operation would be used to determine compliance if the bonds are issued this fall. If the bonds should be issued in 1968, the coverage would be determined by the operation for next fiscal year and could cause some complications.

The number of vacancies in the residence halls for the fall semester necessitate another look at the condition.

3762. O'Meara-Chandler Request

The O'Meara-Chandler Corporation has again submitted a request to run buses through the agricultural facilities to the east of the project through the underpass and to the campus.

The Board reviewed the original request and developments to date, and felt that such procedure would not be to the best interests of the College.

The Board suggested that the Corporation pursue the idea of proceeding from Corporation land to the freeway, to the intersection of 19th and the Brownfield Highway, east on 19th to the College, exit at the north of the campus, return via the west-bound land of the freeway and exit from the freeway via a right turn to the O'Meara-Chandler land.

3763. Other Item

The Committee requested the College to check on the possibility of getting some outside group to build academic facilities on campus and for the College to lease it from them. The question would be whether or not the College could secure rental money from the Legislature.

M. L. Pennington  
Chairman

---

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Campus Planning Committee  
 August 25, 1967  
 Attachment No. 735  
 Item No. 3755

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
 Lubbock, Texas

August 22, 1967

PRESENT AND PROPOSED BUILDING PROGRAM  
 (Does Not Include Auxiliary Enterprise Projects)

<u>Estimated Total Funds Available</u>	Report As of <u>July 31, 1967</u>	Report As of <u>August 22, 1967</u>	<u>Change Since Last Report</u>
1958-66 Constitutional Tax Funds.....	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	
1966-68 Constitutional Tax Funds.....	10,730,000	10,730,000	
Interest on Investment of Tax Funds.....	383,000	383,000	
Estimated Proceeds from Skiles Act Bonds.....	2,750,000	2,750,000	
Estimated Proceeds from Building Use Fee Bonds.....	2,750,000	2,750,000	
Estimated Proceeds from Heating and Cooling Plant Bonds.....	4,800,000	4,800,000	
Approved Facilities Act Funds.....	4,967,634	4,967,634	
Possible Additional Facilities Act Funds.....	<u>1,565,637</u>	<u>1,729,894</u>	Revised budgets for Biology and Chemistry Projects made it possible to file supplemental applications for more Title I funds.
TOTAL.....	<u>\$29,446,271</u>	<u>\$29,610,528</u>	

PRESENT AND PROPOSED BUILDING PROGRAM  
(Does Not Include Auxiliary Enterprise Projects)  
Page Two

August 22, 1967

<u>Building Projects</u>	<u>As of July 31, 1967</u>	<u>As of August 22, 1967</u>	<u>Change Since Last Report</u>
Previously Completed or Near Completion.....	\$ 491,847	\$ 491,847	
Foreign Language-Mathematics.....	1,391,397	1,391,397	
Heating and Cooling Plant.....	4,800,000	4,800,000	
Utility Extensions.....	940,675	940,675	
Temporary Buildings.....	250,000	250,000	
Business Administration.....	4,565,000	4,565,000	
Museum.....	500,000	500,000	
Law School.....	3,055,485	3,055,485	
Biology.....	5,136,931	5,136,931	
Chemistry.....	4,327,707	5,496,078	
			Revised to Architect's latest estimate of cost used in filing supplemental application for grant funds.
Architecture.....	4,414,653	4,414,653	
President's Home.....	65,000	65,000	
Sheep and Goat Facilities.....	55,000	55,000	
Textile Engineering Building Addition and Equipment.....	500,000	1,250,000	
			Increased by Board of Directors at August 5, 1967 meeting.
Civil Engineering Laboratory.....	<u>250,000</u>	<u>250,000</u>	
TOTAL.....	<u>\$30,743,695</u>	<u>\$32,662,066</u>	

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Summary of Facilities Act Funds Approved

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Title I</u>	<u>Title II</u>
Library.....	\$ 67,746	\$ 67,746	\$
Foreign Languages-Mathematics..	450,000	450,000	
Business Administration.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	
Biology.....	875,221	324,207	551,014
Architecture Building.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Chemistry.....	<u>1,074,667</u>	<u>144,687</u>	<u>929,980</u>
TOTAL.....	<u>\$ 4,967,634</u>	<u>\$ 3,486,640</u>	<u>\$ 1,480,994</u>

August 22, 1967

Possible Additional Title I and Title II Grant Funds

	<u>July 31, 1967</u>	<u>August 22, 1967</u>
Architecture.....	\$ 471,551	\$ 471,551
Biology.....	756,483	808,149(b)
Chemistry.....	<u>337,603(a)</u>	<u>450,194(b)</u>
Possible total.....	<u>\$ 1,565,637</u>	<u>\$ 1,729,894</u>

(a) Title I 10% grant of \$144,687 shown in schedule of approved grants at left.

(b) Revised budgets for Biology and Chemistry Projects made it possible to make application for more Title I funds.

August 25, 1967

CHEMISTRY BUILDING  
Changes in Budget for  
Title I Supplemental Application

	<u>Original Budget</u> <u>June 28, 1966</u>	<u>Revised Budget</u> <u>August, 1967</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Architectural and Engineering Fees	\$ 212,163	\$ 274,264	\$ 62,101
Resident Inspection of Construction	15,000	20,000	5,000
Construction	3,042,297	3,458,600	416,303
Built-in Equipment	499,000	642,000	143,000
Site Improvements and Utility Connections	111,075	425,250	314,175
Construction Contingency	(a)	226,292	226,292
Other Budget Items	<u>448,172</u>	<u>449,672</u>	<u>1,500</u>
	<u>\$ 4,327,707</u>	<u>\$ 5,496,078</u>	<u>\$ 1,168,371 (b)</u>

(a) Included in construction figure as required by Application for Grant forms.

(b) Architects took actual cost figures of Biology Building and reworked the budget to present market costs. The original utility connections costs were estimated before the location and size of tunnels could be accurately established. The revised budget represents current market costs, based upon recent utility costs to the Biology Building.

NOTE: The Coordinating Board approved the use of the revised budget figures in the Title I Supplemental Application, though this is usually not permitted until bids are taken. The Application was filed for \$450,194 additional grant funds instead of the first anticipated amount of \$337,603.

Campus Planning Committee  
 August 25, 1967  
 Attachment No. 736  
 Item No. 3761

August 24, 1967

TEXAS TECH'S CURRENT INVESTMENT IN PHASE II - WIGGINS DORMITORY COMPLEX

Pro-rata portion of Central Plant		
Building and auxiliary	\$315,500	
Chilled water	63,000	
Steam	<u>42,500</u>	
		\$421,000
Pro-rata portion of Tunnel		\$103,300
Water, Sewer and Gas Services		\$ 12,900
Electrical Services (unavailable)		
Floor space in Basement Kitchen area		
6038 sq. ft. @ \$30.00/S.F.		\$181,140
Floor space at Dining Hall level		
1040 sq. ft. @ \$20.00/S.F.		\$ 20,800
One-half of Post Office		
706 sq. ft. @ \$20.00/S.F.		\$ 14,120
One-third of Basement Mechanical space		
732 sq. ft. @ \$15.00/S.F.		\$ 10,980
Tunnel (empty) stub-out to the West		\$ 7,000
Food Consultant's fee (approximately)		\$ 5,000
Architects fee (75% of total fee)		<u>\$275,000</u>
TOTAL		\$1,051,240

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS SHOULD PHASE II  
WIGGINS DORMITORY COMPLEX BE POSTPONED

Vehicular traffic circulation will be poor if drives are left as now constructed.

"Raw ends" of unfinished structures have a very unattractive appearance (the finishing of these walls was eliminated by a deductive change order in the amount of \$83,356.00).

A finished red tile roof is not now provided over the mechanical penthouse at the dining hall.

If we had been aware of a possible postponement, a certain amount of agricultural land could have been left available and the new sheep and goat facility might not have been necessary at this time.

Construction costs can be expected to rise at least 4% per year. (For Phase II this would represent approximately \$300,000 per year.)

H. A. Lott estimates an increase in their bid of approximately \$50,000 if they are required to move away from the site and bid later.

Alan Farnsworth has stated that their bid in the future could increase as much as \$500,000 if their work load changed considerably and if their key personnel now on the project were scattered and tied down to other long time construction projects.

Students in Coleman Hall will be required to use the co-educational recreation and snack bar facilities outside of their own dorm for a longer length of time.

The telephone company has invested approximately \$79,000 in the 2,700 pair cable from their main equipment in Doak Hall to the Wiggins Complex for both Phase I and Phase II.

Prepared by Schmidt and Stiles, Roberts & Messersmith, Architects.