

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 248

August 4, 1965

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 10:30 a.m. on August 4, 1965, in the Faculty Club. Those present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington.

3059. Off-Campus Housing

In talking with the various persons and firms interested in providing off-campus men's housing, the need for a formal arrangement has developed.

At the present time, three different groups are in the process of attempting to develop housing. They are: University Housing Construction, Ltd., of Omaha, Nebraska, and Glenview, Illinois; University Dormitory Development, Inc., of Chicago, Illinois; and the local group. University Housing Construction, Ltd., seems to be farther along in planning than the others. According to their representatives, they have a site on 19th Street, have cleared the zoning and plan to construct facilities for 850 students, plus 20 apartments, and would like to build another 850-capacity twin building, if the College approves. They plan to erect an 8- to 10-story building.

After a great deal of discussion, it was agreed that each of the three groups will be invited to make a formal request to the College, stipulating the number of students they wish to handle, the site, the number of stories, the quality of construction, parking, feeding, other facilities, scheduled completion date and the proposed method of operation, all to agree with the regulations issued by the Board of Directors. In addition, each would have an opportunity to ask questions for which answers are needed.

Any other procedure would seem to allow off-campus housing to grow without any college control. Without specific approval, it would be impossible to secure approval of the Board's regulations or to change the policy if it should become necessary.

One point needing clarification is whether or not the Board of Directors approved off-campus housing for men past September 1, 1966. September 1, 1966, was the first date used in discussion by the Board. However, nothing appears in the records that would indicate that the approval should be limited to September, 1966.

3060. New Women's Hall

The Board of Directors has approved additional on-campus women's housing for completion in September, 1967.

It was agreed to take preliminary steps to get the project started. It will be necessary to determine how many spaces to build, the site, whether or not it would be part of a complex and whether or not it might eventually be part of coeducational housing.

The housing staff will be asked for its recommendations and the Campus Planning Committee is to pull its thinking together with a meeting in the near future to get the project under way.

3061. West Hall Renovation

Since the time that the consolidated kitchen and dining room for Bledsoe, Gordon, Weeks and Sneed Halls was approved, it has been part of the plan to remodel the space in West Hall made available by the closing of the

3061. West Hall Renovation (continued)

kitchen, dining room and the operation of the Athletic Department. Mr. Barrick's staff has prepared a very good floor plan which would provide three study areas, rearrangements of the apartments for the counselor and the dietitian, a new apartment for the relief counselor, a small lounge where the girls could meet their dates, rearrangement of the post office boxes and the office, a rearrangement of the laundry and a few other minor items. The total rearrangement would accommodate 26 new spaces for women students. The estimated cost is \$50,000 to \$55,000 and the Building Maintenance Department has such a work load that it would be impossible to do the work by the time school starts.

From a strict standpoint of amortization, the conversion probably would not be economical. Taking into consideration all of the other benefits, it seems essential. Money is available in the Major Repair and Renovation account.

After thorough consideration, it was agreed to recommend the project to the Building Committee of the Board in order that work could begin promptly if it is approved.

Various means of getting the work done prior to the beginning of the fall term, in order that the rooms could be available for additional women students, were discussed. It was agreed that it would be impossible to prepare detailed plans and specifications, take bids and get the work done in time.

It was decided that the only way to get the work done would be to negotiate, perhaps on a cost plus basis, if permission of the Building Committee could be obtained. A list of three contractors was made, with the agreement that Mr. Hap Padgett of H. A. Padgett Construction Company would be requested to meet this afternoon with the Campus Planning Committee to discuss means of making such an arrangement.

M. L. Pennington
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 12 noon.

Mr. Padgett met with Mr. Urbanovsky, Mr. Barrick and M. L. Pennington at 3 p.m. on the same afternoon. The floor plan was studied in depth and various procedures were discussed. It was agreed to recommend to the Building Committee of the Board of Directors that a cost plus fixed fee contract, in keeping with the standard AIA contract, be awarded to Mr. H. A. Padgett, subject to an estimate of cost to be prepared by Mr. Padgett.

Mr. Padgett, Mr. Barrick, Mr. Guy J. Moore and Mr. O. R. Downing were requested to inspect West Hall to determine the implementation of the floor plans.

The group reported that the plans are feasible and recommended that Mr. Downing handle the heating and air-conditioning and Mr. Padgett the rest.

The recommendation was made to the Building Committee on August 6, 1965, and the voting was as follows:

Mr. Wilmer Smith, Chairman	"Aye"
Mr. Herbert Allen	"Aye"
Mr. Harold Hinn	"Aye"

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 249

August 10, 1965

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 9 a.m. on August 10, 1965, in the Faculty Club. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. In addition, Mr. John G. Taylor, Mr. O. R. Downing, Mr. Guy J. Moore and Mr. Hap Padgett were present.

3062. West Hall Renovation

Mr. Padgett presented an estimate for the total project of \$59,164 which includes an allowance of \$6,500 for the Department of Building Maintenance to install the air-conditioning and heating. Mr. Downing has estimated the cost at approximately \$3,000. The total estimate includes a fixed fee of \$3,750 for Mr. Padgett as contractor. After discussion and in keeping with the approval of the Building Committee of the Board of Directors, it was agreed to proceed with the project.

In order to move as rapidly as possible, it was agreed that Mr. Barrick and Mr. Downing would meet with Mr. Padgett to decide on materials and provide the first information needed by Mr. Padgett and that Mr. Downing would be the coordinator for the project.

Mr. Downing said that he is ready to pick up his material for the heating and air-conditioning, and Mr. Padgett said that he had a crew standing by to start the necessary demolition after lunch.

It was agreed that Mr. Padgett can use the paved court to the north of the present kitchen and dining room for storage and operation.

Mr. Padgett said that he needed for the College to understand his method of dealing with subcontractors and presented the following information:

Demolition - Mr. Padgett would do the work with his people.

Carpentry - Nothing would be involved but materials and labor.

Millwork - Seventy doors are needed, and they are not available at the present time. It will be necessary to do some hasty work, and the doors must be properly sized.

Detail of the Screen - Telephone shelves, etc. - Mr. Barrick's staff will provide the details.

Dry Wall - Metal studs and sheetrock.

Acoustical Tile - Suspended grid. Size of the grid will depend on the material available; 2' x 2' size is preferred. Mr. Padgett will take unit price bids and award a subcontract.

Lath, Plaster and Stucco - Mr. Padgett will provide.

Three Folding Doors - Decision will be made later.

Ceramic Tile - The problem is to get a contractor when the work must be done.

Painting - Mr. Padgett will have to negotiate on a fixed fee basis.

Vinyl Wall Covering - Mr. Padgett will have to negotiate on a fixed fee basis.

3062. West Hall Renovation (continued)

Floors - Basically the same.

Glass and Glazing - Mr. Padgett will get someone to do it.

Carpet - It will have to be chosen locally.

Hardware - Mr. Padgett said he hopes there is enough in the college inventory, as there would be a real problem in getting it in time.

Mr. Downing said he had talked with the district representative for Sargent Lock Company and had been told that Sargent could supply the hardware in time. Mr. Downing is to call him.

One Door to be Replaced by a Window - It will be a problem to find a matching window after 30 years. Since the window will be in the cove between the kitchen and the east wing, it was agreed to order a window that will match the others as nearly as possible.

Plumbing - Mr. Padgett said that he had arranged with Joe Rushing, Plumbing Contractor, to do the work on the same basis of contract. He is a small contractor, but one of the very best and will do the work when it is needed.

Heating and Air-Conditioning - To be done by Texas Tech.

Electrical - Arrangements have been made with Clark Electric Company, which did the work on the Central Food Facility.

Patchwork on Existing Floor - Mr. Padgett will provide the work.

Mr. Downing will see that the heavy equipment is moved from the kitchen.

Mr. Bradshaw will be the project superintendent for Mr. Padgett.

Mr. Moore said that he would be prepared to have the areas cleaned as they are completed, in order to be ready for occupancy as soon as possible.

The standard AIA contract form for a fixed fee contract will be used, and Mr. Barrick will be requested to prepare the contract.

It was agreed that everyone must move with the utmost dispatch.

M. L. Pennington
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 10 a.m.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 250 August 14, 1965

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 9 a.m. on August 14, 1965. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Others present were Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. O. R. Downing. Mr. Robert L. Mason was out of town.

3063. Approval of Minutes

On motion by Mr. Barrick, seconded by Mr. Urbanovsky, the Minutes of Meetings Nos. 245, 246, 247 and 248 were approved.

3064. President's Approval of Minutes

President Goodwin approved the Minutes of Meetings Nos. 245 on May 31, 1965, 246 on June 2, 1965, and 247 on June 24, 1965.

3065. Agricultural Facilities (CPC No. 93-64)

Horse Facilities

The area needs to be cleaned up and it has been agreed in the past to wait for Dr. Ellis to arrive on campus as the new department head for Animal Husbandry.

3066. Building Program - Future

Priority List

The Board of Directors has stipulated that the priority list of projects be presented for approval at the October meeting.

3067. Chemical Research Building (CPC No. 87-64)

A. Preliminary Plans and Specifications

The plans were to be presented to the Board of Directors for approval at the August meeting. Since there is no August meeting, the plans will be presented at the October meeting.

B. X-Buildings on Site

The five buildings have been moved to the new site. Electrical connections have been made, and the connection of the other utilities will begin next week.

No problem is anticipated in having the buildings available for the beginning of the fall term.

C. Application

The application cannot be filed until the final plans and specifications have been prepared. If the preliminary plans are approved in October, final plans and specifications probably will be completed by February, 1966, and the Government wants six months to approve an application for funds. However, representatives of the HHFA have reported that they can clear an application in approximately two weeks.

3068. Classroom-Office Building (New) (Foreign Languages-Mathematics)
(CPC No. 79-63)

- A. Mr. Bob White of Pitts, Mebane, Phelps and White, Mr. Bill Felty and Mr. John G. Taylor attended a called conference with HHFA in Fort Worth on July 26, 1965. The forms and instructions on how to proceed were furnished by HHFA personnel.

B. Status of Bidding Documents

It is estimated that the detailed plans may be completed by the end of August. The plans will be checked and promptly sent to the HHFA for approval, and the bid dates will be arranged after HHFA approval is obtained.

3069. Dormitory Expansion

A. Off-Campus Housing

1. Regulations

A copy of the off-campus housing regulations approved by the Board of Directors on July 22, 1965, Item No. 815, is attached for future reference. (Attachment No. 576, page 1753)

2. Projects

As of August 13, 1965, there were 249 unassigned requests from men students with prospects of being able to place only a few. On the same date, there were 330 unassigned requests from women students with 26 new spaces to be created in West Hall. The Office of Room Reservations has not been accepting deposits for three weeks.

At the present time, three groups are pursuing off-campus housing:

University Housing Construction, Ltd.; Omaha, Nebraska, and Glenview, Illinois--850 spaces, September 1966; south side of block east of College on 19th Street.

University Dormitory Development, Inc.; Chicago, Illinois; 700 plus, 1967; seeking site on south side of block to the west of College on 19th Street.

Bob Dickenson, Lubbock--850 spaces, 1967; old Tower Theater site. (This was announced in paper.)

Several dozen others have expressed an interest in off-campus housing, but only the three above are active.

However, there are some rumors that two other groups are considering several thousand spaces--one to the west of the campus and the other to the north.

It seems obvious that there must be some type of formal application and formal reply to prevent the development of a situation which could never be brought under control or only with great difficulty. Without such action, there would be no way to carry out the instructions of the Board. Some type of an agreement before the facilities are constructed seems to be essential and after the facilities are in operation, housing approval will be the means to enforce the agreement.

Consequently, a letter was written to each of the groups, and a copy of the one to University Dormitory Development, Inc., is attached to and made a part of the Minutes for information. (Attachment No. 577, page 1754)

3069. Dormitory ExpansionA. Off-Campus Housing2. Projects (continued)

There are many advantages and many problems in connection with off-campus housing, and very careful steps should be taken in an attempt to create the most workable solution possible. The members of the CPC are to be thinking of the proper steps to take.

The City is being apprised of the developments and is attempting to develop proper zoning.

It is not clear whether or not the Board of Directors authorized off-campus housing for men past 1966, although there seems to be nothing to that effect in the minutes.

B. On-Campus Housing

It was agreed that a separate meeting will be devoted to on-campus housing, with a recommendation on a plan, site, architects, etc., to be made to the Board of Directors at the October meeting.

3070. Greenhouse (Biology)

The low bid on the original plans and specifications was a bit over \$17,000. At the time, it was agreed to reject the bids and to redo the plans and specifications. Since then, the plans and specifications have been redone, and requests for bids are out at the present time. It is estimated that, through a revision, the addition to the Biology Greenhouse can be erected for some \$8,000 to \$10,000.

3071. Library (CPC No. 12-58)Completion of South Basement and Third FloorApplication

The application was completed and sent to the Texas Commission on Higher Education on July 28, 1965. The Commission has informed the College that the priority list will be established on or before September 14, 1965.

3072. Other ItemsA. Paving at Stadium (Athletics)

Various plans have been presented by the City to the Highway Department and the College without concurrence so far. On August 13, 1965, an acceptable traffic signal control at Fourth and Boston was presented to the College. It now must be presented to the Highway Department. It will affect the ingress and egress to the paving contemplated at the north end of the stadium.

Mr. Urbanovsky is to consult with the Highway Department on August 16, 1965, to see if the Highway Department will accept the revised plans, in order that the paving may be started with the least amount of delay.

B. Concessions (Athletics)

The work is in process at the present time.

C. Practice Fields (Athletics)

The work is probably 80 percent complete, and the contractor is on schedule.

3072. Other Items (continued)D. Traffic Light at Flint and 15th Street

Last spring, the College asked the City to activate the light in keeping with the agreement at the time the extension to Flint Avenue was run through the Campus.

The City has just completed a treadle control which allows the Traffic-Security Department to activate the light.

E. Southwestern Public Service Company Easement

Mr. Mason is working with the Southwestern Public Service Company on the details of the easement.

F. Slurry Seal for Parking Lots

The contract has been let and work is to be done between the close of summer school and the opening of the fall term.

3073. ParkingDoak Hall Request

The plans were studied in detail, and it was agreed that Mr. Urbanovsky would check with Dean Tinsley for possible additional spaces and how they might be used, and that the plan would be checked with the Traffic-Security Commission. Mr. Cole has requested that the work not be done until after the start of school, due to the heavy delivery of materials to the Bookstore until then.

3074. Texas Tech Press Addition

Mr. Benge Daniel, Manager of the Texas Tech Press, has requested additional space. A copy of his request is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 578, page 1755)

It was agreed that his request would be studied in connection with the overall needs of the area. Mr. Downing mentioned that Mr. Crawford has developed a traffic problem for delivery trucks coming to the warehouse and suggested that it might be better to have an entrance to the west. A west entrance would necessitate a major overhaul and would be tied to the anticipated future addition.

3075. Wage Scale

The wage scale is a very difficult problem. The raw information has been prepared, and it was agreed that there seems to be no way to handle the need except to have a separate meeting.

3076. West Hall Renovation

The demolition is nearly complete at the present time. It was felt that the contractor is moving as expeditiously as possible.

M. L. Pennington
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

1753

Campus Planning Committee
August 14, 1965
Attachment No. 576
Item 3069A-1

Board Minutes
July 22, 1965
Attachment No. 63
Item No. 815

REGULATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE APPROVAL OF MULTI-UNIT
OFF-CAMPUS RESIDENCE HALLS FOR MEN STUDENTS

1. Adequate and sufficient physical facilities must be provided and maintained as determined by the College.
2. Working cooperatively with the College, competent supervision must be maintained to insure conditions conducive to good health, good study habits and becoming behavior.
3. Full recognition of the parietal rule of the College is acknowledged, and its implementation by the College is expected.
4. All provisions of the Civil Rights Laws must be complied with.
5. If such matters as off-street parking and pedestrian and vehicular traffic are not covered by municipal regulations, they shall be covered by college regulations.

Campus Planning Committee
August 14, 1965
Attachment No. 577
Item 3069A-2

August 11, 1965

Mr. Harold E. Strauss, President
University Dormitory Development, Inc.
35 East Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Bernard B. Heilprin, Vice President
University Dormitory Development, Inc.
111 South Fairchild Street
Madison 3, Wisconsin

Gentlemen:

In attempting to work up information requested by University Housing Construction, Ltd., and to take measures to comply with the regulations applicable to the approval of multi-unit off-campus residence halls for men students as stipulated by the Board of Directors at the meeting on July 22, 1965, it has become apparent that it will be necessary to have a formal request from you and for you to have a formal reply from us. There seems to be no other way to comply with the regulations stipulated by the Board and have everything of record.

Accordingly, you are requested to make a formal request to the College for off-campus men's housing, stipulating the number of students you wish to handle, the site, the number of stories, the quality of construction, parking, feeding, other facilities, scheduled completion date and the proposed method of operation, all to agree with the regulations issued by the Board of Directors.

Also, you are requested to list your experience in the housing field, and it would be helpful to have an indication of your financial ability and backing. References are requested. Of special interest would be the management of the halls once they are placed in operation. In the application it would be well, I think, for you to ask any questions which need answers from your standpoint, and we shall attempt to supply them.

The City is in the process of working up the zoning and definition of a dormitory, and has agreed on a proposal to submit to the City Commission on August 26, 1965.

I shall be grateful to you if you will promptly make an application for off-campus housing for men students in keeping with the Board's regulations, copies of which are enclosed. A reply will be provided to you as rapidly as possible.

If you have any suggestions in connection with this request, please let me know.

Very sincerely yours,

/s/M. L. Pennington

M. L. Pennington
Vice President for
Business Affairs

MLP:b

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Ray Chapman

Photocopies to Dr. Goodwin, Mr. Wells, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Price, Mr. Moore (3),
Dean Allen, Dean Jones and Dean Phillips 8-13-65

Campus Planning Committee
 August 14, 1965
 Attachment No. 578
 Item 3074

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
 Lubbock, Texas

The Texas Tech Press

June 17, 1965

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

Dear Mr. Pennington:

Due to our present crowded condition at Tech Press, we need an addition to our building as soon as practicable.

The additional space is to be used for paper storage.

At the present time we are storing paper in our bookbinding area and in other vacant temporary spots around the shop. Next year we plan to double our output of Library books bound--from approximately 1,000 books per month to 2,000 per month. This expansion of our bookbindery will necessitate our using all this area for binding books. The number of printed jobs is also increasing and we need more room now in all areas--composing (setting type), imposing (make-up of jobs, lock-up, and proofing), presswork (letterpress and offset), and printing bindery (folding, gathering, wire stitching, padding, paper drilling, round cornering, perforating, plastic strip binding, and paper cutting). Paper is often inconveniently stacked where it needs to be moved several times before it is printed and several times after it is printed.

If we had about 4,554 square feet of floor space added (Plan 1) it would be sufficient for our present needs. This would enable us to buy paper in larger quantities, carload lots in some instances, and perhaps buy at a cheaper price. Cartons and skids of paper would be kept here.

With about 6,831 square feet of floor space added (Plan 2) we would have extra space and this should be sufficient for some 10 years or more. Until such a time as we need this extra space, about 3 years, the Mimeograph Department could store paper here; and Building Maintenance could store some equipment which might need to be inside (example, extra waste containers, air conditioners awaiting installation, etc.) at no cost. The addition would not need to be air conditioned--we would move the paper as needed into the present shop for cooling and humidification. It would need some lighting but would not need water or gas.

We would like for the Building Maintenance Department of the College to have a bid on this job. The ideas for future expansion of the Warehouse and Building Maintenance should be taken into consideration so that the Physical Plant area buildings would be functional as well as beautiful.

The money for such a project is available in our Prior Year Balance account.

Yours truly,

/s/Benge R. Daniel

Benge R. Daniel
 Manager--Tech Press

Attached: Plan 1 (These plans are on file in the office
 Plan 2 of the Vice President for Business Affairs.)
 Carbon copy: Mr. Ray Downing
 Mr. Robert Mason
 Mr. Jesse Crawford

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 251

October 1, 1965

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 9 a.m. on October 1, 1965, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Others present were Mr. John G. Taylor, Mr. O. R. Downing, Mr. Guy J. Moore, Mrs. Dorothy T. Garner and Mr. Aubrey Lewis.

3077. New Residence Hall for Women

By way of review, a summary was made of the current situation affecting housing. The Board of Directors has authorized off-campus construction for men students, and three groups are currently working on projects. Each of two of the groups plans to have 850 spaces available for occupancy in September, 1966. The other plans to have 700 plus spaces ready for occupancy in September, 1967. The requests from the three for approval to construct the facilities will be presented to the Board of Directors at the meeting on October 9, 1965. Zoning apparently is not quite complete and probably won't be final until November.

As there will be new facilities for men students in September, 1966, and none for women, Men's Residence Hall No. 9 will be converted to occupancy for women students in September, 1966.

A new residence hall is to be completed for women students in 1967, and that is the purpose of the meeting. A recommendation is to be made to the Board of Directors on October 9 for the plan, site and architects. It has been generally thought that it would be best to start a complex across Flint Avenue.

Mr. Barrick said that Michigan State is trying to house all the students on campus, and it is a mess. He moved that we fill in the spaces on campus available to the east of Flint for additional residence halls, then go out of further housing. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Moore was asked for a recommendation from the housing staff, and he said that the staff has met several times. He read from a list of recommendations, which is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 579, page 1758)

While most of the items in the report were discussed, the chief recommendations were that the units for each wing counselor should be 45-50, and not over 450 to a building to be under one supervisor. The buildings should be constructed for occupancy for either men or women.

Other points such as exteriors, rooms, bathrooms, lounges, etc., were discussed. It was agreed that the complex idea would be the one to follow and that the dining and recreation facilities should be separate from the living quarters. Probably 1,350 spaces should be the target for 1967. It would be advantageous to plan for a specific number of spaces each year for the next several years. There was some thought that the maximum for a commons building (dining and recreation) probably would be 2,000 and that 3,000 could be too many.

(Mr. Urbanovsky had to leave the meeting at 10:45 a.m. to teach his class.)

3077. New Residence Hall for Women (continued)

It was agreed that it would be wise to send out inspecting parties as soon as the general idea of the complex is determined.

The construction schedule is going to be tight as projects for the suggested proportion have been under construction 18 to 19 months before the target date in past years.

It was agreed that the complex idea would be more desirable if it were coeducation and men were also housed in the complex.

A long-range plan on housing is going to present a complication. There seem to be only two sites west of Flint, one to the south of the Physical Plant facilities and the other adjacent to 19th Street. After that, then what? More use will need to be made of some of the present sites for residence halls. The density could be increased. After that it will be difficult to have more residence halls near the campus proper.

It would be wise to decide who shall be housed in the years ahead, including what shall be done for men.

M. L. Pennington
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Campus Planning Committee
October 1, 1965
Attachment No. 579
Item 3077

RESIDENCE HALLS PROPOSAL

In consultation with the Housing Staff of Texas Technological College, a review of the building program which has been followed through the past year and the various statistical information obtained from Part IV, College and University Facilities Survey, published by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the following recommendation is submitted for the information of the Campus Planning Committee.

TYPE OF BUILDING

The construction of the buildings should meet the exterior requirements of the present residential buildings, evidenced by Gates, Wall, Hulen, Clement and Men's #9 and #10 Halls. It is felt that the matching brick is traditional here on the Texas Tech campus, and it would serve no useful purpose to make any alteration or variation in the type of exterior brick used.

NUMBER OF PERSONS

In a series of buildings to be determined in accordance with further recommendations, it was recommended that each building house approximately 450 students of one sex. The building should be so constructed that maximum living groups of forty to fifty persons could be arranged. The building would be administered by one full-time staff member, with the assistance of a graduate assistant or half-time staff member, to absorb part of the administrative and disciplinary duties.

It is also recommended that provision be made for one full-time clerical person to give continuity to the clerical and administrative functions of the building.

The room structure should be one of having built-in furniture, including desks, beds, clothes closets and chests of drawers. These pieces of equipment should be arranged to give a maximum of privacy to the two individual students who would occupy the room. A lavatory should be placed in each of the individual rooms, for the purpose of personal cleanliness and convenience to each of the two inhabitants.

Group toilet facilities are recommended for each living group. It is recommended that the number of units in each facility be divided or back-to-back, so that two separate units could be used in the case of conference groups.

LOUNGE FACILITIES

It is suggested that a small, informal lounge be placed at the end of the corridor or in the center of a corridor for each forty to fifty persons, as stated above. This lounge should be large enough for group meetings of the inhabitants of that particular floor.

An additional lounge should be furnished on the first floor of the building for the reception of guests, and for the use of the building as a whole group. This lounge would be furnished with dividing partitions, by which a larger lounge could be made into small group session rooms, which would be separate and apart for the purpose of hall meetings and special hall council groups, which would be meeting for the programming of educational endeavors and for small group use.

UTILITIES

It was generally agreed upon that each room should have sufficient light for the student to study either on his bed or at the desk, without the requirement of additional separate lamps. The building should be centrally air conditioned and heated, preferably with a self-contained unit within each individual building.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

On the basement level, there should be adequate facilities for trunk storage with built-in shelves, sufficient room for laundry equipment, including washers and dryers, an incinerator room with sufficient space for efficient removal and storage of trash to meet the maximum disposal point. A space large enough for two ping pong tables is recommended for use as a party room for residents only.

STUDENT FACILITIES

An area approximately the size of two student rooms should be set aside on each of the forty to fifty person floors, for the use of the residents of that particular floor. Such study rooms should be equipped with some type of sink, the necessary cabinets, and the necessary electrical outlets for use of small percolators, coffee pots or preparation of hot drinks.

It would be helpful too if space could be provided for a typing room, with desk or platform for a minimum of two typewriters.

KITCHEN FACILITIES

In close proximity to the formal lounge on the first floor, it was requested that a small kitchenette with refrigeration space, dish washing space and light food preparation equipment be established. This unit could be used for formal events, open house, special events of all types.

OFFICE AND ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE

It is recommended that two offices be placed in the center of each building, with a third center office, for general use of the clerical and student staff who may be working there or on duty through various hours of the day and night. These two offices would be established for the full-time staff member and for the student assistant and hall council, who would operate from the second office. A set of post office boxes should be set up with one box per two students with combination locks.

TELEPHONES

It is recommended that one instrument be furnished in each of the individual student rooms throughout the building. In addition, it is recommended that there be placed, either in the public lobby or in close proximity to the office, at least two pay phones per 100 students. It was recommended that long distance calls could be made from the individual room phones. If permitted, one pay phone should be located on each floor.

CONCESSIONS ROOM

It was unanimously recommended that all vending machines be situated in a central public area accessible from both the public lounge and the student room corridors. It was recommended by the group that a variety of drinks be furnished in the individual machines, and that such drinks be served in disposable paper cups. It was felt that paper cups would cause far less administrative and financial headaches for the Residence Halls, and that it would be a much greater safety factor because of the lack of breakage of bottles and the unsightliness of such bottles sitting in unauthorized places when not in use. It is also felt that from the sanitary use of such cups, no additional health hazard would be encompassed.

TV FACILITIES

All informal and formal lounges within the building should have a centralized antenna and accessible outlets in each of the individual areas.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 252

October 2, 1965

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 9:30 a.m. on October 2, 1965, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Others present were Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. O. R. Downing.

3078. Approval of Minutes

On motion by Mr. Barrick, seconded by Mr. Urbanovsky, the Minutes of Meetings Nos. 249 and 250 were approved.

3079. President's Approval of Minutes

President Goodwin approved the Minutes of Meetings Nos. 248, 249 and 250 on August 26, 1965.

3080. Agricultural Facilities (CPC No. 93-64)

Horse Facilities

Dr. Ellis has been in contact with Miss Jerry Kirkwood of Mr. Barrick's office in connection with the plans for the facilities.

3081. Building Program - Future

A. Priority List

It was agreed that President Goodwin's letter of September 24, 1965, which is attached to and made a part of the Minutes (Attachment No. 580, page 1764), will be used as the base for the priority list.

Also attached is a letter from Dr. Henry Thomas and President Goodwin's reply. (Attachment No. 581, page 1765)

Some of the thoughts discussed are as follows:

It probably will be necessary to have some additional space for undergraduate Chemistry, as the research facility may be of little help in that area.

In Engineering, Dean Bradford has mentioned space needs for Architecture, Civil Engineering and the Computer Center. Civil Engineering may need some testing facilities.

In Home ~~Management~~ ^{Economics}, there is some question as to whether or not there are enough classrooms and laboratories.

Dr. Goodwin reported that the Heads of the Physics and Geosciences Departments would be happy to have the existing Science Building with a new building being constructed for Biology. There is some question as to whether or not the attic space can be abandoned by Biology, as the National Science Foundation grant stipulated that it would be used for 10 years.

Miss Clewell is almost desperate for faculty offices. Some relief would be provided by a new building for the School of Business Administration, which would free the present Business Administration Building, probably for English.

3081. Building Program - FutureA. Priority List (continued)

It was agreed that another meeting will be held at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 5, 1965, in order to further develop the list of needs. There will be other needed facilities, such as a power house addition to supply the additional heat, utility lines, roads, walks, etc.

It was agreed that it probably would be well to employ an engineering firm to make specific plans for future utility lines, etc.

The idea of project committees was again discussed, with the feeling that such could contribute a great deal to the projects. It was also agreed that it would be well to add carefully picked representatives from off campus for the projects.

B. Special Approval

Attached to and made a part of the Minutes is a summary of the Special Legislative Provisions which affect construction. (Attachment No. 582, page 1766)

It was the consensus that no change will need to be made in the approval of projects or architects from that which has been followed by the College in past years.

C. Architects

A good bit of discussion ensued on the proposed system of consulting and project architects. Mr. Urbanovsky presented the idea of adding a Director of Facilities, and it was agreed that additional study will be made with a recommendation to be made next week.

D. Music

If President Johnson signs the act creating the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities, it is possible that there could be some help for the Music Building from the Federal Government.

It was agreed that all sources should be investigated, and Mr. Taylor was requested to follow the development.

3082. Chemical Research Building (CPC No. 87-64)

Mr. Barrick reported that the project architects will be ready to present the preliminary plans and specifications to the Building Committee of the Board of Directors on October 8, 1965.

3083. Classroom-Office Building (New) (Foreign Languages and Mathematics) (CPC No. 79-63)Plans

Plans have been made to submit the complete working drawings to the HHFA for approval on October 4, 1965, as required under the Higher Education Facilities Act. The HHFA has approved the bid opening date of November 16, 1965, which is the earliest date on which bids could be taken. The next meeting of the Board of Directors is December 11, 1965.

Would some arrangement be acceptable to the Board of Directors whereby bids could be taken on November 16, 1965? If so, how could the contract award be made? Would it be necessary to hold the award until December 11, 1965? It would be helpful to proceed as rapidly as possible.

3084. Dormitory ExpansionA. Off-Campus Housing Projects1. Applications

Formal applications have been received from the following groups:

University Housing Construction, Ltd., Omaha, Nebraska, and Glenview, Illinois--850 spaces, September, 1966; south side of block east of College on 19th Street.

University Dormitory Development, Inc., Chicago, Illinois, 700 plus, 1967; seeking site on south side of block to the west of College on 19th Street.

Bob Robinson, Lubbock--850 spaces, 1967; old Tower Theater site.

Some additional information is desirable, and Mr. Taylor is in the process of obtaining it. The additional information probably will be available next week, and a recommendation will be made at that time.

2. Zoning

Mr. Taylor reported that University Housing Construction, Ltd., and Bob Robinson have applied to the City for zoning. University Dormitory Development, Inc., plans to file at a later date.

It will be some time before the zoning becomes official.

3. Board Approval

When the Board of Directors approved off-campus men's housing, it started with a request for approval on September 1, 1966. It is not entirely clear if the Board planned for the approval to run past 1966, and there should be clarification at the Board meeting.

B. On-Campus Housing

The selection of architects was not discussed at the meeting held on October 1, 1965, with the housing staff members.

The CPC discussed whether or not the consulting architect should be involved with the planning in the early stages, as there is some relationship to other projects. If so, the dormitory project could influence the selection of a consulting architect.

It was agreed to continue the study at the meeting next Tuesday.

3085. Library (CPC No. 12-58)Completion of South Basement and Third Floor

The Texas Commission on Higher Education approved the request of Texas Tech for \$78,093 for matching funds under the Higher Education Facilities Act on August 31, 1965. The total estimated cost of the project is \$234,278. Official approval from Washington is yet to be received.

Mr. Barrick said that he would request a time schedule from the architects.

3086. Other ItemsA. Paving at Stadium (Athletics)

The City is in the process of erecting control lights at the intersection of Boston and 4th Street at the present time, and the solution promises to be very good.

Mr. Urbanovsky reported that the Highway Department has not approved the plans which the College would like to use.

B. Concessions (Athletics)

Apparently, the installation is complete and acceptable.

C. Practice Fields (Athletics)

Mr. Urbanovsky reported that the project was completed on September 15, 1965.

D. Traffic Light at Flint and 15th Street

The traffic light is apparently working satisfactorily.

E. Southwestern Public Service Company Easement

The agreement is in the process of final checking at the moment.

F. Slurry Seal for Parking Lots

Mr. Urbanovsky reported that the slurry seal was completed on September 9, 1965.

3087. ParkingDoak Hall Request

Plans and specifications are complete, but work is to be delayed until November 15, 1965, or later in order not to interfere with the heavy business of the Bookstore prior to that time.

3088. Student Union

A copy of the recommendation from Dean Allen and Mr. Longley is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 583, page 1767)

It was agreed that the Union expansion should be part of the overall program and handled as such, if possible. It, too, is inter-related with other projects.

3089. Texas Tech Press Addition

It seems essential that additional space be made available to the Press, but it, too, should be part of the overall study as it will affect further physical plant expansion.

3090. Wage Scale

The wage scale is very difficult to determine, and additional work is necessary.

3091. West Hall Renovation

The project was complete in time for occupancy on September 13, 1965, when the residence halls opened. Only a few items remained to be done, and these were necessary due to the delay of delivery of materials.

3091. West Hall Renovation (continued)

Payment has been made to date to Mr. Padgett in the amount of \$47,932.49, and Mr. Downing's cost amounted to \$4,673.56, a total of \$52,606.05.

M. L. Pennington
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

Campus Planning Committee
 October 2, 1965
 Attachment No. 580
 Item 3081A

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
 Lubbock, Texas

Office of the President

September 24, 1965

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

Dear Mr. Pennington:

To develop a priority list of needed buildings may I propose the following for consideration of the Campus Planning Committee which, if approved, could be included in the report of the Campus Planning Committee to the Building Committee of the Board for such action as that Committee and the Board may take.

1. Prior commitments demand primary consideration to a new Museum Building and one for a School of Law.
2. Needs of the college indicate priorities as given below, though it is recognized that this must be a flexible order.

Business Administration
 Sciences: Biology and perhaps Chemistry
 if the N.S.F. grant is denied
 Music
 Engineering: Architecture and Civil
 Engineering
 Home Economics: Home Management
 Agriculture: Greenhouses, Farm Buildings,
 Plant Science
 Library

3. A third order is less clear but could include:

Additional classroom and office
 Administration
 Others as needs develop.

The determination of the type and kind of buildings or addition to present buildings, as well as the best possible use of the present Museum, would be worked out by the Campus Planning Committee with the advice of a consulting architect and in consultation with the Schools and Departments involved.

Sincerely,

/s/R. C. Goodwin

R. C. Goodwin
 President

RCG:jk(b)
 cc: Dr. W. M. Pearce

Campus Planning Committee
October 2, 1965
Attachment No. 581
Item 3081A

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

Office of the President

September 24, 1965

Dr. H. C. Thomas
Department of Physics
Campus

Dear Dr. Thomas:

It is recognized that the needs of the Sciences rank high in any priority list. Should Amendment No. 1 be approved on November 2 I feel sure that considerable relief will be obtained.

I am forwarding your letter to Mr. Pennington for his information.

Sincerely,

/s/R. C. Goodwin

R. C. Goodwin
President

RCG:jk(b)
cc: Mr. M. L. Pennington

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

Department of Physics

September 23, 1965

Dr. R. C. Goodwin
President
Campus

Dear Dr. Goodwin:

Within the last few days, I have seen an article in some newspaper indicating that you would present a list of priorities, with respect to space needs, to the board at the next board meeting. I noticed that on T.V. you stated that if the pending bill concerning the ad valorem tax passed money for building would be available as of January 1, 1966.

I am sure it comes as no surprise to you to learn that the Physics Department needs more space. We have adjusted and readjusted space until we have no place to go. We believe our program has developed quite well, and we must maintain our momentum if we are to become what we should be. This year our undergraduate load has increased as, I am sure, have those of most of the other departments on the campus. However, the increase in our graduate enrollment is the most spectacular and also is indicative of our most pressing needs. We now have 26 graduate students. We want 35 next year and 45 the year after. This will require more staff and certainly more space.

I do not know how a priority list is made. Certainly, it must be difficult to prepare. I just wanted to be sure that we were being considered. Although our numbers may not be as large as some other departments, our ambition is to be a first rate department. I personally believe that we have started well and have an excellent chance to achieve distinction and soon! We can't do it without money and space.

I would think it would be wise if Biology, Geology, and Physics were to get together to make some suggestions concerning the division of space so that we would be prepared when money becomes available. For instance, if one department should get a building, which department should it be--and how should the vacated space be divided. If you have suggestions, I would appreciate hearing them.

Sincerely,

/s/H. C. Thomas

H. C. Thomas

HCT:ch(b)
cc: Dr. S. M. Kennedy

Campus Planning Committee
 October 2, 1965
 Attachment No. 582
 Item 3081B

H.B. No. 12, Fifty-Ninth Legislature

Special Provisions

Sec. 18 COLLEGE BUILDING FUNDS. There also is appropriated for use the allocations from the building funds created by Article VII, Sections 17 and 18, of the State Constitution, to the respective institutions and for the purposes specified therein, provided, however, that none of the monies in such funds may be obligated for the construction of college and university buildings until a summary of the proposed building program, which shall include character and location of buildings, the square feet, type of construction, estimated cost and estimated completion date of each proposed building, has been filed with the Legislative Budget Board.

Sec. 44 BUILDING CONSTRUCTION. Prior to the allocation, expenditure or encumbrance of any funds appropriated by this Act, including funds provided through Article VII, Sections 17 and 18, of the State Constitution, for individual building construction projects costing in excess of Twenty-five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000), other than classroom, library and laboratory building projects, the planned expenditure of such funds shall be approved by the Governor after seeking the advice of the Legislative Budget Board.

General Provisions

Sec. 49 ARCHITECTURAL FEES. Architectural fees paid from funds appropriated in this Act shall be governed by the following schedule and provisions:

g. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended for architectural fees without the advance written approval of the Governor after obtaining the advice of the Legislative Budget Board.

H.B. No. 1, Fifty-Ninth Legislature

Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System

Sec. 15. To assure efficient use of construction funds and the orderly development of physical plants to accommodate projected college student enrollments, the Board shall:

(7) Approve or disapprove all new construction and repair and rehabilitation of educational and general buildings and facilities at institutions of higher education financed from any source other than ad valorem tax receipts of the public junior colleges; provided (1) that the Board's consideration and determination shall be limited to the purpose for which such new or remodeled buildings shall be used and its gross dimensions to assure conformity with approved space utilization standards and the institution's approved programs and role and scope, (2) that such approval for new construction financed from other than appropriated funds shall be limited to projects the total cost of which is in excess of \$100,000, and (3) that such approval for major repair and rehabilitation of buildings and facilities shall be limited to projects the total cost of which is in excess of \$25,000; and provided further that such required approval or disapproval of the Board shall not apply to construction, repair or rehabilitation involving the use of Constitutional Funds which are authorized by Sections II, 17 or 18 of Article VII of the Constitution of Texas.

Sec. 2 (m) Educational and general buildings and facilities means buildings and facilities essential to or commonly associated with teaching, research or the preservation of knowledge. Excluded are auxiliary enterprise buildings and facilities, including but not limited to dormitories, cafeterias, student union buildings, stadiums and alumni centers.

Campus Planning Committee
October 2, 1965
Attachment No. 583
Item 3088

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

Office of Dean
of Student Life

August 31, 1965

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

Dear Mr. Pennington:

Herewith is recommendation for an addition to our Union. Unlike some college student unions, Texas Tech Union is very popular with our students and patronized well by them. Our increasing enrollment would indicate a disproportionate increase in the number of our students who will need regular food services; consequently our careful consideration for the acceptable provision of this service is an important student service.

Though the items of recommendation are, in a sense, listed in preferential order, the addition recommended actually holds together in its several parts, each supporting the others. You will be interested to remember that three were considerations in the earlier addition to the Union: an auditorium, a bowling alley, and additional meeting rooms. Economy forced us to reduce our investment at that time, and consequently the result was the elimination of these items.

The present addition is premised on the possibility of Tech Union's reaching as soon as possible a self-sustaining basis of operation. The additional income areas included here in our recommendation hasten its reaching a point that it can take care of its financial indebtedness.

Mr. Longley and I would like to discuss this recommendation with you at your earliest convenience.

Yours very truly,

/s/James G. Allen

James G. Allen
Dean of Student Life

JGA:cat(b)

(Identical letter and data sent to Dr. R. C. Goodwin)

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

Tech Union

August 31, 1965

Dean James G. Allen
Dean of Student Life
Tech Campus

Dear Dean Allen:

Following our discussions concerning the expansion of the facilities of the Union over the past several months I have brought together several recommendations along with supporting information for presentation to the College for consideration.

The projected increase in students on the campus within the next 24 months will actually decrease the available space in the Union per student to something less than 5 square feet. This is one half of what the national average is or what is recommended by the Association of College Unions. As noted in the enclosed information I have recommended an addition of approximately 32,000 square feet, less than the national average but adequate for our needs in the immediate future.

I personally feel that the proposed addition would be a financially sound investment due to the increase in revenue producing areas plus the increase in the number of students who pay a fee each term to use the building. Even at our present rate of growth the Union income after expenditures this year will be at the highest point since the building was opened. This total will be approximately \$65,000.00 for the year.

I would estimate that if the proposed addition could be completed within the next two years enough of our present bond issue would be paid off to make possible the refinancing of the addition plus the bond balance for a total of approximately \$1,000,000.00, which is about the total cost of the first addition fully equipped and furnished. I feel confident that with the projected increase in income in the Union plus the contribution from the Bookstore that the cost of the proposed addition plus the remaining bond issue could be handled satisfactorily.

Sincerely,

/s/N. H. Longley

N. H. Longley
Director

NHL:lm (b)

1. Expansion of the Snack Bar area--both seating and kitchen facilities. Create a double serving line, one for drinks only, one for drinks and food. Seating area should be increased to 600.

The Union Snack Bar, designed to seat approximately 285 people, is often crowded with as many as four or five hundred students and staff at peak periods or during special events. Even after the addition of the new Cafeteria and Faculty Club, the Snack Bar has had a near-phenomenal growth, averaging 59,000 customers a month for the spring and fall semesters of this year. This is an increase of 43,900 customers over the same period in 1963-64. The total customer count in the Snack Bar this year, including summer has approached the 650,000 level (with a gross income of over \$128,000.00). However, it is estimated that the Snack Bar alone could cater to approximately one million customers a year if the seating capacity is increased to 600 with a corresponding increase in serving line and kitchen facilities. This projected increase in customers in the Snack Bar could be realized by attracting more students to the area rather than diminishing the other areas of food service, just as the Cafeteria and Faculty Club have not decreased business in the Snack Bar.

The existing seating area for the Snack Bar contains less than 5,000 square feet, and the service counter and kitchen are too small, and as a result, badly arranged and inadequately equipped to render multiple services of fountain drinks, short orders, and plate lunches with the consistency and dispatch the students expect. Only 4-6 persons per minute are being served in the line now, which is less than half what a well arranged dual line and counter could do. An addition of 7,000 square feet would be adequate to reach the desired seating capacity and service facilities expansion even though the total square feet including the proposed addition is considered near minimum, since this would be less than one square foot of space per student enrolled in either of the long terms this year.

The importance of a Snack Bar is indicated by the fact that it is almost always the social center of the Unions on college campuses today, and there is little doubt that at Tech the Snack Bar is the most popular "meeting place" for Texas Tech students during their leisure hours. This is particularly true for the many hundreds of students that live off campus. For these reasons an adequate Snack Bar is considered essential for the needs of an ever increasing student body such as is found on the Tech campus.

Snack Bar	<u>1962-63</u>	<u>1963-64</u>	<u>1964-65</u>
Customer Count	525,539	592,776	645,321

2. Construct an auditorium with seating for 600-650 with adequate storage and maintenance areas connected. Rear part of auditorium should be divisible for meeting room areas. Lobby area should be large enough for general lounging and program exhibits.

During the past year the Union has played host to 71 conferences, institutes and large meetings attended by approximately 27,500 people that could have used an auditorium if it were available in the building (see attached list). Along with this number of departmental or college functions the Union program could have used the same area 99 times this year with a projected use of over 160 times a year if the area were made available. In both instances there would certainly be other events attracted to the campus if a good auditorium were available, since the groups would have the advantage of comfortable seats, greater visibility, raised stage area, and better projection facilities. All of these advantages are becoming an indispensable part of conference and institutional programs as well as Union programs.

It would be a decided advantage for both the Union and the various groups to have a large room always set up and ready for an audience without the costly and time consuming job of setting and taking up folding chairs. A group could meet in the auditorium and adjourn to the ballroom for meal service

without waiting for the Union personnel to re-set tables or chairs or both. This is an important consideration for all conference planners when they consider using a local facility, and an important consideration for the Union staff operation.

An auditorium with a 600-650 capacity is suggested since a number of the programs and conferences being held in the Union now are in the 200-600 range as shown on the attached listing. This intermediate capacity should help bridge the gap between the campus educational auditoriums that seat 150-350 and the Municipal Auditorium with a capacity of 3,000. As shown in the listing, even Tech's faculty meetings are now in the 600 seat range.

A multiple purpose auditorium for meetings, lectures, movies, concerts, stage shows, etc., in association with the Union structure would help the College form a total community center on the campus for the benefit of both the students and staff, and would further develop Tech's program of adult education, public relations, and service to the local area and state.

<u>SPONSOR</u>	<u>FUNCTION</u>	<u>TIME HELD</u>	<u>ESTIMATED ATTENDANCE NUMBER</u>
Texas Tech	Faculty Meeting	September 11	600-650
Texas Tech	Freshman Orientation	September 14	550-600
Texas Tech	Texas Tech & Lubbock Assn. for Childhood Educ.	September 14	350-400
School of Arts & Sciences	Arts & Science Freshman Counseling	September 15	350-400
Young Republicans	Organization Meeting	September 17	200
Education Department	Education Majors Orientation	September 21	300-350
AFROTC	Air Force ROTC	September 24	300-375
Marketing Department	Marketing Department Student Orientation	September 24	200
AFROTC	Angel Flight Orientation	September 25	250-300
Education Department	Education Majors Orientation	September 28	300-350
AFROTC	Orientation	October 1	350-375
Tech Dames	Style Show	October 6	200
Religious Interest Council	General Meeting	October 6	600
Young Republicans	General Meeting	October 7	200
English Department	Open Faculty Meeting	October 9	400
Accounting Department	Tax Institute	October 15 (2 days)	270
Young Republicans	General Meeting	October 16	550-600
Engineering Department	Atomic Energy Seminar	October 17	600
Government Department	YMCA	October 31	250
Freshman Class	Freshman Council	November 1	550-600
Young Republicans	Meeting	November 24	250-300
Tech Union	MUN Orientation	December 10	200
Clothing & Textile	Style Show	December 12	450-500
Agriculture Engineering	Products & Processing Conference	December 15	200
AFROTC	Commissioning	January 7	600
Texas Tech	Freshman Orientation	January 25	550-600
Student Council	General Meeting	January 29	350-400
Athletic Department	Coaches Association Meeting	January 30	300
AFROTC	Aerospace Presentation	February 3	475
Economics Department	International Trade Seminar	February 4	500-550
Agriculture Department	West Texas Water Conference	February 5	450-500
Agriculture Department	Agricultural Chemical Conference (2 days)	February 11	450-500
Student Life	International Student Program	February 14	300-350
Music Department	Concert	February 19	450-500
Economics Department	Business Conference	February 20	300
Agronomy Department	Grain Drying Conference	February 23 (2 days)	200
Tech Union	Model United Nations (3 days)	February 27	250-300
Marketing Department	Marketing Department	March 2	250
Journalism Department	Southwestern Journalism Congress	March 11 (3 days)	300
Biology Department	Pre-Med Day	March 13	200
Architecture Department	Lecture	March 15	250-300
AFROTC	Lecture	March 18	450-500
Home Economics Department	Area I FHA	March 19	200
Business Education Department	College Business Education Conference	March 20	200
AFROTC	Lecture	March 25	450-500
Music Department	Concert	April 13	400-450
Tech Union	Lecture	April 14	350-400
Agriculture Department	Agriculture Judging Contest	April 24	200-250

<u>SPONSOR</u>	<u>FUNCTION</u>	<u>TIME HELD</u>	<u>ESTIMATED ATTENDANCE NUMBER</u>
Music Department	Opera Theater	April 25	250-300
Agriculture Department	West Texas Water		
	Institute	April 26	475
Music Department	Concert	April 30	200
Student Council	Robert Penn Warren		
	Convocation	May 3	400-425
School of Agriculture	District 4-H Conference	May 8	500-550
Music Department	Concert	May 9	250-300
Music Department	Concert	May 10	200
Accounting Department	CPA Exams	May 12 (3 days)	200
AFROTC	Awards Ceremony	May 13	550-600
Texas Tech	Faculty Meeting	May 18	550-600
School of Home Economics	School Lunch Workshop	June 7 (5 days)	600-700
Music Department	Senior High Band Concert	June 18	250-300
Office of the Registrar	Freshman Registration	July 15	550-600
Office of the Registrar	Freshman Registration	July 19	550-600
Office of the Registrar	Freshman Registration	July 22	550-600
Music Department	Summer Music Camp	July 23	500-550
Music Department	Summer Cheerleader School		
	School	July 26 (5 days)	500
Office of the Registrar	Freshman Registration	July 26	550-600
Office of the Registrar	Freshman Registration	July 29	550-600
Office of the Registrar	Freshman Registration	August 2	550-600
Office of the Registrar	Freshman Registration	August 5	550-600
Office of the Registrar	Freshman Registration	August 9	550-600
Journalism	Publication Workshop	August 10 (2 days)	450

PROJECTED USE OF AN AUDITORIUM BY UNION PROGRAM

	<u>1964-65</u>	<u>PROJECTED</u>
Movies	62	78
Lectures	25	30
Special Events	4	6
Model United Nations	3	3
Talent Shows and Hootenannies	5	10
Style Shows		2
Town Meeting-Administration and Students		16
Jazz Concerts		6
Union Combined Committee Meetings		8
Musical Programs (Student and Faculty)		8
		<hr/>
TOTAL	<u>99</u>	<u>167</u>

3. Add a Faculty Club food serving area to the existing facilities, perhaps a separate area to the south.

The Union served noon meals to over 12,500 members and their guests in the Club during the two long terms this year, which was an increase of approximately 1,000 over the same period last year. With an adequate serving area it is not inconceivable to project a 100% increase in the total number of people served meals since the Club is one of the most attractive areas for members and their guests to get together on the campus.

Several suggestions have been made in the past two years on ways to eliminate the cafeteria serving line in the Faculty Club, but no adequate solution has been reached and the problem is becoming worse each year with the increase in customers. The original design of the Club dealt with the problem of limited food service in the area and not complete meals such as are being served each noon, Monday through Friday. Table service was tried at one point, but this proved too slow and too expensive both for the Club members and the Union. The members approve of the lower prices brought about by the cafeteria line arrangement but are critical of the slow line and small space provided for the serving area.

If the cafeteria service is to be continued in the Club, it should be taken out of the small kitchen area and moved to an expanded area as an addition to the Club. This could be done by building a small unit on the south side of the Club at the west end. This area should contain a small but complete cafeteria serving line that could be used as an area for self-service coffee during the day or closed off as necessary. The addition of such an area would allow the seating capacity of the Club to remain the same and allow the present small kitchen to serve as a work area for functions held in the Club during the evenings.

	<u>1963-64</u> (First Full Year of Operation)	<u>1964-65</u>
Customer Count*	12,966	14,033
Income*	\$10,642.00	\$10,855.00

*Meal Service Only

4. Construct new meeting rooms over the existing cafeteria and kitchen and Faculty Club on the second floor of the Union.

The seven (7) meeting rooms in the Union were used 1,724 times this past year by 61,528 people. In a typical peak month of Union operation (October, 1964) 246 meetings, luncheons or socials attended by 5,482 people were held in the 7 meeting rooms. This means that each meeting room was used approximately two times each day based on a 5-day week or 20 use days a month per room. Continual use of the available meeting rooms during the two long terms, such as described above, combined with a projected increase in requests to use the rooms, will certainly mean that the Union will have to turn down many requests for meeting space within the next two years.

Through good planning, the college architect made sure that the area above the cafeteria and kitchen and Faculty Club was constructed in such a way as to provide an area for future expansion. This area is marked on the 1960 building plans as "future second floor" and has sufficient square footage to allow construction of 4 or 5 meeting rooms, along with adequate hall and storage space.

Room size priority shows a need first for one room that will seat 150 and 3 or 4 rooms in the 30 to 40 seat range. The 150 seat room is the most acute need since the Ballroom and Coronado room are too large for a group of this size and the existing meeting rooms are too small. The additional meeting rooms in the 30 to 40 seat range are needed also since this size is requested more often by organized groups on campus than any other size.

This size room is also highly desirable for the many small luncheon groups that meet in the Union each year.

An increase in the total number of meeting rooms in the Union from 7 to 11 or 12 would be of particular advantage in accommodating the various groups using the rooms during the peak noon and evening periods and would also offer greater utilization of the space by conference and institute groups who normally hold their meetings mornings and early afternoons.

	<u>1963-64</u>	<u>1964-65</u>
No. of meetings or luncheons	1,811	1,724*
Attendance	54,096	61,528

*The increase in attendance plus the rooms being used for longer periods apparently contributed to the slight decrease in the number of meetings.

5. Construct an area for a 10-12 lane bowling area below the addition to the Snack Bar area. Allow space for spectator seating and mechanical storage.

In the past few years, Association of College Unions surveys have shown that bowling on college campuses is one form of recreation most popular with both men and women, and will frequently encourage students to return to the campus evenings and weekends. It can be an important revenue producer for the Union operation also, if the various educational and recreational areas of the campus can be incorporated in sharing the facility.

An adequate bowling facility in the Union could tie in with women's physical education classes, men's and women's intramural leagues, student married couples league, and the faculty-staff bowling league. This would assure business and occupation of the alleys during an ample part of the morning as well as evening. With approximately 288 bowlers from women's physical education classes, 24 bowlers from women's intramural league, the women's physical education tournament, 120 bowlers from men's intramural league, 32 bowlers from student married couples league, and 24 bowlers from the faculty-staff league, 3 to 4 nights of solid league play (2 leagues per night) would be assured. Such league play, plus instruction, would seem sufficient to justify a sizable alley installation. Ten to twelve alleys are recommended to accommodate standard league play (8 alleys) with two or four alleys for open play. No reference is made to the men's physical education department since they have 15 sections of bowling that total 450 men and will necessarily need more than one bowling area to conduct classes.

The relation of bowling to intercollegiate athletics is demonstrated by the fact that the Union sent a five-man team to the Region 12 Association of College Unions Tournament for the past four years. This year Tech's bowling team won first place in men's team doubles and first and second in men's singles. In 1962 and 1965, the Union sent students to the National Intercollegiate Championship Tournaments who have won several trophies that brought recognition to the Union and College.

6. Develop a court area in the open space in the center of the Union complex.

The open area in the center of the proposed Union complex could provide Tech with a unique "outdoor living room" on the campus. By incorporating the desired architectural and landscape features, the area could be used many months of the year for an overflow seating area, for dances, concerts, and perhaps even some types of dining. This area could also offer a spectacular view from most of the glass enclosed area on the first floor of the Union.

7. Additional Possibility.

Provide space in the proposed Snack Bar addition for the campus post office with a separate entrance that could be used when the Union was closed. Locating the post office in such an area would allow the College to gain needed space in the Administration Building and allow the Union to produce revenue through miscellaneous sales to the individuals going to and from the post office area.

SQUARE FEET COMPARISON OF REVENUE PRODUCING AREA

AND NONREVENUE PRODUCING AREA IN THE PROPOSED UNION ADDITION

REVENUE PRODUCING AREA IN THE PROPOSED UNION ADDITION (APPROXIMATE)

1. ADDITION TO THE SNACK BAR AND KITCHEN-----	7,000 sq. ft.	
2. 1/4 OF THE AUDITORIUM-----	3,000 sq. ft.	
3. FACULTY CLUB SERVING AREA-----	500 sq. ft.	
4. BOWLING AREA-----	7,500 sq. ft.	
	<u>18,000 sq. ft.</u>	
 TOTAL AREA IN PROPOSED ADDITION (APPROX.)-----	32,000 sq. ft.	
TOTAL REVENUE AREA-----	<u>18,000 sq. ft.</u>	56.25%
TOTAL NONREVENUE AREA IN PROPOSED ADDITION----	14,000 sq. ft.	43.75%
 TOTAL AREA IN PRESENT UNION-----	88,000 sq. ft.	
TOTAL REVENUE AREA-----	<u>30,400 sq. ft.</u>	34.54%
TOTAL NONREVENUE AREA-----	57,600 sq. ft.	65.46%
 COMBINED TOTAL FOR PRESENT BUILDING AND PROPOSED UNION ADDITION (APPROX.)-----	120,000 sq. ft.	
TOTAL REVENUE AREA-----	<u>48,400 sq. ft.</u>	40.33%
TOTAL NONREVENUE AREA-----	71,600 sq. ft.	59.67%

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 253

October 5, 1965

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 1:30 p.m. on October 5, 1965, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Others present were Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. O. R. Downing.

3092. Building Program - Future

A. Priority List

It is recommended that the following projects be placed on the priority list, although the listing is not intended to be by order of priority, nor is the time schedule recommended at this time.

1. Museum

The project has been approved by the Board of Directors and, in effect, the preliminary plans and specifications have been prepared and approved.

In order that the information may be of record, the present Museum is located at the northeast corner of the Circle and is the last remaining ideal site for a major educational building. The Board of Directors has approved a plan to duplicate the existing facilities at the corner of Fourth Street and Indiana Avenue in order to obtain the present site for other uses.

2. Law School

The School has been approved by the Board of Directors, Texas Commission on Higher Education, Legislature and Governor.

A dean should be on hand before the building is planned.

3. Business Administration Building

4. Science Building

Probably for Biology, but the recommendation is not specific until a determination has been made of the most efficient use of the space in the present Science Building and the funds available.

5. Music

New facilities, although determination should be made of the most efficient solution, as a new building or as a new addition. Ground usage for the needs in the area and location would be important considerations.

6. Architecture

Probably an addition.

7. Greenhouses

The present greenhouses will have to be moved, as they will be in the way of the Library expansion.

Additional greenhouse space is needed for Agronomy, Biology, Entomology, etc.

3092. Building Program - FutureA. Priority List (continued)8. Agricultural Plant Sciences9. Farm Buildings

There should be no change in the plans to move the horse facilities across the freeway.

10. Chemistry

Undergraduate facilities

11. Library12. Power Plant, Utilities, Roads, Walks, Etc.B. Others for Consideration1. Civil Engineering

It has been suggested that there are needs for additional testing space and hydrology.

2. Home Management

A new president may wish to have the use of the president's home, which is now being used for Home Management.

3. Home Economics

Additional classrooms, laboratories and offices.

4. Classroom and Office Building

Business Administration and the Foreign Languages and Mathematics Building will provide some relief for classrooms and faculty offices. The project needs more thought before recommendation is made.

5. Administration Building

It should be considered in the future. The needs for classrooms and offices in the Administration Building should be weighed, as the space can become too valuable to be used for administrative purposes. The location of the new Administration Building would be affected by the convenience of those who must transact business at the administrative offices.

C. Architects

A great amount of discussion ensued on possible procedures in the use of architects. The decision is both difficult and important.

It was agreed that the ideal system would be to have a director of facilities, consulting architect, project architect, project committees, etc.

However, the time schedule will affect the system used. If Amendment I passes on November 2, 1965, substantial funds will be available, and need indicates that much speed in construction would be necessary.

Prudence dictates that much care and deliberation be exercised in order to realize the maximum use of the funds available.

3092. Building Program - FutureC. Architects (continued)

A new element has entered the picture, in that most educational and general facilities are now eligible for matching funds through the Higher Education Facilities Act. A recent change has been made to greatly broaden the coverage.

It is reported that \$7 million is now available for matching funds and applications must be filed with the Coordinating Board by January 1, 1966. The next available funds are due July 1, 1966, and it is reported that approximately \$18 million will be available for the state of Texas. After that, funds probably will become available once each year and the indicated amount is \$18 million.

Thought should be given to acquiring matching funds for all projects possible. If the policy should be adopted, the acquisition of matching funds would determine the time schedule and would affect the policy procedures on the use of architects, etc.

If projects are to be implemented as rapidly as possible, no consulting firm could do the necessary work fast enough, and the use of project architects without consulting architects would seem to be indicated. A director of facilities, or a firm acting as such, would seem to be essential to aid the CPC with the necessary planning and implementation.

If matching funds were to be a specific criterion, the first projects probably should be let to project architects without the services of a consulting architect. However, consulting architects could be used in later projects.

For example, if the Business Administration Building should be first on the priority list (and it would seem to offer the most general relief at the moment), the best project architects available could be engaged to handle it, if it would be possible to have an application ready for matching funds on January 1, 1966. As preliminary plans and specifications are necessary for an application, it would be essential to have the architects begin work with the least possible delay. It would be necessary to decide how the College would handle the project architects.

Again, if matching funds are to be a criterion, other projects would be established, consulting architects engaged, and later project architects. A strict order of priority would have to be determined, in order for the requests for matching funds to be submitted. The projects could be implemented only as matching funds are approved.

This system would provide maximum funds for construction and more time for planning. It would not be the fastest system, but it could provide the best possible results over the next several years.

Business Administration would seem to be a good project for quick development and yet provide much relief for classrooms and faculty offices. It would not be as complex, for instance, as a Science Building. If it seemed wise, it probably would be possible to prepare other applications for projects on the priority list by the same procedure by January 1, 1966.

3093. Chemical Research Building (CPC No. 87-64)

Mr. Barrick reported that he has been in touch with the project architects. Mr. Bob White will be in Lubbock and have material available for presentation to the Board of Directors for preliminary plans and specifications.

3094. Classroom-Office Building (New) (Foreign Languages-Mathematics)
(CPC No. 79-63)

Two sets of the final plans and specifications are now en route to the College for checking. One set will be sent to Mr. Downing for checking by him and his staff for the mechanical portion, and Mr. Urbanovsky and Mr. Barrick will check the other.

Mr. Taylor agreed to serve as coordinator to add the other documents and to submit the plans to HHFA for approval by Saturday of this week.

The presentation to the HHFA will be on October 11, 1965, instead of October 4, 1965, as thought. The HHFA requires two weeks as the minimum for checking.

It was agreed to request approval of the HHFA and the Board of Directors for a bid opening on Thursday, December 2, 1965. Mr. Barrick will notify the architects.

It was agreed that the required ads will be run as soon as the HHFA approves the plans and specifications. The project architects are to prepare the copy and Mr. Taylor will see that the ads are properly run.

The recommendation for a contract award will be made to the Board of Directors at the meeting on December 11, 1965.

3095. Dormitory Expansion

A. Off-Campus Projects

A fourth group is in the process of preparing plans and specifications for housing 900 plus men, adjacent to the southwest corner of the College property, the facilities to be completed by September 1, 1966. No request has been made to the College nor has any notice been given to the College of the intent of the group. The representatives reported that an application is being prepared with haste. Some doubts were expressed that the application should be accepted at this late date if there is to be order in the construction of off-campus housing and the procedures stipulated by the Board of Directors followed. More information will be available later.

As some additional information has been requested from the three firms in the picture, it was agreed to delay a recommendation to the Board until later in the week.

B. On-Campus Housing

A new residence hall for women is essential. It, too, could be handled by project architects, with a decision to be made on the handling at college level. Also, it must move very rapidly. Probably a single firm of architects cannot feasibly serve as consulting architects for both projects with the necessary speed. However, it would not be impossible to do so, and further thought would seem to be indicated.

3096. Library (CPC No. 12-58)

Completion of South Basement and Third Floor

The architects have been waiting for word from the College to begin the working drawings and bidding documents. As the space is to be completed in keeping with the original plans for the Library, it was agreed to instruct the architects to begin the preparation of working drawings and bidding documents, and to tie the bid opening to that for the Foreign Languages and Mathematics Building, if possible.

3096. Library (CPC No. 12-58)Completion of South Basement and Third Floor (continued)

HHFA approval is necessary before the project can be submitted for bids, and Mr. Taylor is to check with the HHFA to see if it would be possible to make arrangements to time the bid opening with that of the Foreign Languages and Mathematics Building. While it would be advisable, it would be possible to start the Library construction at a later date and run into no complications of supervision.

M. L. Pennington
Chairman

The meeting recessed at 5 p.m., to reconvene at 10:30 a.m. on October 6, 1965.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 254

October 6, 1965

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 10:30 a.m. on October 6, 1965, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Others present were Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. O. R. Downing.

3097. Building Program - Future

A. Matching Funds

The Chairman reported that he had called Mr. Ray Fowler, who handles the Higher Education Facilities Act for the Coordinating Board, since the last meeting. The information received is as follows:

First closing date is January 1, 1966. Approximately \$7 million is available to the senior colleges for matching funds under the Higher Education Facilities Act, plus the possible transfer of surplus from other states. The Commissioner can allocate as he sees fit. The chances are pretty good that from \$50 million to \$100 million could be available for reallocation, depending on the demand of various states. The demand would be based on unfilled requests, and Mr. Fowler said that Texas probably will be in fourth place for reallocation of additional funds from other states.

Second closing date is July 1, 1966. Texas' share is expected to be \$18 million each year from here on, plus possible reallocation of funds from other states late in the Federal fiscal year.

B. Priority List

The priority list, as recommended the preceding day, was reviewed.

Policy Recommendations

- a. As a basis for implementation, it was agreed that the programs for the various projects should be developed before the budget is set.
- b. After much discussion, and as a major policy recommendation, the CPC voted to recommend that the priority list be implemented in such a manner that the maximum funds available from the Higher Education Facilities Act may be realized.
- c. Since funds will be available for matching on projects for which applications are filed with the Coordinating Board by January 1, 1966, it was agreed to recommend that Texas Tech apply for as many projects as possible at that time.

C. Project Recommendations

1. Business Administration

As the project for Business Administration would be the easiest and fastest program to develop and would provide the greatest overall college relief at the undergraduate level, it was agreed to assume that Amendment I would pass on November 2, 1965, and recommend that an application be filed with the Coordinating Board under the Higher Education Facilities Act for matching funds on a \$1 to \$2 basis by January 1, 1966, if at all possible.

3097. Building Program - FutureC. Project Recommendations1. Business Administration (continued)

To file the application, it would be necessary to commission architects for the project without delaying.

Page, Southerland and Page of Austin is an excellent firm, with a large capable staff and extensive experience in college work. The firm recently constructed the new Business Administration and Economics Building at The University of Texas for \$3,469,000.

It was agreed to recommend that the firm be selected for the project at a fee of 6 percent, with the College to furnish a clerk of the works if the services of one are deemed advisable. The recommendation is based on the contingency that the firm can get the necessary plans prepared in time to file an application with the Coordinating Board for matching funds by January 1, 1966.

It was agreed that there would be no advantage for the "hurry up" project to have the services of a consulting architect.

2. Science Building

The next greatest overall college need seems to be a science building which probably could help all of the sciences on campus.

Pierce and Pierce of Houston is another large, excellent firm, experienced in science buildings with a reputation for quality work.

It was agreed to recommend that Pierce and Pierce of Houston be commissioned for the project at a fee of 6 percent, with the College to furnish a clerk of the works if the services of one are deemed advisable, if the firm can provide the required information to file an application by January 1, 1966, for matching funds under the Higher Education Facilities Act.

(The CPC agreed that the two projects, to be handled immediately, would comprise an ambitious program and a difficult schedule which could be handled only by the greatest cooperation by all involved.

It may not be possible to move rapidly enough but the members of the CPC feel that the results would be so important that the attempt should be made. Also, the members feel that the recommended architects can provide the necessary information if it is possible for it to be done.)

(The meeting recessed at 12:30 p.m. and reconvened at 4 p.m.)

3. Power House, Utilities, Etc.

It was agreed that a study of the needs should be made by a professional engineering firm and that the CPC will attempt to recommend a firm to the Board of Directors at the meeting on December 11, 1965. The study would cover heat, chilled water, electricity, etc.

4. Other Architectural Services

It was agreed that if the recommendations for the two projects are approved, the proposed system involving consulting architects' services could be studied further and adopted later.

3098. Dormitory ExpansionA. On-Campus Housing

It was agreed to recommend that a project be started in keeping with the following:

Basic concept:	Begin a complex.
Capacity:	First unit, spaces for 900 to 1100 women plus the commons area.
Site:	West of Flint with specific location to be determined later after further study with project architects.
Architects:	Associated Architects and Engineers of Lubbock, subject to an advance recommendation of engineers to be used.
Fee:	6 percent, with the College to furnish services of a clerk of the works, if one is seemed essential.
Schedule:	Commission architects on October 9, 1965, and move rapidly, with occupancy scheduled for September, 1967.
Estimated Cost:	To be determined by the program study, but it probably will cost \$3½ million to \$4 million.
Source of Funds:	HHFA, interest rate now 3 percent.

B. Off-Campus HousingFirms

1. U. S. (Bob) Robinson, Lubbock; 850 spaces, 1967, old Tower Theater site. According to information received, Mr. Robinson is not ready to file an official request with the College for the construction and operation of the off-campus housing for men students.
2. University Housing Construction, Ltd., Omaha, Nebraska, and Glenview, Illinois; 850 spaces, September, 1966, south side of block east of College on 19th Street. The reports on Mr. Seldin, who would finance and operate the project, are very good. It was agreed to recommend that the request from the firm be accepted subject to compliance with city and college regulations.
3. University Dormitory Development, Inc., Chicago, Illinois; 700 plus, September, 1967, seeking site on south side of block to the west of College on 19th Street. The firm has applied to the College for permission to construct the facilities, but a bit of additional information is desired and has been requested. The firm has not filed a request with the City as yet. It was agreed that the CPC was not ready to recommend approval, and Mr. Taylor is to call the firm tomorrow to check on the status.
4. O'Meara-Chandler Corporation, 4140 Southwest Freeway, Houston, Texas; 968 spaces, eventually 4,000 students; 23-acre tract at the intersection of Brownfield Highway and extension of 19th Street adjoining the Santa Fe tracks, Seagraves branch. Number of stories, four (three winged); construction, Class A, poured concrete slab and frame brick veneer, concrete block, metal lath and plaster; dining room seating 630 students; lounge; public and recreational facilities, including enclosed swimming pool; September, 1966. The operating procedure will follow that recommended by the Housing Office of Texas Tech, relative to staffing and regulations. Permission would be requested for the staff to meet with the college housing staff and that the college housing contract be adapted for their use.

3098. Dormitory ExpansionB. Off-Campus HousingFirms (continued)

The firm has built and is operating housing in eight universities and colleges in Texas, California, Virginia and Georgia. Under construction at the present time are housing units at four universities and colleges in Colorado, Florida and California. Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company of Milwaukee would provide stable financing.

The firm was under the impression that a request was not to be made to the College until the plans had been developed. A request has been made to the City for zoning approval. The firm is in position to start construction as soon as permission is received from the College and from the City.

In past talks, the firm has said that a bus shuttle service would be operated from the facilities to the campus proper, but no mention is made in the information received in the past day or so. Neither is any information on parking spaces specifically set forth, although statements have been made that there would be more parking than the two-for-one ratio required. Also, there is no statement that the firm would comply with the regulations prescribed by the Board of Directors.

After consideration, it was agreed not to make a recommendation until more information is available.

3099. Library (CPC No. 12-58)Completion of South Basement and Third Floor

Mr. Taylor reported that he called Mr. Berrey of the HHFA in Fort Worth, who told him it would be necessary to have separate wage rates for the project and that it would be possible to request them without waiting for a project number.

Also, Mr. Berrey said that possibly it could be arranged for the Library additions to be bid at the same time as the Foreign Languages and Mathematics Building.

M. L. Pennington
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Row
Ralph
Civil
Jed
K
FM
TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

AGENDA FOR THE JOINT MEETING
OF THE CAMPUS AND BUILDING COMMITTEE AND CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE
TO BE HELD AT 4 P.M. IN THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OCTOBER 8, 1965

3100. Building Program - Future

A. Priority List

OK
Although the listing is not intended to be by order of priority, nor is the time schedule recommended at this time, it is recommended that the following projects be placed on the priority list:

1. Museum
 2. Law School
 3. Business Administration Building
 4. Science Building
 5. Music Facilities
 6. Architecture Facilities
 7. Greenhouse
 8. Agricultural Plant Sciences Facilities
 9. Farm Facilities
Horse Facilities
- OK
10/9/65

3100. Building Program - FutureA. Priority List (continued)10. ChemistryUndergraduate Facilities11. Library12. Power Plant, Utilities, Roads, Walks, Etc.B. Policy Recommendations *OK*

1. The programs for the various projects be developed before the budget is finally set. *OK*
2. The priority list be implemented in such a manner that the maximum funds available from the Higher Education Facilities Act be realized.

C. Project Recommendations *begin immediate implementation* *OK*1. Business Administration Building

OK Architects - *Page, Sutherland & Page - Austin*

2. Science Building

OK Architects - *Pierce & Pierce - Houston*

3101. Chemistry Research Building (CPC No. 87-64) *OK*

OK Consider approval of preliminary plans and specifications.

authorizing archis to begin final plans & specs.

3102. Dormitory ExpansionA. Off-Campus HousingApproval of Groupsa. Mr. U. S. (Bob) Robinson, Lubbock

OK The Zoning Board recommended approval of the Tower Theater site on October 7, 1965. However, Mr. Robinson has made no request to the College for approval of off-campus housing, and it is recommended that he be passed over. OK

b. University Housing Construction, Ltd., Omaha, Nebraska, and Glenview, Illinois; 850 spaces, September, 1966, OK
south side of block east of College on 19th Street.

OK On October 7, 1965, the Zoning Board delayed action on the request, pending further study on traffic conditions in the area.

Consider recommendation of the CPC that the application for off-campus housing be accepted, subject to compliance with City and College regulations.

c. University Dormitory Development, Inc., Chicago, Illinois; 700 plus, September, 1967, seeking site on south side of OK
block to the west of College on 19th Street.

OK The group has not asked for zoning approval as yet.

Consider recommendation of the CPC to accept the request of the group to construct off-campus housing, ~~provided the Board included additional off-campus housing for men after 1966.~~

d. O'Meara-Chandler Corporation, 4140 Southwest Freeway, Houston, Texas; 968 spaces (eventually 4,000 students, but there is no request for any beyond 968), 23-acre tract at the intersection of Brownfield Highway and extension of 19th Street, September, 1966. OK

OK The City Zoning Board recommended the zoning change at the meeting on October 7, 1965.

Consider the recommendation of the CPC that the request of the firm be accepted.

3102. Dormitory Expansion (continued)

OK

OK

B. On-Campus Housing

Consider recommendation of the CPC that a complex be started to the west of Flint, with the first unit to house between 900 and 1100 women, plus the commons area.

Schmidt & Stiles, Roberts &
Messersmith -
Lile -

If the project is approved, permission is requested to file an application for a loan from the HHFA.

Architects

(Wilmer)
Parking Traffic
Traffic & Security Comm.
Below at Sec. meeting -
- two days in advance study to Board
time ahead for study to Board
enough to avoid military wave
appearance

Law School

OK

Sept. 1966 start? -

Adm. Sec. so directed -
to get clear, etc -

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 255 October 8, 1965

A meeting of the Campus and Building Committee of the Board of Directors and the Campus Planning Committee was held at 4 p.m. on October 8, 1965, in the Office of the President.

Members of the Building Committee present were Mr. Wilmer Smith, Chairman, Mr. Herbert Allen and Mr. Harold Hinn. Other members of the Board of Directors in attendance were Chairman R. Wright Armstrong, Mr. Alvin R. Allison, Mr. Manuel DeBusk, Mr. Roy Furr, Sr., and Mr. J. Edd McLaughlin.

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

In order that the results of the meeting of the Board of Directors may be included in the Campus Planning Committee Minutes for record purposes, the action taken by the Board at the meeting on October 9, 1965, will follow that of the Campus and Building Committee for each item.

3100. Building Program - Future

A. Priority List

Approved the following projects to be placed on the priority list, although listing is not intended to be by order of priority, nor is the time schedule recommended at this time.

1. Museum
2. Law School
3. Business Administration Building
4. Science Building
5. Music Facilities
6. Architecture Facilities
7. Greenhouses
8. Agricultural Plant Sciences Facilities
9. Farm Facilities
Horse Facilities
10. Chemistry
Undergraduate Facilities
11. Library
12. Power Plant, Utilities, Roads, Walks, Etc.

B. Policy Procedures

Approved the following:

1. The programs for the various projects be developed before the budget is finally set.

3100. Building Program - FutureB. Policy Procedures (continued)

2. The priority list be implemented in such a manner that the maximum funds available from the Higher Education Facilities Act be realized.

C. Projects1. Business Administration Building

Approved the Business Administration Building, with immediate steps to be taken for its implementation.

Approved the commissioning of Page-Southerland and Page of Austin as the architects at a fee of 6 percent, and stipulated that a request for matching funds under the Higher Education Facilities Act be filed with the Coordinating Board by January 1, 1966.

2. Science Building

Approved the Science Building, with immediate steps to be taken for its implementation.

Approved the commissioning of Pierce & Pierce of Houston as architects at a fee of 6 percent, and stipulated that a request for matching funds under the Higher Education Facilities Act be filed with the Coordinating Board by January 1, 1966.

(The Board of Directors approved.)

3101. Chemistry Research Building (CPC No. 87-64)

Approved preliminary plans and specifications presented by Mr. Bob White of Pitts, Mebane, Phelps & White, the project architects, and authorized the architects to begin the preparation of working drawings.

(The Board of Directors approved.)

3102. Dormitory ExpansionA. Off-Campus HousingApproval of Groups

- a. Mr. U. S. (Bob) Robinson, Lubbock; 850 spaces; 1966;
old Tower Theater site.

The Zoning Board recommended approval of the project on October 7, 1965, but Mr. Robinson has made no request to the College for approval of off-campus housing.

Approved the recommendation of the Campus Planning Committee that he be passed over.

- b. University Housing Construction, Ltd.; Omaha, Nebraska,
and Glenview, Illinois; 850 spaces; September, 1966;
south side of block east of College on 19th Street.

On October 7, 1965, the Zoning Board delayed action on the request, pending further study on traffic conditions in the area.

Approved the recommendation of the CPC that the application for off-campus housing be accepted, subject to compliance with City and College regulations.

3102. Dormitory ExpansionA. Off-Campus HousingApproval of Groups (continued)

- c. University Dormitory Development, Inc.; Chicago, Illinois; 700 plus; September, 1967; seeking site on south side of block to the west of College on 19th Street.

Approved the recommendation of the CPC to accept the request to construct off-campus housing subject to compliance with City and College regulations.

- d. O'Meara-Chandler Corporation, 4140 Southwest Freeway, Houston, Texas; 968 spaces (eventually 4,000 students, but there is no request for any beyond 968); 23-acre tract at the intersection of Brownfield Highway and extension of 19th Street; September, 1966.

The City Zoning Board recommended the zoning change at the meeting on October 7, 1965.

Approved the recommendation of the CPC that the request be accepted, subject to compliance with City and College regulations.

B. On-Campus Housing

Approved the following:

Basic concept:	Begin a complex.
Capacity:	First unit, spaces for 900 to 1100 women, plus the commons area.
Site:	West of Flint with specific location to be determined later after further study with project architects.
Architects:	Schmidt & Stiles, Roberts & Messersmith of Lubbock, subject to an advance recommendation of engineers to be used.
Fee:	6 percent, with the College to furnish services of a clerk of the works, if one seems essential.
Schedule:	Occupancy scheduled for September, 1967.
Source of Funds:	HHFA, interest rate now 3 percent; application to be filed as soon as feasible.

(The Board of Directors approved.)

M. L. Pennington
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes No. 256 October 12, 1965

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 5 p.m. on October 12, 1965, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Others present were Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. O. R. Downing.

3103. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)
(Page-Southerland & Page)

A. First Goal

1. It was agreed that all efforts should be pointed to filing an application under the Higher Education Facilities Act by January 1, 1966, with the Coordinating Board, for matching funds.
2. The entire early effort should be devoted to the steps necessary for the application. There will be time for the other required steps after that.
3. In general, the following information is needed for the application:
 - a. Floor plan
 - b. Square footage
 - c. Elevations
 - d. Movable equipment
 - e. Outline specifications
 - f. Cost estimates

B. Steps

1. Faculty Committee

a. Composition

The CPC agreed to think in terms of three members from the using department, two from the College but outside the department, and probably one from outside the College, if feasible.

It was agreed that the members should have a definite interest in the project and be able to meet often and at times on short notice and be willing to devote the necessary time, especially in the early stages, as it will be a very tight schedule.

b. Duties

Develop the program for the project by working with the project architects and the expeditor.

The needs should be developed by listing what the department requires in the way of space and facilities in the order of priority.

2. Procedures

The Faculty Committee should designate a chairman, with the responsibility to act, and to give answers when necessary.

It would be well to outline the mechanical procedures necessary to meet the January 1 deadline. It probably would be wise to start with the deadline and work backwards.

3103. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)
(Page-Southerland & Page)

B. Steps

2. Procedures (continued)

There should be a joint session with the CPC, the architects and the dean at a preliminary session to get under way.

3. Expediter

The CPC agreed to ask Miss Jerry Kirkwood to serve as expediter to assist the faculty committee, the architects and the CPC to proceed as rapidly as possible with the project to be her No. 1 priority. She probably will need to meet with all groups. Her chief function will be that of liaison to expedite the project by lending all possible aid and assistance. She is to report to the CPC.

4. Application Coordinator

The CPC agreed to request Mr. John G. Taylor, Business Manager, to assume the responsibility for putting the application together and to try to help stay on the schedule in the development of the application.

5. Mechanical Plans

The CPC agreed to ask Mr. O. R. Downing, Director of Building Maintenance and Utilities, to work with the architects on the design and development of the mechanical plans and specifications.

It will also be Mr. Downing's responsibility to check the plans.

6. Budget

The budget is to be determined after the program has been developed, which is considered to be ideal, but the process places even more responsibility on the faculty committee, the architects, the dean and the CPC to consider most carefully the needs and costs.

There should be provisions for reasonable future expansion and needs.

7. Time Schedule

It probably could be developed after the first meeting between the various groups. It is going to be a very tight schedule, and it will be vital to maintain it.

8. Compliance with State Regulations

It will be necessary to file the usual informational report with the Legislative Budget Board just as soon as the information is available.

It is assumed that there are no other state regulations applicable to the design of the project.

9. Project Architects (Page-Southerland & Page)

It was agreed that the Chairman would call Mr. Lewis Southerland, explain the CPC's thinking as shown above and obtain his suggestions on how to proceed in the most expeditious manner.

3103. Business Administration Building (CPC No. 98-65)
(Page-Southerland & Page)

9. Project Architects (Page-Southerland & Page) (continued)

(The call was made on October 13, 1965. Mr. Southerland said that Mr. Barrick had requested a letter from him outlining what he would like for the faculty committee to do and it had been mailed. He plans to come to the campus on Tuesday, October 19, 1965, and suggested that the College get together as much of the information outlined in his letter as possible.)

10. Financing

The project will be dependent on the passage of Amendment 1 on November 2, 1965.

3104. Science Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce)

First Goal

1. Type of Building

Which science will be housed in the project is of primary importance, and the decision should be based on the most efficient and economical use of the existing space in the present Science Building.

It would be possible to construct a building for a single department.

Semester Credit Hours (Dean Kennedy's figures)

	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Biology	12,903	14,321	2,228	18.4
Geosciences	4,309	5,509	1,200	27.8
Physics	4,202	4,582	380	9.04

There could be some problem in financing graduate facilities, if needed, under Title I as it provides only for undergraduate facilities. Possibly graduate facilities could be requested under another title if identifiable.

It was agreed to ask Dean Kennedy and his department heads to study and recommend which science is to be housed, with the reasons, by Thursday morning at 10 a.m.

2. Faculty Committee

a. Composition

It was agreed to start with the idea of three committee members from the department, two from outside of the department but from the College, and one probably from the outside. The other two faculty members could be from Agriculture, Home Economics, some phase of premed or some other part of the College.

It was agreed to check with Dean Kennedy for his recommendations.

The members should have a definite interest in the project and be able to meet often, and at times on short notice, and be willing to devote the necessary time, especially in the early stages as it will be an extremely tight schedule.

3104. Science Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce)First Goal2. Faculty Committee (continued)b. Duties

To develop a program for the project, working with the project architects and the expeditor.

Develop the needs by listing what the department requires in the way of space and facilities in the order of priority.

c. Procedures

The faculty committee should designate a chairman, with the responsibility to act, and to give answers when necessary.

It would be well to outline the mechanical procedures necessary to meet the January 1 deadline. It probably would be wise to start with the deadline and work backwards.

There should be a joint session with the CPC, the architects and the dean at a preliminary session to get under way.

3. Expeditor

The CPC agreed to ask Mr. Bill Felty to serve as the expeditor to assist the faculty committee, the architects and the CPC and to proceed as rapidly as possible, with the project to be his No. 1 priority. He probably will need to meet with all groups. His chief function will be that of liaison to expedite the project by lending all possible aid and assistance. He is to report to the CPC.

4. Application Coordinator

The CPC agreed to request Mr. John G. Taylor, Business Manager, to assume the responsibility for putting the application together and to try to help stay on the schedule in the development of the application.

5. Mechanical Plans

The CPC agreed to request Mr. O. R. Downing, Director of Building Maintenance and Utilities, to work with the architects on the design and development of the mechanical plans and specifications.

It will also be Mr. Downing's responsibility to check the plans.

6. Budget

The budget is to be determined after the program has been developed, which is considered to be ideal, but the process places even more responsibility on the faculty committee, the architects, the dean and the CPC to consider most carefully the needs and costs.

There should be provisions for reasonable future expansion and needs.

7. Time Schedule

The time schedule probably could be developed after the first meeting between the various groups. It is going to be a very tight schedule, and it will be vital to maintain it.

3104. Science Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce)First Goal8. Compliance with State Regulations

It will be necessary to file the usual informational report with the Legislative Budget Board just as soon as the information is available.

It is assumed that there are no other state regulations applicable to the design of the project.

It was agreed that the Chairman would call Mr. George Pierce, explain the CPC's thinking as shown above and obtain his suggestions on how to proceed in the most expeditious manner.

(The Chairman called Mr. Pierce on October 13, 1965. He said that, after talking with Mr. Barrick, he was planning to come out early on Tuesday afternoon, October 12, stay over until Wednesday, October 13, and leave Mr. Deshayes here as long as he needed to be. He said he would like to work with the faculty committee and with its chairman and certainly endorsed the idea. He suggested that strict lines of authority be arranged and said that he would like to meet with the chairman of the committee and the CPC, and the sooner the better.

(After several conversations, it was agreed that Mr. Pierce and Mr. Deshayes would arrive on the first plane from Houston on Friday morning, October 15, and that Mr. Felty would acquaint him with the campus in general in the morning. In the afternoon, a meeting is scheduled with Mr. Urbanovsky, Mr. Barrick, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Downing, Mr. Felty, Dean Kennedy, Dr. Camp, the chairman of the faculty committee, and perhaps other members of the faculty committee available at that time.

(On Saturday morning, October 16, there is to be a meeting with the same group and M. L. Pennington at 8 a.m. in Room 120 of the Administration Building.

(The general purposes of the meetings will be to develop the guidelines to get the project under way.)

9. In the Chairman's conversation with Mr. Pierce, it was mentioned that the CPC will recommend an engineering survey. Mr. Pierce pointed out that it should be started as quickly as possible, as both he and the architects on the Business Administration Building will need specific information in order to file the applications.

10. Financing

The project will be dependent on the passage of Amendment 1 on November 2, 1965.

3105. LibraryCompletion of South Basement and Third FloorElevators

Mr. Barrick said that the architects have raised a question as to the number of elevators to be included in the project. There are two elevators in use. One runs to the third floor and the other to the second. There is a shaft for a third elevator.

It was agreed that two elevators would be ample to handle the load to the third floor.

3106. New Residence Hall for Women (CPC No. 97-65)

In order to expedite the project, the CPC agreed on the following:

1. The Women's Residence Council be requested to prepare a list of the things they like about the present residence halls and those that they would like to have. A very excellent contribution was made by the members of WRC on the four existing new women's residence halls.
2. The housing staff, including Food Service, would be asked to help prepare the programs.
3. The architects would be asked for their needs. (When asked, Mr. Howard Schmidt said that he thought it would be well to start with a CPC and housing staff meeting as the first step.)
4. The architects would be asked for their suggestions on the site, which would be west of Flint.
5. A check would be made with the architects for the recommended engineering firm before contacts were made.
6. Mr. John G. Taylor would coordinate the application to the HHFA for a loan.
7. Mr. O. R. Downing would be the person to consult on the mechanical design and plans.
8. The CPC will be the focal point, short of the President and the Board of Directors.
9. The available information on hand in connection with the thoughts on housing should be pulled together for the architects.
10. A consultant for food facilities should be considered. (Mrs. Bates is very pleased with the work of Mr. Arthur W. Dana and has pointed out that the services should be available at the outset.)
11. There would be a study of the maximum or ideal capacity in the complex area.
12. Some thought should be given in siting the present project to that for the next units.
13. The housing staff would be asked for their thoughts and ideas on the site, capacity, program, etc.

M. L. Pennington
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 257 October 13, 1965

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 4 p.m. on October 13, 1965, in the Office of the President. Members of the CPC present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsky, Mr. Nolan E. Barrick and Chairman M. L. Pennington. Others present were Mr. John G. Taylor and Mr. O. R. Downing. In addition, Mrs. Shirley S. Bates, Mrs. Dorothy T. Garner, Mr. Guy J. Moore, and the project architects, Schmidt and Stiles, Roberts & Messersmith, were present.

3107. New Residence Hall for Women (CPC No. 97-65) (Schmidt and Stiles, Roberts & Messersmith)

A. Food Consultant

It was generally agreed that the services of a consultant would be needed. After discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Dana's design and specifications were very good, but that there should be some reevaluation of the extent of his inspection services.

B. Preliminary Application

Mr. Taylor mentioned that the preliminary application is little more than a project description. It was agreed that efforts should be made to file the application as quickly as possible.

The financing of possible overdesign for later additions could create a problem.

Mr. Taylor had talked with the HHFA officials on October 12, 1965, and a copy of his report is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 584, page 1788)

C. Incinerators

It seemed to be the consensus that a great deal of thought should be given to the design of waste disposal in the residence halls. Residence halls over the country have the same problems, and no one has found an ideal solution.

D. Utilities

The requirements for utility tunnels will affect the site selection.

E. Consulting Engineers

It was agreed that steps should be taken to recommend a consulting engineer and the scope of the survey that should be made and request clearance.

F. Power Plant

It is generally agreed that a new power plant will be necessary and that it probably will provide for all the buildings to the west of Flint in the future, including chilled water. The question should be included in the survey of the consulting engineer.

G. Acreage

It was pointed out that there are approximately 14 acres in the site for Men's 9 and 10. This is approximately 72 men per acre. Various means of conserving space were discussed.

3107. New Residence Hall for Women (continued)H. Parking

It was agreed to provide one parking space for each two students in the project.

I. Classrooms

It has been the thought for some time that it would be well to have some classrooms with future residence halls projects, but there is a complication on financing. It is not permissible to combine constitutional building amendment money with borrowed funds for residence halls.

J. Other

All the other topics shown under Item No. 3106 were discussed, and it was agreed that the next step would be for the project architects to work with the housing staff to begin the development of the program, and they are to let the CPC know when there is something needing the members' attention.

It was agreed that the facilities should be designed for occupancy by either men or women.

It seemed to be the general consensus that it might be well to take some additional space for housing from men for women and provide space for men in the proposed facilities.

It was agreed that there should be some single rooms. In the spaces occupied by men, the wing advisor is housed in a single room in order that he may counsel in his room. If the space is used by women, Dean Garner said it could be rented as a single room for an additional price, and some such space is needed.

M. L. Pennington
Chairman

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Campus Planning Committee
October 13, 1965
Attachment No. 584
Item 3107

Texas Technological College
Lubbock, Texas

MEMORANDUM
FROM
OFFICE OF THE BUSINESS MANAGER

TO: Mr. M. L. Pennington DATE: October 12, 1965

I talked with Miss Emma Brown and Mr. Don Horsley at the HHFA office in Fort Worth Tuesday morning, October 12, 1965, about our plans for submitting an application for a new residence hall complex. Miss Brown said that the recent bill passed extending the housing provisions made \$300 million available each year; however, HHFA has to mechanically borrow the money from the Treasury, and this has not been done yet. HHFA is accepting and processing applications, but has not committed any funds at all for the current year. Miss Brown suggested that we proceed with our application. I asked her if she thought we would have any trouble getting up to \$4 million on this project, and she said she did not think so since their present limit is about \$4 million per year per school.

I asked Miss Brown about the Student Union addition, and she said that unions are still eligible and that the post office connected with the Union is an eligible item. I had asked her this question so that if the post office were not eligible, we might not want to consider it in our planning.

Don Horsley walked into Miss Brown's office while I was talking with her, and she put Don on the phone to discuss some of the problems on financing. He said that if we could meet our earnings test on the project, we would have no problem at all in financing the project and selling some bonds on the side for movable equipment. However, if there is quite a bit of "ineligible stuff," as Don Horsley calls it, in the project (I suppose he's talking about oversizing the utility tunnels and building more kitchen than we need or something), and we are unable to put in the money to cover this, we might have some problem.

Don suggested that we get our application in just as soon as possible. When it comes down to the financing, he will see which is the best route to take. He also mentioned that we probably could not have our loan agreement provide for the issuing of bonds for the Union unless they were handled together from the start. However, he suggested that we proceed at the present time with our application just on the residence hall.

I raised the question with Don on what interest rate we would have on the bonds we sold outside of the system to provide funds for movable equipment, etc. He said that the interest rate would be whatever we could get and would not be limited to 3 percent. He thinks we have to go more than \$100,000 to \$200,000 on these outside bonds and we may have trouble selling them.

John G. Taylor
Business Manager

JGT:b
cc: Mr. R. B. Price

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE
Lubbock, Texas

MINUTES OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 258

October 15, 1965

A meeting of the Campus Planning Committee was held at 2 p.m. on October 15, 1965, in the Office of the President. Members present were Mr. E. J. Urbanovsk and Mr. Nolan E. Barrick. Chairman M. L. Pennington was out of town.

Other persons present were Mr. George Pierce and Mr. Bob Deshayes of the architectural firm, Pierce & Pierce, Houston, Texas, Dean S. M. Kennedy, Dr. Earl Camp, Mr. Bill Felty, Mr. O. R. Downing and Mr. John G. Taylor.

3108. Science Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce)

Dean Kennedy reported that the new Science Building would be for the Department of Biology and that he had appointed Dr. Earl Camp, Dr. R. W. Strandtmann and Dr. Lyle C. Kuhnley to the Faculty Committee. Dr. Camp represents the botanist, Dr. Strandtmann the zoologist and Dr. Kuhnley the microbiologist. The other members of the Faculty Committee have not been appointed.

It was announced that the next meeting will be at 8 a.m. on Saturday morning, October 16, 1965, in Room 120 of the Administration Building. All members of the Faculty Committee were to be notified of the meeting. Dr. Camp reported that Dr. Kuhnley was in Austin attending a meeting and would not be available.

Mr. Taylor read Item 3104 of the CPC Minutes of Meeting No. 256 regarding the policies and procedures set by the CPC on the Science Building.

After discussion of the CPC Minutes, Mr. Pierce stated that it would be a mistake to try to plan the building fully by January 1. He said that six months are required to program a building as complicated as this. He thinks they can do enough work to permit us to file the application by January 1, but they need to reserve the right to change the plans and concepts later as they make further studies. Mr. Pierce thinks that the information for the application will permit the changes and that the budget will be adequate.

Dean Kennedy pointed out that for two or three years the Biology Department has been working on its future needs, and this information should help with the programming.

The requirements of the application were discussed. Mr. Taylor gave Mr. Pierce a copy of the application filed on the Foreign Languages-Mathematics Building. It was agreed that Mr. Taylor would call Mr. Ray Fowler, a staff member of the Coordinating Board, to see if the requirements for filing the application had changed and if the January 1, 1966, deadline could possibly be changed.

It was Mr. Pierce's recommendation that the Faculty Committee program their needs for a five- or ten-year growth.

Mr. Pierce also recommended that as many people as possible make a trip to Rice University to see the science building his firm has designed. He pointed out the good, flexible features of the building, but said that it was designed primarily for research and graduate work. Our building would have to be somewhat different because of our large undergraduate enrollment.

The problem of the building's being for undergraduate and graduate students was discussed. The consensus was that we would file for

3108. Science Building (CPC No. 99-65) (Pierce & Pierce) (continued)

our needs and divide the facilities as best we could, probably filing an application under the graduate research portion of the Higher Education Facilities Act. The latter application should be filed with the U. S. Office of Education in Washington, D. C., and provides one-third matching funds.

Mr. Deshayes gave Dr. Camp a list of items the architects would like to have from the Faculty Committee. The list is attached to and made a part of the Minutes. (Attachment No. 585, page 1791)

Mr. Pierce asked that the Faculty Committee give him the information they have gathered in two weeks and give him everything for the final program within four weeks.

Mr. Pierce raised a question about the central chilling station. He said that NSF, Department of Health, and NASA will not pay for a chilling station unless it is part of the building being financed. It was agreed that Mr. Taylor would call HHFA and raise this question.

Dr. Camp asked Mr. Pierce what he thought the cost per square foot would be for the Science Building. Mr. Pierce said that he estimated the cost would be \$30 per gross square foot, including fixed furniture.

(Mr. Downing entered the meeting.)

Mr. Pierce asked if the College would give him a list of equipment, building materials, etc., that the College would prefer not to have in the Science Building. Mr. Barrick and Mr. Downing will see that he has this information.

John G. Taylor
Business Manager

The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

(Mr. Taylor called Mr. Berrey of the HHFA regional office on October 15, 1965. Mr. Berrey said there was no problem with the central chilling station. It can be in the building or at a separate location, and the portion relating to the Science Building would be a part of the project cost.

(Mr. Taylor called Mr. Ray Fowler of the Coordinating Board on October 15, 1965. Mr. Fowler stated that they did not have any application forms and were not going to print any more for awhile. He said that the College should proceed with the present forms and, if necessary, duplicate them. The Coordinating Board is waiting for Congress to pass an education bill that is pending which may affect the Higher Education Facilities Act.

(Regarding the January 1 deadline, Mr. Fowler said that the staff is asking the Coordinating Board to change the date to January 7, 1966. He thinks the Coordinating Board will approve the January 7 date at its meeting on October 18, 1965.

(Mr. Fowler gave Mr. Taylor some information about the amount of money requested by other schools. The Coordinating Board has already been notified that claims will be filed for \$8,700,000 against the \$7,000,000 now available for colleges and universities above the junior college level.)

Campus Planning Committee
October 15, 1965
Attachment No. 585
Item 3108

STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM
(for Architects)

Biology Curriculum

Undergraduate (departments)
Length of Academic Program
Students by Semesters
 Majors
 Nonmajors
Classrooms
 Size of Study Groups
 Number Undergraduate Studies
 vs Student Enrollment
Areas of Space
Student Load
Lecture Facility(ies)
 Live Direct
 Live Televised
 Proctored
 Informal
 Canned
Laboratory Facility (teaching)
 Type of Experimentation and
 Philosophy of Method
Auxiliary
 Reference Rooms
 Seminar Rooms
 Animal and Plant Rooms
 Storage Facility

Graduate (departments)

Research Program
Experimental Facilities

Doctoral (departments)

Administrative Requirements

General Offices
Staff Offices
Staff Research

Percent of each area devoted to undergraduate study

A statement of special orientation relationships