

Y2K+10

CAMPUS MASTER PLAN SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGES	TOPIC	PLATE NAME	SHEET
1	Introduction		
2	Summary		
3	History of Huntsville		
4-5	History of the University		
6-11	Planning Issues & Missions		
12	Existing Conditions	SHSU INVENTORY: 2001	A
		SHSU LAND USE: 2001	B
		SHSU CIRCULATION	C
13	Existing Campus Plan: Y2K+01	SHSU CAMPUS PLAN: 2001	D
14-15	Y2K+10: Phase One: 2001-2005	SHSU CAMPUS PLAN: 2005	E
		SHSU CAMPUS PLAN: 2005	F
16-17	Y2K+10: Phase Two: 2005-2010	SHSU CAMPUS PLAN: 2010	G
		SHSU LAND USE: 2010	H
		SHSU CAMPUS PLAN: 2010	I
18	Y2K+10: Master Plan Sequence	MASTER PLAN SEQUENCE	J
		MASTER PLAN SEQUENCE	K
19	SHSU Campus Plan: 2050	SHSU CAMPUS PLAN: 2050	L
		SHSU CAMPUS PLAN: 2050	M
20-23	Y2K+10: Financial Analysis		
24-25	Conclusion		
26	Acknowledgements		

July 27, 2001

INTRODUCTION:

In 1982, architect & campus master-planner Ralph D. Spencer Sr. of Spencer Associates in Austin, Texas, presented his concept for the Sam Houston State University campus. The report was entitled, **SHSU: 2000**, and it represented a dramatic look into the future of the University. About ten years later he was called upon again to update the Plan. As SHSU moved through the plan, essentially rebuilding the campus, the results turned out to be amazingly like Ralph Spencer said they would. Sam Houston State University now enjoys a beautiful, functional campus in most respects, especially with the academic and administrative buildings, and with the open pedestrian malls and green space.

As SHSU came to the end of the planned changes, our minds turned to the need for another update to extend the plan for another ten years. Spencer Associates was no longer in business; Ralph had retired some years earlier. It was hard for us to think in terms of working with a different campus master planner, one who would have to start from the beginning to know the University. Ralph knew the personality and infrastructure of the University well. Frankly, we began to contrive ways of coaxing him out of retirement on a temporary basis, to update the campus master plan one more time.

To shorten the story we were successful in our attempts; Spencer agreed to return to Sam Houston State University and develop a new campus plan for the next ten years. He calls the new plan **Y2K+10**.

We asked Mr. Spencer to give special attention to the campus edges and student housing. During the University's 122 year history, it has grown into the City and the City has grown into the University. There is no longer a "front door" to SHSU. Some entries are attractive and some are unsightly, belying the interior beauty of the campus. In addition, we are painfully aware that

student housing, all of which is very old, is hurting the University in spite of good efforts to keep it in as good condition as possible. Student housing is the one area of Spencer's original and updated plans that has been ignored.

Working with Ralph Spencer through the past year has been a pure pleasure, and seeing his concepts for the next ten years for Sam Houston State University's campus is refreshing and exciting. His treatment of the streets on the south side of the campus, his plan for student housing, and his concepts for new building placements are designed to take SHSU's physical plant into the new century with both function and style, which will contribute greatly to the educational process. This plan has undoubtedly been developed in a shorter time period than would have been possible with a campus planner new to the SHSU campus. We are grateful to Ralph Spencer for taking a respite from retirement on our behalf.

Bobby K. Marks, President
Sam Houston State University

SUMMARY

This report presents a studied development plan for the campus at Sam Houston State University. The Plan's focus is the first decade of the new Millennium, 2001-2010.

Authored by Ralph D. Spencer Sr., who also developed similar studies for the 1980-2000 period, the new Campus Master Plan moves his thinking into a third phase of time and opportunity.

Many see the opening decade as a period of challenge unlike others before, a time frame compressed by the impact and pace of change. Spencer expresses concern for the consequence of not acting deliberately, not moving into such challenge and opportunity definitively and forthrightly.

Explicit concerns addressed have to do with adequate and appropriate space to instruct, house and otherwise accommodate people and missions of the University.

This presents an orderly, coordinated and generally consensual Plan for managing current and projected space needs of academic programs at SHSU for the next ten years.

Implicit concerns addressed relate more to sociological or methodological solutions to the management of other related needs. The campus is Habitat. It should be functional and livable, an inspiration to scholars. In this paradigm, Spencer moves against aesthetic, quality of life, safety, access and functional problems.

Believing certain of these implicit concerns influence recruitment and retention, Spencer brings some urgency to his call for new Student Housing, improved Campus Edges and Structured Parking.

Few University campus environments are as contained, unified, orderly or convenient as SHSU is or could be. It is an advantage of considerable value that a student can walk to any campus destination in less than ten minutes...from a dormitory or parked auto. Here, that is possible. Cost is a factor of convenience of course, but convenience has a ready market. Spencer feels few substitute actions could do more to stabilize and promote student recruitment and retention.

This new Plan does not address utilization or facility assessment in a deliberate or detailed way. Data studied by the planner indicate administrative groups managing such issues know the situation well. More generally, however, Spencer does speak to the worthiness of structures as candidates for repair, renovation and continued service.

Illustrating deliberately phased actions to be taken in the term of this study, various drawings, charts, schedules and discussions are included in this report.

It will become obvious through study this will be an ambitious and costly undertaking. That reality is softened somewhat by the fact more than half the costs will relate to Student Housing and Auxiliary projects funded by revenue, while the remainder will be from HEAF and Tuition Bond sources.

The published report includes a Program specific, first-things-first, time-sensitive, cost-conscious strategy for doing things that need to happen...soon and later. For full effect, certain project actions should be granted active status very soon...if and as funding can be assured. There are few other good reasons to postpone implementation.

HISTORY OF HUNTSVILLE, TEXAS

Huntsville and several other East Texas communities were founded very early in the history of Texas. The Mexican Government granted Mr. Pleasant Gray a league of land in 1834. The City was founded on a part of his seven mile square tract. The first building was probably his Trading Post, where he did business with the Bedias Indians, settlers who bought land from him, and travelers moving Westward.

Texas became a Republic after the Battle of San Jacinto. Nacogdoches, San Augustine, Huntsville and other East Texas towns became safe places to settle and take roots. Nearby, steamboat traffic on the Trinity River was available, and by the mid 1840's there was talk of Huntsville as the new State Capitol City. The Great Northern Railroad by-passed Huntsville in 1871, several miles to the East, but later built a Huntsville Tap.

Huntsville's very own Citizen General, President, Governor, Senator Sam Houston had much to do with many good things that happened in the 1840-1870 era, but other able and influential people also did much. These included the Gray, Gibbs, Smithers, Thomason, Smithe, Yoakum and Ball families, to name a few; all were both generous and faithful in promoting the welfare of the town and its people.

Several major events in the early years had a profound effect on the community, people of the time, and the future of the community. Early, the people developed opportunities for learning. By 1843 there was a co-ed Academy; by 1852 the Austin College was open. There is no doubt the very earliest settlers gave high priority to education. Later, in 1879, Austin College became Sam Houston State University.

The Texas Department of Corrections was established in Huntsville by the new State of Texas, soon after its Statehood in 1845. Employment opportunities there, unique to most early towns, gave Huntsville a unique stability that is still a major industry for the area.

An outbreak of Yellow Fever swept over the community in 1857, causing the death of more than ten percent of the people of Huntsville. This terrible thing and the Civil War years stifled development and growth for ten or more years.

Land and fruits of the land, i.e. cotton, cattle, timber etc. were dominant area industries of the first hundred years. WWII and the flagging Agrarian Era overlapped in years of transition for the community. New and stabilizing growth promoted land sales and development, commercial, institutional, residential, and road building. Enrollments at the University increased, payrolls grew steadily, and many other good things happened causing Huntsville to grow and prosper.

The community projects its historic and cultural significance in dynamic ways, as it matures in a field of Opportunity, to grow, to become something more than it is if not bigger. It hovers at the edge of the largest population center in Texas, the fourth largest in the United States. As such, and for a variety of other reasons, Huntsville's future as a contender for industry and all things any city wishes for.

Huntsville's significant history dims in the brilliance of its future. The best, definitely, is yet to come.

HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Sam Houston State University's history is a witness to the early and determined interest of the community in educational opportunity for the young. As early as 1840, perhaps, a brick academy was built on land occupied now by the Walls Unit of the Prison System. Later, it was called the Andrew Female Academy.

In 1843, Mr. and Mrs. Pleasant Gray gave land for a new college incorporated in 1846. It was known as Huntsville Academy. The Huntsville settlement grew rapidly in those ten years of the Republic, and various new interests in higher education surfaced.

Baylor considered Huntsville as a site for their school, but chose Independence. By 1844, the Presbytery of the Brazos was very actively seeking sites for institutes of learning. One they had established at Nacogdoches was closed in 1847. Reverend Daniel Baker came to Texas in 1849; by August he had visited Huntsville and convinced the Presbytery to approve it as the site. Later the same year, on November 22, Governor George P. Wood signed a charter for the new college. Huntsville citizens proposed the name of Baker College to honor Rev. Baker, but he preferred to honor the "Father of Texas" with the name of the school, and the Presbytery agreed. The name became Austin College.

The first Board of Trustees included Robert Smither, John Branch, Henderson Yoakum, Anson Jones, Sam Houston and several other Texas notables. Dr. Samuel McKinney was elected as the first president of the new school and Baker stayed on as fiscal agent. McKinney organized classes in the building of the Huntsville Male Institute, which had presumably been the Huntsville Academy. The enrollment increased rapidly.

Architect Abner Cook was in Huntsville in August 1848, involved in design and supervision of the new Prison. He was subsequently engaged to design and manage construction of what we know now as Austin Hall. Cook is remembered as the earliest and most able architect of the time in Texas. His surviving work also includes the Governor's Mansion in Austin and other fine homes there. The Austin College building was completed in October of 1852.

Personal squabbles involving Sam Houston and President McKinney surfaced soon after that. Houston moved away and McKinney quit his job. Rev. Baker was having trouble raising money to support the work but, even so, enrollment peaked at 84 students in 1855. The Trustees established a law department that same year, the first in Texas. Debt plagued the school in the late 1850's and enrollment declined.

Then came the War Between the States and enrollment never recovered. A disastrous yellow fever epidemic in Huntsville in 1867 only darkened the picture. Rumors that the college might relocate surfaced in the early 1870's. By 1876 a new site was chosen at Sherman and the school at Huntsville closed at the end of that school year. All Austin College property reverted to the City of Huntsville.

The Methodist Church used Austin Hall for a very brief period as a boys' school, calling it Mitchell College.

Rumors were rife in 1878 that the state would soon establish a normal school for the purpose of training teachers. Huntsville sent a delegation to Austin to offer the state clear title to the Austin College, and that if located there it should be named in honor of General Sam Houston. Governor Oran Milo Roberts signed a bill creating Sam Houston

Normal Institute on April 21, 1879. The following October the school opened with a faculty of four and the student body numbered 110, when it began its first term in the Austin College Building. The enrollment almost tripled in the first ten years.

A succession of Presidents followed, including Bernard Mellon, Hosea Smith, Joseph Baldwin, H. Carr Pritchett, Harry Fishburn Estill, Charles P. Estill, Charles N. Shaver, H. L. Lowman, A. B. Templeton, Elliott T. Bowers, Martin Anisman and Bobby K. Marks have provided leadership and guided development of the university in the 122 years since. Dr. Marks will retire on 15 August 2001, and Dr. James F. Gaertner was selected to succeed him as the thirteenth President of the university on July 8, 2001.

The first baccalaureate degree was awarded in 1919. Since then, more than 85,000 others have been awarded.

The name of the institution was changed from Sam Houston Normal Institute to Sam Houston State University in 1923, during the tenure of Dr. Templeton. Enrollment at that time was 600. The count varied greatly through the thirties and forties, when in 1940 it peaked at 1938. Enrollment dropped during the War years to a low of 600 students. In post war years, from 1946 to 1976, the enrollment climbed to 10,593 and peaked out at 12,906 in 1995. The Fall 2000 count was 12,305.

Currently, Sam Houston State University is organized into four colleges: Arts and Sciences, Education & Applied Science, Business Administration, and Criminal Justice. Students are offered an extensive range of bachelor's and master's degrees, as well as the Doctor of Philosophy in Criminal Justice, the Doctor of Philosophy in

Forensic Clinical Psychology, and the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership.

The faculty and the university are recognized regionally, nationally, and internationally.

PLANNING ISSUES & MISSIONS

Studies such as this rely on data, believable statistical data. If not available in the form needed at the site of study, it must be generated by the Planner. This time, here, most such information was available.

Early attention of the Planner was dedicated to a study of ACADEMIC issues trending over time; i.e. mission statements, institutional and program enrollments, degree offerings, credit-hour production, upper and lower division disparity, faculty and staff counts, demographics, recruitment, retention, program turf, etc...and the impact of all that on the ten year future addressed by this Plan.

Similar study and consideration was given existing STUDENT HOUSING...i.e. occupancy, adequacy, age and condition, location, maintenance costs, recruitment-retention, and how these issues might influence plans for a predictable future.

STUDENT LIFE issues were also a continuing focus for the Planner throughout the study. Did the student feel good about being at SHSU? What did the student like most about the campus? Will they encourage friends to come? What do they dislike most on a scale of ten?

TRAFFIC AND PARKING problems at SHSU are Twenty First Century issues in an early Twentieth Century World. CAMPUS EDGES, intersections and access corridors are hardly different from what they were fifty to seventy-five years ago. In this dilemma, a call to all constituencies of the University must go out...begging help. The Texas Department of Transportation, the City of Huntsville, Utility Providers and others perhaps must move against these issues **with** the University. It could reasonably be argued these are their responsibilities.

CAMPUS & COMMUNITY interface, relations and synergy are, or should be, topical concerns in any consideration of one or the other...as we look to the future. Dependence of one on the other is not an issue; coupling of assets, talents, and synergies are, however, and always will be.

HABITAT, that quality, texture, form and attitude of space-in-space, having obvious and defined boundaries, is an aesthetic issue caught up in all the others. Elsewhere, the report will speak of Habitat as an inherent quality found in functional, livable places where scholars might find inspiration as well as shelter and safety. Aesthetic values? Yes!

And, as one might wonder, how did these issues and understandings influence the Planner as he went from discovery to decision phases of his work? This paper goes to the heart of that question and others, in the following discussions.

ACADEMIC: It is undoubtedly true a number of Programs need more and/or better space. Examples: the Sciences, Dance, COBA, Education, Library, and CJC. Other needs as evident are more problematic than critical, and must wait for enabling authority and other project actions to get out of the way. Examples might include Agriculture, and Renovation of existing COBA space which must await completion of the new COBA addition. Also, Renovation of Farrington must await completion of its new Tower Addition...if the P.1-B Option is built. Various north campus project actions must await demolition of existing campus housing now in the way of such.

Justifications, good reasons to build new space are not always obvious. Other programs can justifiably demonstrate such needs. Some it can be argued are not critical and urgent needs.

The Planner has responded to all stated needs for space by recommending project

actions, with tongue in cheek in certain instances. Justifications are often obscure, or contradicted by trending data. Project justification and actions should be reconciled at the time Authority is granted for each...**again,then!**

Conversations re TECHNOLOGY did not always reconcile with Program Issues. Technology as a field of study is quite fragmented on campus. This was a surprise for the Planner, who still wonders why Technology is not a currently successful, cohesive and interactive field of study with several degree options. No facilities for technology are proposed by **Y2K+10**. All such matters were discussed, variously, but no definitive facility-related requests for technology were presented to the Planner.

The Planner believes various Colleges and program people feel threatened by any focus on technology as a multi-discipline field of study. Something of a Turf Tug will have to be resolved, administratively, before technology can become what it might on the SHSU Campus. Until then, this is not an architectural or planning concern.

Administrative and support services maintaining and operating academic facility assets are doing a very good job...with what they have to work with. All buildings where instruction occurs are suitable for such use. Some have problems, all likely have such, but the Physical Plant team is aware and actively engaging those issues. The Planner sees no need to get in their way or otherwise become involved in those matters.

STUDENT HOUSING: More explainable are project actions driven by critical and urgent needs for better Student Housing. These concerns have history. The CMP-2000 called out the need for new dorms in 1982 but nothing happened. The updated CMP ten years later restated such needs, but nothing has happened since. “Why” is not important. What is important, now, is

moving through excuses and helping the right thing happen **soon**. What must not be doubted again is that new dorms are 20 years late coming and critical to various interests of the University **now!**

This is a big deal! It will take time and a lot of money to resolve this gap in university assets and do what needs to be done, **now!** No one doubts cost was the primary obstacle standing in the way of these project actions years ago, but it does not matter. Hindsight is good, but it was not the right thing to do then and it will not be the right thing to do today, **again!**

In the Fall of 2000, fifty-two separate structures were student housing assets in the SHSU inventory. Each was and is a point of service to be operated and maintained, repaired and expensed. All are free of debt, but sink-holes for rental revenue. Almost as much is being spent annually to maintain and repair old and inappropriate housing as would be needed to service debt assumed to build new and appropriate facilities.

Conditions in and around existing dorms are not good. Reportedly, the inferior nature of student housing at SHSU is even now a major problem opined in recruitment and retention discussions.

Some feel the University should stand aside, get out of the dormitory business, and let private sector providers deal with the problem. The Planner thinks this can be a ‘qualified’ good idea...**but only to the extent the University competes and sets the standard by which students can judge competitive quality and space**. Students should not be exposed to a private-sector **franchise** on student housing. The Planner cannot endorse such thinking.

In 1980, roughly one third of the students lived in University Housing; 3,500 more or less. Now, in 2001, less than 20 percent live in such. Are they avoiding the quality of University Housing? Probably!

White Hall conversion and improvements completed in 2000 seem to endorse convenience and other quality-of-life issues students seek. Booked full with a waiting list before opening in the Fall of 2000, it is true White Hall is on the right track. It is better than other options. Rents are less per square foot, and it provides more and better space than any other dorm on campus. No wonder students like it?

Students want better housing! They want the convenience of near-campus locations where they do not have to struggle with traffic and compete for parking. Like other 21st Century people, they want convenience. This is not something the University pays for, it is not an expense to the State of Texas. Even maintenance and utility costs are borne by students. Land values and certain administrative expense are the only contribution the State or University might make here...and that is the way it should be. The students are customers. So, what to do?

The Planner concludes saying **build new and quality housing, with food service and structured parking for 600 students** and see what happens. If successful, build another complex like it. If not, what is lost?

STUDENT LIFE: Over the period of a full year, the Planner had hundreds of conversations with students. Typically, questions and answers came to focus on opinions that related the student to the campus, its assets, people, services...and their sense of student life in general. Talk of academic issues surfaced at times. The Planner was more interested in other matters, however, such as what is wrong and right, what can or should be done to make things better?

Students generally and unequivocally admire and respect the campus core as an attractive place, one they enjoy. Few expressed any disagreeable opinions re academic facilities they go to for instruction.

They seem comfortable with the people factors here; i.e. student groups, faculty, and service providers they are in contact with. Student morale, if we should call it that, is high, and pride in their university is real. No doubt!

Student interest in competitive sports is noticeable but spotty. None question the validity or presence of such, and all are obviously loyal and true **BEARKAT** fans. Many expressed interest in Recreational Sports facilities, especially indoor exercising assets available there after hours. Wishful thinking and talk of a new indoor pool (Natatorium) surfaced frequently as well.

Discussions relating to student housing and food service were entirely different. Those living on campus were typically negative in their opinions. Others who had lived on campus and moved away said the inconvenience is more than offset by quality of life advantages elsewhere. Some required to live on campus by University Policy were less than pleased about it. Others enjoying the convenience campus-life provides complained of the facilities and food...then moved out in subsequent years. Students, faculty, staff and others (even one Regent) cited examples where parents refused to have their children live in the dorms.

COMMUNITY-RELATIONS: Attention to facts help us understand the dimensions of this issue and discussions that follow:

The 12th Day Fall 2000 enrollment of the University was 12,355. Students living on campus in dormitories etc. at that time totaled 2,555. Other students living off campus, in or near the City of Huntsville and elsewhere, totaled 9,800. Available campus parking spaces total 5,789.

Interested in how students on campus or within the City of Huntsville feel about the assets of the Community, the Planner asked a lot of related questions. Afterward, the Planner concluded student/community attitude is at best, perhaps, one of **benign**

ambivalence. Another way to say it might be that students do not seem very aware of or dependent on assets and resources of Huntsville. Shopping? Yes, some that is; fast food places, grocers, cleaners, and other providers especially. Entertainment? What entertainment, they ask in response? Cultural events? Where, besides on campus, they ask? In the end, it seems gas enough in the tank to get to Conroe and the Woodlands, or to North Houston, might be the primary dependence on the community otherwise. Too bad, if true!

That said, students living on campus rely very much on assets and resources provided by the University for fellowship, recreation, entertainment etc. Few students feel deprived. Other providers including the City of Huntsville, would be welcome as University partners or sole providers of more and better social and cultural assets. It is unlikely the University can do more than it is doing, alone.

Students living off-campus in or near Huntsville, and other commuters living elsewhere, with one exception, feel much the same as on-campus dwellers do about most community-relations. They do not expect as much of their University or the Community, but their concepts of convenience and frustrations related to traffic and parking seem quite significant.

Commuter students, they in reality being all who do not live in university housing, come and go with little on their minds but what they need and find on campus. They enjoy the Student Center, the Recreational Sports facility, Computer Labs and other quiet places to pass time between classes. Living their day out of an automobile, so to speak, little things become big problems; like arriving late, finding a place to park, carrying a day's supply of books etc around, or going back and forth to the car for things they forget. The Planner is convinced these students will pay for the convenience of

assured and closer parking. Some even say they pay more in fines than parking fees would be.

Recommendations of the **Advisory Task Force for Campus Planning** include suggestions for a Center for Performing Arts and Faculty Center, on or adjacent to the campus. They also encourage on-campus commercial ventures including a bookstore, theatre, coffee shop, restaurant, small shops etc...with integrated parking.

The Planner agrees these are good ideas, of course, but is conceptually stymied as to where that kind of development money would come from, where such assets would fit in current land use patterns and, if or not private sector ventures could be permitted on campus? Like all good ideas, this one needs study...very careful study.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING: Much has been said or implied above, about this subject. More must be said:

Unhappy people talking about both these issues are not all students, but students do matter, most perhaps. They are paying customers of the University. Administrators look after themselves in privilege. Faculty are less privileged but more indulged; they do have allocated space. Students have little more than a hunting license, good beyond the range of convenience only.

Defensive response the Planner hears most often, from non-students, is that there is plenty of parking space but "**they**" do not want to walk far; "**they**" want it front-row. Well, so what is different about that? We all have such feelings.

Most people on any campus know these are endemic issues within university life, everywhere. Sam Houston State University has it pretty good, the Planner feels.

More importantly, the Planner feels other considerations should influence and shape action plans that might reconcile these and

other concerns, **and** make more people happy.

Access to the campus and circulation at the campus edges frustrate commuters, even as much as finding a parking spot perhaps. In this paradigm, reflection comes to focus on certain problems; access corridors are not adequate for heavy traffic-counts involved, intersections are unsuitably designed and controlled, sidewalks, if any, and pedestrian crossings are quite unsafe and our Campus Edges are ugly!

A principal virtue of the Sam Houston campus is its “contained” nature. So much is so convenient, once you get there. It has that potential for extraordinary excellence as habitat few universities ever realize. At all costs, this potential should be promoted and preserved.

The Planner feels automobiles are alien intruders in that potentiality; parking spaces above ground in the core area also. Streets, too, except as necessary for emergency and services.

Parking is a very contemporary dilemma pushing other things around in our culture today. Where people go, so do cars. If you want to do business with people you must expect to take care of their cars...or provide other acceptable transportation options.

Like commercial ventures, it is likely universities will experience rewards or consequences of such expectations, well or poorly addressed and managed, one way or another; recruitment and retention no doubt.

From the beginning of his studies here, the Planner has believed in and promoted a contained campus concept, one dedicating the campus core to academic activities. All else, he feels, should be outside well defined campus edge boundaries served by adequate and attractive access corridors. This study reaffirms that philosophy and policy.

In that strategy, the Planner wants a ring of convenience for student housing and parking to have priority on the sideline.

From that ring to any student destination, or faculty site, no more than a ten minute walk is involved. That walk would or should be obstacle free, for the most part, enabled by bridged crossings, and lifts or elevators. Another dilemma forming in development of the SHSU campus has to do with that ratio of pervious to impervious cover in a contained environment. Parking lots are not friends of virtue in such concerns. Balance is a key to successful development in zones of density and containment. Parking lots in the campus core area are not appropriate.

A medley of opportunities and proposed actions engage virtually all concerns relating to commuters and automobiles. First, the Planner proposes redevelopment of 20th and 17th streets & University Drive, new and adjacent housing and auxiliary facilities, structured parking below, at and above grade, celebrated gateways giving the campus needed identity, and various underground parking where future academic buildings will be constructed.

More importantly, the Planner proposes reserved, structured parking for students living on campus in new housing proposed. If we are now creatures of convenience to the extent we expect such indulgences, these proposed actions should satisfy any who are willing to pay for it. There are no free-lunch deals here however.

Here again, it will be very necessary for the University to have the cooperation and participation of the City of Huntsville, the Texas Department of Transportation and the several Utility Companies with buried or overhead services there.

CAMPUS EDGES: The Planner likes to think of Campus Edges as an enclosing and defining but welcoming and celebrated arrival zone; one where students, parents and friends, faculty, staff and the general public know very well where they are...and are excited about it.

Edges define, divide, zone and defend space, missions and activities in particular ways. They proclaim rights of ownership and responsibility. Edges explain mass in space, even zones of safety and danger, even conceptual images perhaps.

Growth, evolution and stress have come to our campus edges at SHSU. Parked and speeding autos, blaring horns, dangerous street crossings, brutalized terrain, scalped landscapes, encroaching walls and structures and a long list of other negative forces have wounded hopes for exciting discovery and approach, arrivals and penetration of today's campus. Excepting only a few locations, it is not convenient or fun to come onto the campus today...even if you know where you are going.

Over time, being adaptable creatures, we grow into cultural frames of opinion that respect beauty, stewardship, efficacy, responsibility etc., or we stagnate in this paradigm, eventually, and become part of the problem, part of what we experience. Quite probably, sooner or later, we get friendly with compromised values and fly lower and smaller flags in all we think and do. We must not allow that to happen; we must turn these problems around.

Believing 20th Street, 17th Street, Avenue H and Sam Houston Avenues should be the edges of our celebrated arrival zone at SHSU, the Planner proposes ambitious plans for redevelopment of all but Avenue H. He proposes a joint venture where SHSU, the City of Huntsville, the Texas Department of Transportation and Utility Companies share this task in a commitment to excellence. In line with real responsibility, the Planner proposes the University provide right-of-way, and expense hardscape and landscape development of the edges outside curb lines; the City of Huntsville expense streetscape and municipal utility issues; the DOT plan, expense and execute intersecting sites at 20th and 17th streets...and explore, execute,

expense the widening of Sam Houston Avenue from 15th to 22nd streets. Other Utility providers with buried or overhead service should participate in planning, expensing and executing redevelopment (**underground**) of all such service.

Engaging these issues will bring us into contact with considerations of directive campus graphics, pedestrian pathways and safety, handicap access, lighting, planting, watering and other energy concerns. The university should direct and oversee the planning and execution of each such obligation.

HABITAT: The Planner has no interest in esoteric arguments that claim special power resides in sophisticated concepts of space or elegant environments. He respects such and is personally attracted to excellence, and to quality "anythings", but this report is about a place of Higher Education, work, study, and **inspired scholarship**. Those qualitative forces have many origins and any influence environment might have on the learning process is questionable. All the Planner hopes for is environment that sustains, promotes and advances concepts of excellence, opportunity and scholarship.

More to the point, the Planner suggests the SHSU campus is at a turning point, one where much is right, little is wrong, and anything is possible if we clean up our own mess and move on with a clear sense of direction...and dedication.

COMMITTMENT: Pilot error, more than anything else, explains most disappointment in the outcome of master plans. Somewhere along the way many things can happen, and do. The best hope for a successful ending is commitment to the vision, confidence in the advocacy and authoritative management. Issues studied and reported are worthy of such. The ultimate outcome can be equally worthy of the effort

**EXISTING CONDITIONS: SHSU, 2001
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

The following Plates A, B, C, indicate land use, building locations and identification, parking lots, property lines and adjacent neighborhoods. Streets and particular areas of concern are also indicated.

July 27, 2001

**EXISTING CAMPUS PLAN: Y2K+01
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

Plate D, following, illustrates the rendered existing (2001) campus plan, complete with buildings there now, streets, green space and other features within and near the campus core.

July 27, 2001

**Y2K+10: PHASE ONE, 2001-2005
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

The following two Plates E, F indicate project actions proposed in **PHASE ONE**, i.e. the first five years of **Y2K+10**. Proposed are new Student Housing, Additions and Alterations to existing Academic buildings, new Academic buildings, redevelopment of Streets, new and extended Malls, Structured Parking facilities etc.

July 27, 2001

CMP.Y2K+10.PHASE ONE. 2001-2005

Project Actions proposed for this term of CMP.Y2K+5 are indicated on the drawing that follows. Simply stated, each fits neatly in one of five areas: a) Academic, b) Student Housing, c) Auxiliary including Parking, and d) Campus Edges including Streets.

Many such Actions come into conflict with existing buildings in the way, i.e. old Student Housing mostly. A fifth category so made necessary is e) Demolition.

The challenge of Phase One is daunting, to say the least. Fifteen academic project actions are proposed for initiation in the 2001-2005 term, involving a budget of about seventy-seven million dollars. Concurrently, a total of ten auxiliary projects are to be initiated involving a budget of eighty-seven million dollars.

Daunting might be an understatement, to convey the scope of the challenge. Program teams each seem believe their priority is highest, or at least somewhere up front. Said elsewhere, however, little proposed is urgent; needed, yes, but not urgent. We will do what we can, when we can, respecting the Sequence Schedule outlining order and dates for the various project actions.

The encouragement needed to accept this challenge might be 18 to 20 million dollars from a Tuition Bond sale approved by the Legislature late in the recent Session. That and oncoming HEAF funds, needed to service debt assumed in other Bond Sales, should should jump-start academic project actions proposed on schedule.

About thirty-seven million dollars will be needed to initiate the high-priority South Dorm project action. This sum will have to come from revenue bond sources, but no obstacle seems in the way of this possibility. That being true, the Science and Dorm projects could be on the drawing board very soon.

Several other project actions seem critical to the success of these first moves. One would be redevelopment of 20th Street and the other would be Demolition of seven small dorms near the intersection of 20th and Avenue I. Together, budgets for such work would involve about four hundred thousand dollars of University E&G and/or Auxiliary funds.

When complete, these Science and Dorm project actions, including 20th Street and the Demolition work, together, would have consumed about fifty-seven million dollars.

Remaining at that time would be the need for another fifty-eight million dollars to complete other academic projects proposed in the first five years, and forty-seven million to complete auxiliary projects also proposed.

Any encouragement we might find in the academic prospects would be that no more than ten million dollars each would be needed in 2002 and 2003 calendar years. As much as twenty million dollars would be needed in each of the following two years. Assuming two more Tuition Bond authorities and continuing HEAF fund streams of income, this is possible.

To meet the needs of auxiliary projects proposed is not easy to explain away. The management advantage comes in how many proposed parking structures, if any, will be initiated each year. The Recreational Sports facility should not be managed out of the budget, however. Until some experience confirms adequate revenues are developing from completed parking structures, it would be wise to think this way...regardless.

Lastly, the Planner would encourage all Street project actions proposed be given high priority. Most expense related to such will hopefully be borne by the City and others. It is important that SHSU have funds to participate in shared costs.

**Y2K+10: PHASE TWO, 2005-2010
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

The following three Plates G, H, I indicate project actions proposed in **PHASE TWO**, i.e. the second five years of **Y2K+10**. Proposed are a new Student Housing Complex, new Academic facilities, redevelopment of 17th Street and parts of Avenues I and J, and several Structured Parking facilities.

July 27, 2001

CMP. Y2K+10. PHASE TWO. 2005-2010

The impact of Phase One is clearly seen in the drawing for Phase Two. To sense this more clearly, look back at Campus Plan 2001. Several new or renovated academic facilities will be complete and occupied. We will have more green space, fewer parking lots, new student housing, improved campus edges, more and safer pathways for pedestrians, better traffic management and more convenient parking.

New academic and auxiliary facilities, including a 600 bed Dormitory and the new Recreational Sports facility will be open and in place along 20th Street. The Arts, the Sciences, and the College of Business are in new facilities. Additions and/or alterations are complete at Communications, Education, Library, Theatre and CJC facilities. Also, hopefully, three or four structured parking facilities will be complete by 2005. SHSU in 2005 will be a very different place if things go as planned. It can happen.

The Phase Two term (2005-2010) is less daunting, but several Phase One project actions will still be incomplete when this Phase commences.

Funds required to carry out all work in this Phase will likely total about forty-seven million dollars, about nine of which would be E&G for academic and street projects. The remaining thirty-eight million would be for the South Dorm Complex and related demolition work.

By the end of 2005 the South Dorm will have been in operation a full year, if all goes as planned. It should be possible to revisit the Student Housing issues then, with that experience, and proceed or not with the North Dorm Complex.

With that experience, too, it should be possible to site adapt and revise South Dorm drawings and move ahead without redesign time and costs at the South site.

A years experience with new parking structures should affirm the concept as well, and promote its continuance. The challenge here will be the economics of the concept, i.e. if or not Faculty and Students are willing to “Pay the Fiddler”. The challenge there will be a fair price. Charging too much will “**Spoil the Pudding**”, as President Elliott Bowers used to say.

Phase Two is a second-generation effort that might have to pick-up some left-over Phase One project action assignments. The Planner expects this. Phase Two is conceived with such in mind, knowing those things happen.

It matters very much, however, that all this comes to pass. These ten years and this work will have a profound influence on the University in the new Millenia. The North Campus might become a very public front as inevitable development of Huntsville and its Central Business District come together. How and where their edges collide will have much to do with how well each plans for it. By 2010, or whenever this Y2K+10 study is updated, some focus and consideration must address that concern.

Several other concerns he cannot resolve now still linger in the Planner’s mind. One is Sam Houston Avenue, or SH 75 as some know it. Traffic there even now is a problem growing worse year by year. The University and City of Huntsville need to put pressure on the State Department of Transportation to do something about it. It too, like 20th and 17th should be a divided boulevard with one way lanes, straightened somehow along the campus edge. Avenue H needs attention, and a meaningful destination northward.

Few, surely, can doubt the real benefits accruing to promises made by **Y2K+10**. The Planner thinks of all this as a Third Generation effort, one that has and will give a great institution a great presence, one that inspires scholars, learning and instruction.

**Y2K+10: MASTERPLAN SEQUENCE
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

Plates J and K illustrate various action dates proposed for each project proposed for both Phases, i.e. during the entire ten year period. As the Legends explain, the charts indicate a) the Year and Quarter in which Authority is sought to carry out the work, b) Architects are selected and authorized to proceed with Design and Documentation, c) Bidding and award of contracts for construction, d) such construction is in progress, and completed, and e) projected occupancy of the work.

July 27, 2001

**Y2K+50: SHSU CAMPUS PLAN 2050
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

Text with Plate L discusses the potential for growth at SHSU beyond **Y2K+10**, indicating various possibilities relating to future sites for construction and enrollments well into the 21st Century.

July 27, 2001

Y2K+ FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

The following three pages present a studied financial analysis of all project actions proposed by **Y2K+10**. These outlines indicate the square footage scope of the work, probable action and project costs, funding sources with totals for each, and the year and quarter in which authority for the for the projects are proposed. All sums represent 2001 dollars.

July 27, 2001

Y2K+10: FINANCIAL ANALYSIS: ACADEMIC FACILITIES

NO.	PROJECT	TSF	\$ E&G	\$ AUX	\$ TOTAL	YEAR
P.1-A	SCIENCES					
	New Building, 20 th St.	100,000	18,500,000			4Q-2003
	Sub grade parking	100,000		6,240,000	24,740,000	4Q-2003
P.1-B	SCIENCES-OPTION					4Q-2002
	New Tower-Farrington	60,000	9,150,081			
	Renovate Farrington	50,947	10,776,000			
	Enviro. Abatement		300,000			
	Utility relocation		250,000		20,476,081	
P.2	BUSINESS ADMIN.					
	New Addition/Bridge	32,500	5,742,000			1Q-2003
	Renovate COBA Bldg.	44,571	6,239,940			4Q-2005
	Renovate AB1	19,000	2,660,000		14,641,940	4Q-2007
P.3A	LIBRARY					
	Renovate L. S. Area	14,000	2,800,000		2,800,000	4Q-2002
P.3B	TEACHER ED.					
	New Addition	4,000	730,000		730,000	3Q-2003
P.3C	THEATRE					
	Additions to exist bldg.	12,320	2,476,000		2,476,000	3Q-2003
P.4	AGRICULTURE					
	New Building	36,000	6,552,000		6,552,000	1Q-2005
P.5	COMMUNICATIONS					
	New Addition	25,000	6,675,000		6,675,000	1Q-2002
P.6	VISITORS CENTER					
	New Building	3,600	540,000		540,000	4Q-2003
P.7	DANCE					
	New Building	35,714	6,607,090		6,607,090	1Q-2005
P.8	GENERAL PURPOSE					
	New Building	36,000	6,300,000		6,300,000	4Q-2004
P.9	CRIMINAL JUSTICE					
	New Addition	31,000	5,885,000		5,885,000	4Q-2004
P.10	RECITAL HALL					
	New Building	15,000	3,330,000		3,330,000	4Q-2004
P.11	INST. ADV./SERVICES					
	New Building	30,000	5,040,000		5,040,000	4Q-2004
<hr/>						
	SUB-TOTALS					
	With P.1-A Option	538,705	80,077,030	6,240,000	86,317,030	
	With P.1.B Option	549,652	82,053,111	-0-	82,053,111	

EXPLANATIONS

- A) Difference in total costs shown above relates to Total Square Foot numbers for Projects P.1A and P.1B, and Sub-Grade Parking under P.1-A.
- B) Year notations for each Project relate to Project Authority and acceptable Bids, i.e. before the contract for construction is awarded.
- C) Probable Costs are expressed as 2001 Dollars, without any consideration of future inflation or other Allowances..

Y2K+10: CONTINUED: AUXILIARY FACILITIES

NO.	PROJECT	TSF	\$ E&G	\$ AUX	\$TOTAL	YEAR
P.A1	SOUTH DORM					
	New Dorm	156,000		21,840,000		
	Food Service	26,000		6,760,000		
	Contingency	10,000		1,400,000		
	Parking Structure (600)	190,000		7,820,000	37,820,000	1Q-2003
P.A2	NORTH DORM					
	New Dorm	156,000		21,840,000		
	Food Service	26,000		6,760,000		
	Contingency	10,000		1,400,000		
	Parking Structure (600)	190,000		7,820,000	37,820,000	4Q-2006
P.A3	RECREATIONAL SPORTS					
	New Bldg. W/ Pool	40,000		6,720,000	6,720,000	3Q-2002
SUB-TOTALS		804,000		82,360,000	82,360,000	

Y2K+10: CONTINUED: STRUCTURED PARKING

SP.1	20 TH , STREET (350)					
	South/Estill	115,000		5,313,000	5,313,000	1Q-2003
SP.2	AVENUE H (1,000)					
	East/ Coliseum:	330,000		13,530,000	13,530,000	3Q-2002
SP.3	AVENUE H (125)					
	East/Teacher Ed.	41,250		1,526,250	1,526,250	4Q-2003
SP.4	AVENUE H (300)					
	East/Library-Theatre	99,000		3,663,000	3,663,000	3Q-2004
SP.5	AVENUE H (125)					
	East of Hotel:	41,250		1,526,250	1,526,250	4Q-2003
SP.6	17 TH STREET (500)					
	North/ Student Center	165,000		7,590,000	7,590,000	1Q-2005
SP.7	AVENUE I (225)					
	West of CJC	74,250		3,415,500	3,415,500	1Q-2005
SUB TOTALS		865,750		36,564,000	36,564,000	

Y2K+10: CONTINUED: DEMOLITION

NO.	PROJECT	TSF	\$ E&G	\$ AUX	TOTAL	YEAR
D.1	SEVEN DORMS					
	Randall, Vick, Spivey, Allen, Adams, Barrett, Parkhill	57,127		138,819	138,819	1Q-2003
	STUDENT CENTERS					
	Baptist, Church of Christ	8,000	18,000		18,000	4Q-2004
D.3	SERVICES BUILDING					
	Institutional Advancem't	5,600	13,508		13,508	4Q-2004
D.4	FOUR DORMS					
	Jackson, Gibbs, Shaver, Soriority Hill	40,000		97,200	97,200	4Q-2006

Y2K+10: CONTINUED: DEMOLITION

NO.	PROJECT	TSF	\$ E&G	\$ AUX	TOTAL	YEAR
D.5	SERVICES BUILDING Career Services	6,183	15,025		15,025	4Q-2006
D.6	TWO DORMS Smith-Kirkley	12,619		375,021	375,021	3Q-2004
D.7	FOUR DORMS Belvin-Buchannan, Elliott, King	131,023		412,092	412,092	4Q-2006
D.8	TWO DORMS Lawrence, Mitchell	16,040		38,977	38,977	4Q-2006
D.9	TWO DORMS Frels, Wilson	52,723		128,116	128,116	1Q-2006
D10	ACAD. BLDG Recital Hall	6,511	16,470		16,470	4Q-2005
SUB-TOTALS		335,826	63,003	1,190,225	1,253,228	

Y2K+10: CONTINUED: STREETS

NO.	PROJECT	TSF	E&G	COH'VILLE	TOTAL	YEAR
S.1	20 TH STREET South Campus Edge	123,012	260,496	470,340	730,836	3Q-2003
S.2	17 TH STREET North Campus Edge	116,960	257,040	442,000	699,040	4Q-2006
S.3	UNIVERSITY AVE. Campus Road	68,360	456,400	-0-	456,400	2Q-2002
S.4	AVENUE J North Mall Ext.	22,400	224,000	-0-	224,000	3Q-2004
S.5	AVENUE I Campus Access	39,360	131,200	131,200	262,400	4Q-2005
S.6	21 ST STREET COH Street	37,184	116,200	185,920	302,120	4Q-2003
SUB-TOTALS		407,276	1,445,336	1,229,460	2,674,796	4Q-2010
GRAND TOTALS						
	With P.1-A Option	N/A	81,585,369	126 354 225	209,169,054	4Q-2010
	With P>1-B Option	N/A	83,561,450	126,354,225	204,905,135	4Q-2010

CONCLUSION:

Here, the Planner looks back to things done long ago, what has happened since, what is now concluding, and what the consequence might ultimately be. He does so feeling good about his work, humbled by the respect and confidence shown him.

His efforts at Sam Houston State University will have influenced, at the end, thirty years of engagement in it's future...from 1980 to 2010. That will be a proud legacy. His is a glass-ball sort of art, fraught with risk. Now in his 75th year, believing his advocacy both prudent and timely, he feels safe in dotage if his talents otherwise fail him.

The Advisory Task Force Report, appendant herewith, says "a master plan is not a rigid blueprint", and this is true. It goes on to say it is a "guideline and vision" for the physical development of the university, SHSU in this case, which is also very true.

Even so, this limiting rationale often renders such plans ineffective, somewhere down the line.

Within each community are those forces of stewardship, power, privilege, and mischief, which, coupled with urgency, economics or necessity can neuter any advocacy, plan or strategy. Master Plans are not tattoos; they wash off with hot or cold water. They are at risk in a room with second guessers and insensitive souls. They need the nourishment only commitment, support and authoritative oversight can give. They must be monitored. Mid-course corrections are to be expected; primary goals should be fixed in purpose.

The Planner salutes Drs. Elliott Bowers and Bobby Marks for giving faithful attention to most recommendations of previous Plans.

Now is another time for new players to give such visions of the future the same fealty.

Forsaking student housing, for whatever reason, was a mistake. Nothing is gained by going back over that ground. The time has come to do something, now; that is what we must believe in and act on today. Private Sector concepts for "getting out of the dorm business" have questionable merit, which the Planner cannot endorse. Better options are open and available.

For too long, campus edges and surrounding streets have also been neglected by both the City and University. Access corridors which serve the campus are inadequate and unsafe! The City now seems willing and anxious to address and resolve any such problems. The University must encourage such action and share its resources to support campus edge projects proposed by **Y2K+10**.

Academic project actions **Y2K+10** proposes have merit. Space utilization concepts and practices in higher education, everywhere it seems, do not reconcile well with urgencies outlined by some program administrators. Other considerations are involved, however.

This is true at SHSU, the Planner feels, and justification should be monitored carefully. As is true in student housing, the quality of academic spaces now available are very real considerations.

Some program actions have been deferred too long. Agriculture, for instance! Growing fast, a lot, they need help! Dance is in an old facility that should come down; they need a place to go. Others also have grown to a point where space is at a premium and more students are coming into the program each year. One such example is the Dan Rather Communications building. While **Y2K+10** outlines quite specific dates for each project

action, a watch over project order should be maintained with some flexibility.

Auxiliary projects are dorm complexes and structured parking, the one exception being a Recreation Sports & Natatorium facility. Revenue Bond sales will finance construction of these projects; user fees and rental income will service this debt. Much of the promise and power of **Y2K+10** hinges on housing and parking advocacy. No one else is compromised by these actions.

Various University constituencies not named or illustrated in **Y2K+10** await attention to needs not reported here. The Planner thinks each issue is due independent consideration and a separately reported Master Plan guiding development of each. These include:

- A) Abandoning and/or redevelopment, lease or sale of the existing Agriculture and Industrial Technology Complex site at IH-45, which the Planner thinks is not needed...and has the potential for various better and higher uses with greater yields for the University.
- B) Studies developing long range plans for all off-campus Agriculture facilities at the Gibbs Ranch, and Industrial Technology facilities adjacent to the Campus.
- C) A new and comprehensive study of the Sam Houston Museum and Homes sites, and all other property bounded by Sam Houston Avenue, Avenue O, 17th and 19th Streets...engaging consideration of this area as a Historic District.
- D) A report filed with the Planner by the Athletic Department during the term of this study outlined various needs. The Planner feels the athletic complex is large enough that it should be as a stand-alone consideration...worthy of a master-plan study of its own.
- E) Current master plans giving guidance to Utility and Thermal Energy should

be reviewed and amended as necessary to anticipate project-actions proposed by the **Y2K+10** report.

- F) And, there are other concerns related to ADA (handicap access) and Campus Graphics that will be influenced by this report as well.

If it seems there is no end to the planning process, it is true. And, the University must not surrender this critical issue to a five year or ten year calendar term. Management is well advised to review these issues as regularly as any other concern.

The Planner will say his goodbyes now, with every confidence in the power and potential good this **Y2K+10** document promotes in the future of our, repeat, **our** Sam Houston State University. He does so, also grateful for the opportunity to be a part of it's history and evolution.

Ralph D. Spencer Sr.
Architect-Planner

Huntsville, Texas
July 10, 2001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS Y2K+10

The Planner gratefully acknowledges the faithfully rendered and skillfull assistance of a young student associate and friend who helped me through the documents phase of this work:

Mr. Jason McFadden

Also the courtesies, support and assistance of Graeber, Simmons & Cowan, Architects, Austin, Texas, especially:

Mr. Tommy Cowan, AIA

Mr. Kameron Cheney

Mr. Ed Richburg AIA

And, the respect, courtesies, confidence and freedom given me in the development of this study by my friends:

Dr. Bobby Marks, President

Mr. Jack Parker. V. P.

Ralph D. Spencer Sr.
Architect, Planner