

10-6-1967

Board of Trustees Minutes, October 6, 1967

Eastern Washington State College

Follow this and additional works at: http://dc.ewu.edu/trustees_minutes

Recommended Citation

Board of Trustees Minutes, October 6, 1967. Board of Trustees Records, University Archives & Special Collections, Eastern Washington University, Cheney, WA. http://dc.ewu.edu/trustees_minutes.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Board of Trustees Records at EWU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Board of Trustees Minutes by an authorized administrator of EWU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jotto@ewu.edu.

Approved 11/17/67

Eastern Washington State College

MINUTES OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

Empire Room, Davenport Hotel
Spokane, Washington
October 6, 1967

The Board of Trustees of Eastern Washington State College held a special meeting on Friday, October 6, 1967, in the Empire Room at the Davenport Hotel. The meeting was called to order by the chairman, Mr. Melvin B. Voorhees, at 7:45 P.M., with the following present:

Members:

Mr. Melvin B. Voorhees, Chairman
Mr. Harvey Erickson
Mr. Thomas Meagher
Mr. Robert F. Brachtenbach

Staff:

Dr. Emerson Shuck, President
Mr. Fred S. Johns, Business Manager
Dr. Wayne L. Loomis, Associate
Director of Research
Mr. Henry Koslowsky, Director of
Public Information

Guests:

Mr. Frederic A. Long, Associate Architect, Division of Engineering and Architecture
Mr. Robert Peck
Mr. Carroll Martell - Culler, Gale, Martell & Ericson
Mr. William C. James - Carlson & James
Mr. David McKinley, Kirk, Wallace & McKinley
Mr. A. W. Carlson - Carlson & James

The Chairman announced that this special meeting had been called to consider statements made by Mr. Robert Peck in a letter to the Trustees, to the effect that more than four hundred thousand dollars could have been saved by changes in the design of Dryden, Dressler, and Streeter Halls. (Letter attached.) Mr. Peck had been employed as resident construction inspector by the firm of Culler, Gale, Martell and Ericson, design architects on Pearce, Dryden, and Dressler Halls, and is currently employed by Carlson and James and Kirk, Wallace and McKinley, design architects on Streeter Hall. Under the terms of the architectural agreement in each case, the architect was reimbursed by the College for the amount of Mr. Peck's salary and payroll taxes, since the standard State architectural contract form does not provide for resident inspection as a basic service of the architect to be performed within the basic fee schedule. This arrangement was necessitated by the requirement of the Department of Housing of Urban Development

for full time inspection services on buildings financed with Federal loans.

Mr. Voorhees noted that copies of Mr. Peck's letter had been furnished to each of the architectural firms represented at the meeting and he asked if anyone wished to have the letter read aloud by the Secretary. There was no request to have it read.

The Chairman asked if Mr. Peck wished to amend or enlarge on any of the statements made in his letter. Mr. Peck asked if the Board wished to see the evidence that he had to support his conclusions. Mr. Meagher asked if all the facts were in the letter or whether Mr. Peck had something to add. Mr. Peck replied that he felt that he had been in an unfortunate situation because he was employed by one set of people and working for another. Mr. Meagher repeated his previous question as to whether the letter was complete. Mr. Peck said that he thought that it was.

The Chairman asked if any others present wanted to make a statement. Mr. Martell said that he felt that serious charges had been made in a general way and that some evidence should be presented to substantiate them. Mr. Carlson said that he felt the same and would have to hear specific charges before he could answer them. Mr. McKinley also asked to hear the specific areas of criticism. The Chairman then asked Mr. Peck to make his statement.

Mr. Peck presented a series of drawings that he had made of Dryden Hall and explained how construction costs could have been reduced by constructing a four-story rectangular building and by changing the room arrangement. Mr. Meagher asked Mr. Peck if he were challenging the competency of the design architects. Mr. Peck replied that he was not. Mr. Meagher asked him what he was challenging. Mr. Peck said that he was attempting to show how money could be saved by the College if there were someone on the College staff who could perform a critical review of the architect's preliminary design plans. Mr. Meagher asked Mr. Peck if he were a licensed engineer or architect or whether he had a college degree of any kind. Mr. Peck replied in the negative. Mr. Brachtenbach asked Mr. Peck if he were saying that if he had been on the Board of Trustees he would not have approved the architects' schematic or preliminary plans. Mr. Peck replied in the negative and said that a critical review of any architect's design might reveal areas where construction savings could be obtained.

Mr. Brachtenbach asked Mr. Peck to suggest how the college's procedures could be corrected to avoid spending money on extravagant design, if in fact such designs had been approved. Mr. Peck replied that if he had been employed by the College to review the architect's plans, he could have pointed out certain costly design features early enough for the administration and Board to consider whether they wished to pay for them.

The Chairman asked if the Dryden Hall architect wished to reply to Mr.

Peck's statements. Mr. Martell stated that Dryden Hall was constructed at a cost of \$4,400 per student, which was a typical unit cost for dormitory construction in this area at that time. He briefly reviewed the relationship of the design to the program that had been given to him by the College, noting, for example, that the rectangular rooms were laid end-to-end rather than side-to-side (as suggested by Mr. Peck) in order to minimize the transmission of noise between rooms. Mr. Voorhees noted that Mr. Martell had covered all of these same points when he presented the building's schematic and preliminary designs to the Board and that the Board had been fully apprised of the fact that the design involved costs to achieve a pleasant environment for the students living and studying in the dormitory.

Mr. Meagher asked Mr. Peck whether he was suggesting an improvement in the processing of supervising the construction of building or whether he was asking for a position on the College staff. Mr. Peck replied that he had an application for employment with the College on file for the past four and one-half years, and that he would like clarification as to whether he is to be a College employee or he is to work for the architects so that he can orient his thinking. Mr. Meagher repeated his question and Mr. Peck answered "Both". Mr. Erickson asked Mr. Peck if he knew of anything that would suggest that the architects had endeavored to raise construction costs to the detriment of the owner. Mr. Peck replied that he did not.

Mr. Voorhees asked if any others present wished to speak. Mr. McKinley said he was concerned about the lack of time to prepare an answer to Mr. Peck's criticism and was also concerned about the legal aspects raised by Mr. Peck's letter.

Mr. Long noted that Mr. Peck had referred earlier in the meeting to a letter he had received from Mr. Long which included the statement "inasmuch as you are paid by the school". Mr. Long asked Mr. Peck if the Division of Engineering and Architecture had ever asked him for any information or report beyond what Mr. Peck had furnished to the project architect. Mr. Peck replied in the negative.

It was moved by Mr. Brachtenbach and seconded by Mr. Erickson that the meeting be adjourned at 9:15 P.M. Motion carried.

APPROVED:

Melvin B. Voorhees, Chairman

Fred B. Johns, Secretary