

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

June 6, 1985
10:30 a.m. - 2:05 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Fred R. Sheheen, Chairman
Mr. George L. Brightcharp
Mr. W. Jerry Fedder
Mr. Robert C. Gallagher
Mr. Robert E. Graham
Mr. Harold W. Jacobs
Dr. Alba M. Lewis
Mr. David B. Smith
Mr. Mortimer F. Smith
Mrs. Nanette H. Smyth
Mrs. Nelle H. Taylor
Mr. Robert L. Utsey, Jr.
Mr. William J. Whitener
Dr. Robert F. Williams
Mr. Robert L. Wynn III

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dr. Willa J. DeWitt
Mr. Roosevelt Gilliam, Jr.
Mr. B. P. Gordon III

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

Mr. John Norton
Ms. Clisby Williams

GUESTS

Dr. John T. Austell
Dr. Francis T. Borkowski
Dr. Belinda Friedman
Dr. Andrew Hugine
Dr. Charles E. Kaylor, Jr.
Mr. Hans Knoop
Mr. Philip Lader
Ms. Lynnette D. Lown
Mr. J. Lacy McLean
B. Gen. George F. Meenaghan
Dr. W. Marcus Newberry, Jr.
Mr. John Presto
Mr. Marion E. Woodbury
Mr. Mark A. Wright

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Mr. Charles A. Brooks, Jr.
Ms. Sandra E. Carr
Dr. Jeanette A. Deas
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Mr. Alan S. Krech
Dr. Gail M. Morrison
Dr. James A. Paschal
Mr. John E. Smalls
Dr. Leonard P. Sternbach
Dr. John C. Sutusky
Ms. Gaylon Syrett
Ms. Julia E. Wells

I. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 2, 1985

It was moved (Lewis), seconded (Brightcharp), and voted that the minutes of the meeting of May 2, 1985, be adopted as written.

II. Report of Committee on Academic Affairs

Mrs. Taylor, chairman of the Committee on Academic Affairs, reported on the following matter:

Notice of Promulgation of Regulations for Teacher Loan Program in 1985-86.
In December 1984 the Commission adopted regulations governing operation of the Teacher Loan Program, as authorized by the Education Improvement Act of 1984.

In April 1985 the Commission approved and filed notice, as required under the State Registry Act, that regulations would be promulgated. The notice included an invitation to the public to submit written comments or to request a public hearing. No written comments or requests for a public hearing were received.

The Committee recommends that Dr. Boozer submit the regulations, as approved by the Commission, for publication in the State Register, constituting promulgation of the regulations. It was moved (Taylor), seconded (Smyth), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

III. Report of Committee on Business and Finance

Mr. Gallagher, chairman of the Committee on Business and Finance, reported on the following matters:

a. Consideration of Appropriation Formula Revisions for 1986-87. The Appropriation Formula Advisory Committee met on Monday, April 15, 1985, to review and recommend changes in the 1985-86 Appropriation Formula for consideration by the Committee on Business and Finance. The Committee on Business and Finance met on May 13 and adopted the following recommendations:

(1) Student/Faculty Ratios. Based on the results of a review of current student/faculty ratios conducted by the Committee on Academic Affairs, the Business and Finance Committee recommends no change in the formula student/faculty ratios at this time. The Committee also recommends that additional data on faculty workload be collected for use in further review of all student/faculty ratios for possible use in the 1987-88 formula review process. It was moved (Gallagher), seconded (Taylor), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

(2) Library Funding. Based on the results of a review by the Committee on Academic Affairs of the current formula method of funding libraries, and on comparisons of formulas used in other SREB States, the Committee on Business and Finance recommends no change in the library step of the formula for 1986-87. Mr. Graham noted that the formula generates excessive appropriations in the case of medical schools. He requested that the Committee consider revising the formula to reflect this problem. Mr. Gallagher stated that the Committee has discussed this and other possible future changes. It was moved (Gallagher), seconded (Smyth), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

(3) Special Funding for Honors Programs. The Committee on Business and Finance recommends, consistent with the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Affairs, that no special provision be added to the formula for funding honors programs. The Business and Finance Committee further recommends, however, that the Commission notify the institutions that it would be receptive to justify requests for special funding for honors programs under the unique cost step (Step 12) of the formula. It was moved (Gallagher), seconded (Taylor), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

(4) Credit Hour FTE Divisors for Medicine and Dentistry. The FTE divisor currently used in the formula for medicine and dentistry is 20 and the funding for these disciplines is based on fall enrollment. MUSC and the USC School of Medicine, however, require different numbers of credit hours for medical

degrees. MUSC requires 204 credit hours based on a 32 week academic year plus summer school and USC requires 172 credit hours based on a 48 week academic year and no summer school. The staffs of the Commission and the two medical institutions have reviewed the disparities between credit hours at both institutions and have determined that using headcount enrollment for medicine and dentistry would be a more accurate method of determining funding for these disciplines. The Committee on Business and Finance recommends that funding for medicine and dentistry be based on headcount enrollment rather than FTE's. It was moved (Gallager), seconded (Wynn), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

(5) Change in the Method of Calculating Funding for Summer School Enrollment. Currently, the formula adds fall, spring, and summer credit hours together and determines FTE by dividing by 30 (12 fall, 12 spring, and 6 summer) at the master's level, and by 24 (9 fall, 9 spring, and 6 summer) at the doctoral level. The Committee believes a more accurate way of funding summer enrollment is to determine the actual formula faculty salary cost per credit hour, multiply by actual summer school credit hours, and adjust the result by a uniform percentage (except MUSC and S.C. State). For example, the student/faculty ratio for business at the Group I master's level is 17 FTE students to one faculty member. The formula average faculty salary for business is \$38,530. The salary divided by the total number of credit hours generated by 17 FTE students is the salary cost per credit hours, i.e., $\$38,530 - (17 \text{ FTE students} \times 12 \text{ credit hours} \times 2 \text{ semesters}) = \94.44 . This amount multiplied by the actual number of credit hours generated in Business at a Group I institution during the summer session equals the faculty salary costs for that discipline.

Since approximately 40% to 60% of the total summer school E & G costs for all institutions (except MUSC & S.C. State) are generated by student fees, the total calculated for summer school should be adjusted to reflect this. The Committee on Business and Finance recommends, therefore, that funding for summer school enrollment be calculated by the above method and that institutions (except MUSC & S.C. State) be funded at 60% of the total summer school salary costs. It was moved (Gallager) that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted. The motion was amended (Utsey) seconded (Taylor), and voted to note that the two exceptions cited above (MUSC and South Carolina State College) will be phased in as the percentages of their fees for E&G operations are increased.

(6) Annualizing all Levels of Enrollment. When the formula was revised to include annualized graduate credit hours, it was a step toward annualizing all levels of enrollment. It has been viewed by some members of the Legislature, as well as the staff, as inconsistent to annualize one level of credit hours (graduate), but not another (undergraduate). South Carolina is the only state among the 14 SREB states that practices this inconsistency. All other states in this region with the exception of Maryland (which funds on the basis of fall and spring enrollments) fund summer school at all levels.

At present, the funding of undergraduate education is based on fall enrollment. As most institutions experience a decrease in enrollment from fall to spring, the funding of undergraduate education is currently based on the fall peak load. Most institutions plan for this decrease, and it should be taken into consideration in the formula.

The Committee therefore recommends that undergraduate as well as graduate education be funded on an annual basis using the method discussed in item 5

(above) for the funding of summer school at all levels. It was moved (Gallager), seconded (Smyth), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

(7) Counting Course Auditors for Funding Purposes. The Committee considered a request to include course auditors in the credit hour count for funding. It has been the Commission's policy in the past that auditors not be counted for funding purposes. The Committee on Business and Finance recommends that this policy be continued. It was moved (Gallager), seconded (Whitener), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

It was moved (Gallager), seconded (Wynn), and voted that the Appropriation Formula for 1986-87, as amended, be adopted (Exhibit A).

b. Consideration of Proposed 1985-86 Administrative Budget of the Teacher Loan Program. Mr. Gallager reported that the Education Improvement Act (1984) authorized the establishment of a Teacher Loan Program, to be administered by the South Carolina Student Loan Corporation. A provision of the EIA with respect to this program is that "appropriations for loans and administrative costs incurred by the Corporation are to be provided in annual amounts, recommended by the Commission on Higher Education, to the State Treasurer for use by the Corporation." The State Board of Education requested and was appropriated \$1.5 million for loans and administrative costs for this program in FY 84-85. The State Board requested, without reference to the Commission, \$2.5 million for loans and administrative costs for the program for 1985-86. This amount was approved by the House and is under consideration by the Senate.

The Board of Trustees of the Student Loan Corporation approved, at its spring quarter meeting on May 8, 1985, a proposed budget for administration of the Teacher Loan Program for 1985-86.

The corresponding budget for administration of the Teacher Loan Program for 1984-85, totaling \$140,740, was approved by the Commission in November 1984. The Corporation requests Commission approval of an operating budget of \$77,970 for 1985-86 for the Teacher Loan Program. The higher cost in the first year was due to start-up costs for computer software to process Teacher Loan applications, an expenditure not needed in the second year.

The Committee on Business and Finance recommends that the proposed operating expenditures of \$77,970 by the South Carolina Student Loan Corporation for administration of the Teacher Loan Program be approved. It was moved (Gallager), seconded (Utsey), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

c. Status Report on 1985-86 Appropriation Bill. Mr. Gallager reported on the status of the 1985-86 Appropriation Bill as recommended by the Senate Finance Committee.

IV. Report of Committee on Facilities

Mr. Graham, chairman of the Committee on Facilities, reported on the following matters:

a. Informational Report on Project Approved by the Committee -- Request to Recondition Turf on the Athletic Fields, Clemson University. Mr. Graham reported for information that in accordance with procedures adopted by the

Commission on April 4, 1985, the Facilities Committee on May 2 approved a request by Clemson University to recondition turf on the athletic fields at an estimated cost of \$240,000, to be funded with athletic operating funds.

b. Consideration of 1985-86 Annual Permanent Improvement Plans of the Public Colleges and Universities. The Committee reviewed projects proposed for 1985-86 by the public colleges and universities and makes the following recommendations:

<u>The Citadel</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u>
1.	Daniel Library - exterior waterproof/paint	\$ 30,466
2.	Thompson Hall - exterior waterproof/paint	32,000
3.	Removal and replacement of insulation - two buildings	328,000
4.	Summerall Chapel - repair/protect stained glass windows	130,000
5.	Remove/replace streetlights on campus	130,000
6.	Murray Infirmary and Coward Hall - install boilers	134,000
7.	Exterior painting and waterproofing	150,000
8.	Roof repairs - various locations on campus	181,500
9.	Exterior concrete patching	200,000
10.	General renovation and repair	60,000
		<u>\$1,275,966</u>

The Committee recommends approval. It was moved (Graham), seconded (Lewis), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

Clemson University

1.	Rhodes Engineering Research Center - structural renovation	95,000
2.	Fike Recreation Center - repair/replace gutters and downspouts	175,000
3.	Martin Hall - replace fan coil units	150,000
4.	Lee Hall Original Wing - reroof and replace coil units	90,000
5.	Freeman Hall - replace transformers	50,000
6.	Long Hall - replace drain, waste, ventilation piping	130,000
7.	Newman Hall - replace windows	255,000
8.	Holtzendorff YMCA Center - renovate plumbing system	30,000
9.	Physical Plan Parking Lot - repair	65,000
10.	Calhoun Courts - expansion of parking	70,000
11.	Expansion of Computer Center Machine Room	1,800,000
12.	Campus - additional COAX cable	100,000
13.	Riggs Hall - renovation of classrooms and support areas	75,000
14.	Daniel Hall - renovate Room 209	36,000
15.	Earle Hall - renovate laboratories	85,000
16.	Pool Agricultural Center	90,000
17.	Greenhouse 8 - refurbish	40,000
18.	Gentry Hall modifications	170,000
19.	Norris Hall - replace gutters	50,000
20.	Recondition fan coil units in Johnstone A, B, C, & F	120,000
21.	Lever Hall - replace carpet	150,000

22. Harcombe Dining Hall - reroof	210,000
23. Fike Recreation Center - regunite pool and diving tank	60,000
24. Intramural Tennis Courts - recondition	40,000
25. YMCA Recreational Building - reroof	31,000
26. Memorial Stadium - new prospect room	175,000
27. Memorial Stadium - seal asphalt	30,000
28. Memorial Stadium - clean and seal older concrete stands	100,000
29. Varsity Tennis Court Shelter	550,000
30. Outdoor Lab - swimming pool	120,000
	<u>\$5,125,000</u>

The Committee recommends approval of the 28 maintenance projects, as well as Project 29 (Tennis Court Shelter) which will be funded by private donations, for a total of \$3,325,000. The Committee does not recommend Project 11 (Computer Room). It was moved (Graham) and seconded (Lewis) that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted. Mr. D. Smith objected to approving Project 26 (Memorial Stadium: New Prospect Room, \$175,000), to be utilized to entertain prospective scholarship athletes and their families during official campus visits. The motion was amended (D. Smith) and seconded (Fedder) to delete Project 26. Mr. Utsey requested that the Committee on Business and Finance obtain reports of the financial condition of athletic departments at the public colleges and universities. Mr. M. Smith stated that it would be unjust on the part of the Commission to disallow the recommendation of the Committee in only one particular case without examining such programs at the other colleges and universities. Mrs. Taylor concurred. Mr. Fedder noted that a new computer at Clemson was damaged because of inadequate air-conditioning. He suggested that the Commission go on record in favor of protecting computers valued at \$4.5 million before investing \$175,000 in a room to entertain prospective athletes. Mr. Sheheen suggested that a study be made concerning auxiliary enterprise funds used for athletic programs.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Mark A. Wright, Clemson's Campus Master Planner, stated that Clemson is aware of the conflict between athletic and academic programs. He noted that in the past two years the athletic department at Clemson has provided funds to the University and the community for academic purposes and various other causes.

The amendment was disapproved, by eight negative and four affirmative votes. The motion was amended (Wynn) and seconded (Taylor) to include the comment that the Commission requests that an appropriate share of auxiliary enterprise funds is made available for non-athletic purposes. Mr. Gallager suggested that the Commission request the State Auditor to review cost allocations for administrative costs between auxiliary enterprises and academic programs, and that such information be included in each institution's annual management letter with copies available to members of the Commission. A substitute amendment was made (M. Smith), seconded (Wynn), and voted to provide that the Committee on Facilities be directed to utilize the report of the State Auditor in consideration of projects funded by auxiliary enterprises.

College of Charleston

1. College Inn - paint interior and replace doors	\$ 40,000
2. College Inn - roof repair	35,000
3. Replace Roof at Small Library	85,000
4. Small Library - upgrade the HVAC system	30,000

5. Sottile House - exterior painting	40,000
6. Buist Rivers Residence Hall	40,000
7. Rutledge Rivers Residence Hall	40,000
8. The Knox Lesesne House	32,000
9. Fine Arts Center - flood/water control	35,000
10. Science Center - roof repair	30,000
11. Stern Student Center - renovate and upgrade interior	100,000
12. Thaddeus Street Education Center	50,000
13. 9 Liberty Street - first floor renovation	100,000
14. Deferred maintenance	100,000
15. Maybank Hall - upgrade elevator system	50,000
	<u>\$ 807,000</u>

The Committee recommends approval. It was moved (Graham), seconded (Smyth), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

Francis Marion College

1. Upgrade Sewage Plant	\$158,000
2. Campus Antenna System	50,000
3. Refinish Smith College Center Gym Floor	40,000
	<u>\$ 248,000</u>

The Committee recommends approval. It was moved (Graham), seconded (M. Smith), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

Lander College

1. Genesis Hall Repairs	\$ 60,000
2. Tennis Court Resurfacing	35,000
3. President's House - reception room	110,000
	<u>\$ 205,000</u>

It was moved (Graham), seconded (Gallager), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

Medical University of South Carolina

1. Biomedical Research Center (Institutional Bonds)	\$5,000,000
2. Anderson Property	
Institutional Bonds (\$187,000)	
Excess Debt Service (\$188,000)	375,000
	<u>\$5,375,000</u>

Mr. D. Smith requested that the projects be considered separately. Mr. Graham noted that the Biomedical Research Center has been approved by the Commission and is listed as #64 on the 1984 capital improvement bond priority list under consideration by the Senate. He stated that the University plans to service the institutional bonds from revenues received from MUSC's operational cost share of federal grants to do animal research studies. Mr. Smith expressed the opinion that MUSC could renovate another facility for this purpose for less than \$5 million. Mr. Marion E. Woodbury, MUSC Vice President for Finance, stated that all of the institution's buildings currently are in use. The Committee recommends approval. It was moved (Graham), seconded (Utsey), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

Mr. Graham noted that the purchase of the Anderson property will complete the overall boundary of the University. The property consists of a main house containing 5,800 sq. ft., a kitchen building of 2,500 sq. ft., and a garage of 748 sq. ft. The house and related buildings are occupied. MUSC will not take possession of the property during the lifetime of the current owners who will rent the property from the University for \$1,500 per month. Renovation will not take place until MUSC takes possession. Mr. Graham noted that the Committee has strong reservations about approving the purchase of the property but, because it is located within the planned boundary of the University, it recommends approval with the proviso that this purchase will complete the boundary lines of MUSC and no more land or building acquisition will be requested outside the boundary.

Mr. D. Smith expressed concern with respect to the overall indebtedness of MUSC and other institutions in the State. He suggested exercising caution by placing reasonable limits on rapid growth at MUSC. Mr. Utsey stated that while this would be an excellent purchase he is concerned about purchasing a house for a president who might never occupy it. Mr. Woodbury stated that the building might be used for academic offices or other purposes. It was moved (Graham), seconded (Smyth), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

It was moved (Utsey) and seconded (D. Smith) that the Committee on Business and Finance be requested to make a study concerning the build-up in excess debt funds. The motion was adopted.

South Carolina State College

1. Dukes Gymnasium	\$ 57,000
2. South Campus (residential facility)	200,000
3. Turner Hall: replacement of roof	150,000
4. Rowe Hall: installation of A/C unit	75,000
5. Nix Hall	75,000
6. Miller Hall: replace windows and doors	114,000
7. M.F. Whittaker Library	40,000
	<u>\$ 659,000</u>

The Committee recommends approval. It was moved (Graham), seconded (Brightharp), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

USC Columbia

1. Abestos abatement - Phase I	\$3,500,000
2. Wardlaw - window/wall repair	30,000
3. BA - patio repair	35,000
4. LeConte/Petigru gutter repair	80,000
5. P.E. Center - facade repair	75,000
6. Thomas Cooper Library - patio waterproofing	30,000
7. B.A.-Close Building - roof repair	80,000
8. Printing roof replacement	40,000
9. I Building roof replacement	37,000
10. Bates House roof replacement	37,000
11. Elliott/Pinckney roof replacement	59,000

12. Law Center renovation	190,000
13. P.E. Center modifications - Phase I	35,000
14. Racquetball courts	350,000
15. Coliseum - arena modifications	175,000
16. McBryde Quadrangle - Phase I	400,000
17. Towers mechanical systems - planning	250,000
18. BA Building HVAC control repairs	33,000
19. Utilities - modifications/repair/expansion	352,000
	<u>\$5,688,000</u>

The Committee recommends approval. It was moved (Graham) and seconded that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted. Mr. Sheheen requested, and it was agreed, that the motion be amended to provide that the racquetball courts will be accessible to all students and faculty. The motion was adopted.

USC-Spartanburg

1. Campus development - Phase I	\$ 60,000
2. Roof repair project: Hodge Center	40,000
3. Gym floor replacement	100,000
	<u>\$ 200,000</u>

The Committee recommends approval. It was moved (Graham), seconded (Lewis), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

USC-Sumter

1. Roof replacements	\$ 50,000
----------------------	-----------

The Committee recommends approval. It was moved (Graham), seconded (Utsey), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

Winthrop College

1. Bancroft painting	\$ 80,000
2. Thomson Cafeteria: entrance improvements	30,000
3. Water tower retrofit	30,000
4. Tillman Auditorium renovation	300,000
5. Byrnes acoustical improvements	35,000
6. Roddey Apartments renovation	500,000
7. Lee Wicker painting	60,000
8. Winthrop Lodge painting	34,000
	<u>\$1,069,000</u>

The Committee recommends approval. It was moved (Graham), seconded (Fedder), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education

1. Aiken Technical College - Early Child Care Training	\$ 62,475
2. Trident Technical College - Installation of Auxiliary Building: Automotive	36,000
	<u>\$ 98,475</u>

Mr. Graham noted that the Committee recommends approval of the Aiken Technical College project contingent upon approval by the Commission of the child care program. With this understanding, the Committee recommends that the projects be approved. It was moved (Graham), seconded (Brightharp), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted.

V. Report of Committee on Implementation of the State Desegregation Plan

In the absence of Mr. Gilliam, chairman of the Committee on Implementation of the State Desegregation Plan, Mr. M. Smith reported on the following matter:

Recommended Desegregation Plan Allocations for 1985-86. The Committee recommends that \$3,857,347 available for Desegregation Plan activities in 1985-86 be distributed as follows in 1985-86:

1. ENHANCEMENT		\$2,597,122
a. S.C. State College	\$2,403,994	
b. Denmark TEC	193,128	
2. GRADUATE INCENTIVE FELLOWSHIPS		500,000
a. USC-Columbia	175,000	
b. MUSC	100,000	
c. Clemson	105,000	
d. The Citadel	20,000	
e. The College of Charleston	25,000	
f. Winthrop	35,000	
g. S.C. State	40,000	
3. PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT PROJECTS		47,820
a. Charleston County	\$14,770	
b. Darlington County	10,000	
c. Marion District #2	14,050	
d. Spartanburg District #6	9,000	
4. OTHER DESEGREGATION PLAN ACTIVITIES AT STATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION		605,344
a. Charleston Higher Education Consortium	\$ 10,100	
b. The Citadel	21,391	
c. Clemson	32,457	
d. Denmark Technical College	15,208	
e. College of Charleston	80,240	
f. Francis Marion	71,723	
g. Lander	58,716	
h. MUSC	42,000	
i. USC-Aiken	20,000	
j. USC-Beaufort	5,000	
k. USC-Coastal Carolina	18,405	
l. USC-Columbia	123,559	
m. USC-Spartanburg	44,100	
n. Winthrop	62,445	

5. CHE ADMINISTRATION	98,000
6. UNALLOCATED	<u>9,061</u>
TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE	\$3,857,347

It was moved (M. Smith) and seconded (Lewis) that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted. Mr. Gallagher expressed concern with respect to the source of funding for these activities at the conclusion of the five-year Plan. He asked if the institutions will then be able to absorb the costs involved. Mr. Sheheen stated that the assumption has been that the programs established by the start-up funds appropriated for the Plan will generate sufficient revenue in the Appropriation Formula to support them in subsequent years. He suggested that the Committee prepare for Commission consideration a listing of continuing higher education desegregation efforts at the conclusion of the Plan. The motion was amended (Gallagher) to provide that by September 1985 a report be made on how the institutions plan to absorb the costs and programs in future years. The amended motion was adopted.

Mr. Sheheen expressed appreciation to the Governor, the Commission, and the staff for their efforts and assistance in urging funding by the Legislature of the proposed study of higher education in South Carolina.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gaylon Syrett
Recording Secretary