

MINUTES OF THE INFORMAL MEETING
of the
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
November 18, 1971

Present: President Wharton; Trustees Carrigan, Hartman, Huff, Martin, Merriman, Stevens, and Thompson; Executive Vice President and Secretary Breslin, Provost Cantlon, Vice Presidents Muelder, Perrin and Wilkinson; Deans Nonnamaker and Sullivan; Messrs. Ballard, Carr, Dykema, Paul, Spaniolo, Svoren, Wilkie.

Absent: Trustee White.

President Wharton called the informal meeting of the Board of Trustees to order at 7:30 p.m. He then announced that the informal meeting would consist of three presentations: the first to deal with the proposed performing arts center, the second to be a progress report on veterans affairs at the University, and the third to be concerned with financial aids at MSU.

Dr. Wharton explained that the reason for the presentation on the performing arts center was that it would be part of a three-building proposal which the Board would be asked to approve at the formal meeting Friday, November 19. While the proposals for the ice arena and an all-events building have been previously presented to the Trustees, a presentation on the performing arts center has not been made. Dr. Wharton added that in order to assist the Trustees in their decisions concerning a performing arts center, the Administration has conducted an overview of what is being done at several campuses throughout the nation in the development of quality facilities for the arts.

Overview pre-
sented on
various perform-
ing arts
centers

Provost Cantlon reported to the Trustees that Dr. Richard E. Sullivan, Dean of the College of Arts and Letters, and Dr. Wilson B. Paul, Consultant to the Dean, had been asked to conduct this overview. Dr. Cantlon added that there has been growing support among University faculty and students for the upgrading of campus facilities for music and the performing arts. He pointed out that this grass-roots support among the campus community also includes growing interest in the Greater Lansing community. He added that what the University can actually afford in the form of a new facility will be a later stage.

Dean Sullivan reported on the overview which he and Dr. Paul have conducted concerning what is going on at other campuses. He indicated that as one evaluates the current University facilities for the performing arts, it is quite clear that MSU has a problem. He also discussed the high quality of talent in the performing arts among faculty and students. What is now needed, he added, is a quality facility. With assistance from Dean Sullivan, Dr. Paul presented slides of several campuses where quality facilities have been developed. Included were the University of Illinois, University of Indiana, University of Iowa, Iowa State University, Butler University, Purdue University, and Ball State University.

Dean Sullivan recommended that the Board of Trustees and the University community give serious thought to the development of a performing arts facility which would contain a 2,500 seat auditorium, an 800-900 seat recital hall, a 700-800 seat theater, instructional areas for the performing arts, and auxiliary accommodations such as dressing rooms. He then presented a slide of the performing arts center in Milwaukee and indicated that he and Dr. Paul felt that this facility represented a direction that the University go in meeting its needs. In answer to a question by Trustee Huff, Dean Sullivan said that the Milwaukee facility cost about \$12,000,000 to build. Trustee Huff also asked how performing arts facilities are financed at universities. Dean Sullivan responded that generally private gifts were used. However, at Iowa State University, students were assessed a fee to cover a package of performing arts and all-events facilities.

President Wharton pointed out to the Trustees that at the present time there is no firm figure available as to what a performing arts center would cost but the range would appear to be between \$12,000,000 and \$15,000,000. He mentioned some sources of funding that the University might consider for this facility but indicated that any final details would have to be based on availability of funds.

Executive Vice President Breslin asked Dean Sullivan if the performing arts facility at the University of Illinois included faculty offices. He responded that offices for the theater and music departments were included. In response to a question by Trustee Huff, Provost Cantlon indicated that the presentation by Dean Sullivan and Dr. Paul was but the first step in the process. He added that the next step will be to determine cost. Much of this work is to be done by a committee within the Provost's Office and the University architect.

Progress report
on veterans
affairs

President Wharton announced that the next item before the informal meeting was a progress report on veterans affairs at the University as had been previously requested by the Board. Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker mentioned that to date his office has established a veterans newsletter as a communications device aimed at MSU veterans. He indicated that various steps have been taken within the University Administration to assist MSU in being more responsive to the needs of veterans. He mentioned work in the area of academic tutoring, job placement, housing and financial aids.

Trustee Thompson asked how the University defines "dependents" under the veterans category. Dean Nonnamaker responded that these students were children of war veterans who receive special financial assistance from the Federal Government.

Trustee Stevens asked if there was any further information regarding Federal funds for counseling veterans. Don Svoren, Veterans Affairs Coordinator in the Dean of Students Office, responded that he is not aware of any available funds for the counseling of veterans. He pointed out that MSU currently has some 2,485 veterans classified as regular students,

19 veterans in the Agricultural Technology program, and 77 veterans under special rehabilitation programs. In addition, the University has 152 students who are dependents receiving Veterans Administration assistance including widows of servicemen. He added that this brings the University's total of veterans and dependents in its education programs to 2,733.

Trustee Merriman asked if persons in the service applying for admission to the University are automatically channeled through the Veterans Affairs Office. Provost Cantlon responded that efforts are under way in the Admissions Office to indicate when an applicant is a veteran so that special assistance can be given. Trustee Stevens stated that the report by Dean Nonnamaker and Mr. Svoren shows that the University is making progress in the area of veterans affairs. Dr. Nonnamaker added that the University is also exploring possible involvement in the Federal Government's Emergency Employment Program in terms of helping veterans. Vice President Perrin reported that at the present time the money allocated to Ingham County under this program had been spent. He added that there is some hope for additional funds in the future.

Vice President Muelder introduced Henry C. Dykema, Director of Financial Aids under the Office of Dean of Students, for a presentation on financial aids at the University. Dr. Muelder pointed out that in recent years progress has been made in bringing about closer coordination in financial aids between the Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance, the Office of the Dean of Students, and the Admissions Office under the Provost of the University. He added that this is being done through a special committee and is coming along well. He also mentioned the various difficulties faced in operating a financial aids program. Dean Nonnamaker indicated that he and Mr. Dykema would be willing to respond to any questions from the Trustees concerning his office's recent report on financial aids or in the general area of financial aids at MSU.

Report on
Financial Aids

Trustee Thompson asked about the maximum number of sources from which a student can receive financial aid. Dean Nonnamaker responded that generally the limit was five to six sources.

Mr. Dykema made a brief presentation on how a financial package is put together for a student. He indicated the different factors that must be taken into consideration in determining student need. These include family income, financial demands on students, availability of funds, Federal and State requirements for public funded assistance, as well as academic ability. He added that the Federal Government requires that 85 percent of students receiving work-study money must come from families with annual incomes of \$7,500 or less.

Trustee Carrigan asked Mr. Dykema if in evaluating need one of the factors would be the number of children in the family and number of children in college. He responded that this is taken into account. Trustee Merriman asked Mr. Dykema about the University's experience in students paying back loans. Mr. Dykema answered that MSU's experience has been excellent and indicated that much of the credit for this belongs to the business office in collecting loans. He added that the University's experience is not generally found on other campuses in regard to student loans. Trustee Merriman asked how much money is currently involved in student loans. Mr. Dykema responded that MSU has been approved to loan up to \$3,000,000 but that the University won't reach this level due to the Federal Government's inability to completely fund its share of the loan program.

Trustee Huff asked about the loan total in the recent report on financial aids at MSU. Mr. Dykema responded that the total to which Mr. Huff was referring was only National Defense loans. Trustee Merriman asked Mr. Dykema what percent of the money in financial aids represents loan funds. He indicated that about 50 percent of the funds were loans. Trustee Huff asked Dean Nonnamaker if the University has any figures to indicate the average economic resources of MSU's students as compared with students at other universities. Dean Nonnamaker responded that currently 50 percent of the University's students come from families with annual incomes of \$15,000 and over.

President Wharton pointed out that at some of the more expensive private schools, the cost of attending is higher than MSU and therefore there may be greater numbers of students receiving some form of aid than at MSU. He indicated that a more preferable comparison could be made as to the socio-economic profile of the University as compared with other institutions. Mr. Dykema added that the biggest group of MSU students come from families with annual incomes of from \$3,000 to \$6,000. Trustee Huff asked if it wasn't true that on MSU's own student aid grants the average family income was around \$6,000. Mr. Dykema indicated that this was true. Trustee Huff also asked Mr. Dykema if the University was currently short of short-term loan money for students. He responded that at the present time there was enough loan money. Trustee Martin asked Mr. Dykema what methods of communication are used by his office in alerting students to the availability of financial aids. He answered that in addition to the efforts of the Admissions Office, stories appear regularly in the State News. He added that meetings are also held in residence halls in an attempt to provide more information on financial aids. Dean Nonnamaker added that in response to the needs of Chicano students, the University is considering translating the parent's confidential statement document into Spanish.

Trustee Huff asked how many young people who have been admitted to Michigan State are unable to attend due to financial reasons. Dean Nonnamaker responded that his office doesn't know the number. President Wharton added that the magnitude is hard to determine but there appears to be two groups of young people who are affected most seriously. The first group are those young people who have been admitted to MSU as well as several other institutions and find that one of the other schools offers them a better financial package than does the University. The other group are those who come from families which experience a great strain on their financial resources to send them to college but generally do not

qualify as "financial need families" due to their annual income. He pointed out that the University would be hard put to determine how many students don't come to MSU for this reason. He added that Mr. Dykema and his staff try within the availability of resources to help these young people.

Trustee Carrigan asked Mr. Dykema if there are any loan programs available for students who no longer are supported by their parents, especially graduate students. He indicated that as far as using Federal funds for such loans, his office must follow the Federal Government's requirement that the student must not be claimed as an income tax deduction by his family for two years. He added that other funds could be used for these students but again it would depend on the availability of resources.

President Wharton expressed appreciation for the presentation.

The meeting was adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
of the
FINANCE COMMITTEE
November 19, 1971

President Wharton called the Finance Committee meeting to order at 7:40 a.m.

The following members were present: Trustees Carrigan, Hartman, Huff, Martin, Merriman, Stevens, and Thompson; President Wharton, Executive Vice President and Secretary Breslin, Provost Cantlon, Attorney Carr, Vice Presidents Muelder and Wilkinson, Assistant to the President Ballard.

Absent: Trustee White.

Investment
recommendations

- Investment recommendations from Scudder, Stevens & Clark and Mr. George Cress, as follows:

Forest Akers Fund

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Security</u>	<u>Approx. Price</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Income</u>	<u>Yield</u>
Recommend selling:					
4,000	Ford Motor Credit Notes (Out of 9,000) Mat. 12-31-71		\$ 4,000		

Recommend purchasing:					
Up to 250	Scott Paper (making 420)	\$ 16	4,000	\$ 125	3.1%

Forest Akers Golf Course Fund

Recommend selling:					
3,000	Ford Motor Credit Notes (Out of 5,000) Mat. 12-31-71		3,000		
	Cash on Hand		755		

Recommend purchasing:					
Up to 200	Scott Paper	16	3,200	100	3.1%

Albert Case Fund

Recommend selling:					
10,000	Ford Motor Credit Notes (Out of 20,000) Mat. 12-31-71		10,000		

Recommend purchasing:					
Up to 650	Scott Paper (making 1400)	16	10,400	325	3.1%

A. H. & S. A. Case Fund

Recommend selling:					
30,000	Government National Mortgage Assoc. 6.4% Mat. 12-11-87	94	28,200	1,920	6.9%

Recommend purchasing:					
Up to 1,760	Scott Paper	16	28,160	880	3.1%

Finance Committee Minutes, continued

November 19, 1971

1. Investment recommendations, continued

Investment
recommendationsConsolidated Investment Fund

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Security</u>	<u>Approx. Price</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Income</u>	<u>Yield</u>
Recommend selling:					
30,000	Government National Mortgage Association 6.4% Mat. 12-11-87	\$ 94	\$ 28,200	\$1,920	6.9%

Recommend purchasing:

Up to 1,760	Scott Paper (making 3,230)	16	28,160	880	3.1%
----------------	----------------------------	----	--------	-----	------

John Hannah Fund

Recommend selling:

32,000	Ford Motor Credit Notes (Out of 150,000) Mat. 12-31-71		32,000		
--------	---	--	--------	--	--

Recommend purchasing:

Up to 2,000	Scott Paper (making 4,280)	16	32,000	1,000	3.1%
----------------	----------------------------	----	--------	-------	------

Insurance Fund

Recommend selling:

20,000	Government National Mortgage Association 6.4% Mat. 12-11-87 (Out of 40,000)	94	18,800	1,280	6.9%
--------	--	----	--------	-------	------

Recommend purchasing:

Up to 1,150	Scott Paper (making 2,130)	16	18,400	575	3.1%
----------------	----------------------------	----	--------	-----	------

Jenison Fund

Redemption:

26,000	MSC Apt. Bldg. Revenue 3.40% due 5-1-83		26,000	884	
--------	--	--	--------	-----	--

Recommend purchasing:

Up to 1,625	Scott Paper (making 2,745)	16	26,000	812	3.1%
----------------	----------------------------	----	--------	-----	------

H. W. & E. A. Klare Fund

Recommend selling:

16,000	Ford Motor Credit Notes (Out of 73,000) Mat. 12-31-71		16,000		
--------	--	--	--------	--	--

Recommend purchasing:

Up to 1,000	Scott Paper (making 2,100)	16	16,000	500	3.1%
----------------	----------------------------	----	--------	-----	------

Rackham Fund

Redemption:

27,000	MSC Apt. Bldg. Revenue 3.40% due 5-1-83	100	27,000	918	
--------	--	-----	--------	-----	--

Recommend purchasing:

Up to 1,680	Scott Paper	16	26,880	840	3.1%
----------------	-------------	----	--------	-----	------

Retirement Fund

Redemption:

12,000	MSC Apt. Bldg. Revenue 3.40% due 5-1-75		12,000	408	
--------	--	--	--------	-----	--

Principal Payment:

22,000	MSU Women's Co-op Apts.		22,000	990	
--------	-------------------------	--	--------	-----	--

Contribution

75,000

Recommend purchasing:

Up to 6,800	Scott Paper (making 33,073)	16	108,800	3,400	3.1%
----------------	-----------------------------	----	---------	-------	------

Investment
recommendations

1. Investment recommendations, continued

Fred Russ Fund

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Security</u>	<u>Approx. Price</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Income</u>	<u>Yield</u>
Recommend selling:					
10,000	Government National Mortgage Assoc. 12-11-87	\$ 94	\$ 9,400	\$ 640	6.9%
Recommend purchasing:					
Up to 600	Scott Paper	16	9,600	300	3.1%

It was also recommended that Ford Motor Credit Notes maturing on December 31, 1971 in the amount of \$880,000 be extended to January 31, 1972.

On motion by Trustee Hartman, seconded by Trustee Carrigan, it was unanimously voted to approve the investment recommendations.

State News
alternate
refund policy
approved

2. In February 1971, the Board of Trustees approved the separate incorporation of the State News effective July 1, 1971. Included in the February action of the Trustees was authorization of a student referendum to determine the continuation of the \$1.00 fee per term per student after the commencement of winter term of 1972. Since that time, the newly constituted Board of Directors of the State News has instituted a refund policy for students who do not wish to pay \$1.00 per term for the State News. The Board of Directors has recommended to the President that the new refund policy be accepted as an alternative to the single referendum, as authorized by the Trustees in February, since the new policy is in effect a referendum each term for the students of Michigan State University.

The President recommended that the Trustees approve the alternative proposed by the State News Board of Directors.

On motion of Trustee Carrigan, seconded by Trustee Martin, the Board approved unanimously the new refund policy for the State News. The Trustees strongly recommended that adequate publicity be given to this new policy in both the State News and the Student Handbook.

Approval of
Ernst & Ernst
as Univ. audi-
tor for fiscal
1972

3. Vice President Wilkinson introduced a discussion relative to the employment of the University auditor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

Trustee Thompson reported for the Trustee Audit Committee, recommending that Ernst & Ernst be employed to do the audit of the University for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. It was moved by Trustee Thompson, seconded by Trustee Hartman, to approve this recommendation. Carried unanimously.

Univ. officers
authorized to
sign final
agreement for
transfer of
Pontiac osteo-
site

4. Executive Vice President Breslin reported that a final agreement for the transfer of the Pontiac Osteopathic site to the Board of Trustees had been reached, and that on November 11, 1971 a suit had been filed in Oakland County Circuit Court against the Michigan College of Osteopathic Medicine on behalf of the North Oakland Chamber of Commerce seeking a determination of rights as to the osteopathic site in Pontiac. The trial date is set for December 12, 1971. In view of these developments, it was recommended that the Trustees take no action at this time but if MCOM wins the suit and Attorney Carr is satisfied that the Board of Trustees is receiving a clear title to the Pontiac property from MCOM, and if Attorney Carr is satisfied that the Board of Trustees will not become involved in a suit after property transfer, the officers of the University are authorized to sign the necessary papers to consummate the agreement on the property transfer.

It was moved by Trustee Huff, seconded by Trustee Stevens, to approve the above recommendation. Carried by a vote of 6 to 1 with Trustee Thompson voting "No."

Approval ex-
penditures for
off-campus
courses

5. As we have responded to the State's request to move off-campus credit instruction toward a prebudgeted process, it becomes necessary to obtain Board approval for additional expenditures related to offering courses under special contracts.

These direct expenditures are offset by a guarantee from the contracting agency to provide enough student fees to balance all direct costs plus the overhead costs of offering the course.

The Administration recommended the Board approve an additional expenditure of \$32,000 for these contract courses and asserted this would be balanced by student fees or contracting firm payments in any case of inadequate enrollment.

It was moved by Trustee Carrigan, seconded by Trustee Martin, and unanimously voted to approve the above recommendation.

Expansion of
East Lansing
sewage plant
approved

6. Executive Vice President Breslin reported the extensive negotiations that have been under way with the City of East Lansing and Meridian Township relative to the proposed new agreement with the City of East Lansing for the expansion of the East Lansing sewage plant. Following is the detail of the proposed new agreement.

6. Sewage Treatment Agreement, continued

East Lansing
Sewage Plant,
cont.PROPOSED EXPANSION
EAST LANSING WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT

There has been much criticism regarding the inadequacy of the present East Lansing Waste Water Treatment Plant. It is obvious that the City presently discharges sewage and wastes into the Red Cedar River without adequate treatment and the situation must be corrected.

On June 25, 1971 the City signed a stipulation with the Water Resources Commission agreeing to meet immediate and projected future water quality standards. This will necessitate certain alterations to the existing plant, as well as constructing additional new facilities. The City has agreed that this rebuilt treatment plant will be in continuous operation on or before December 31, 1973. The engineering firm of Hubbel-Roth and Clark has been engaged by the City to design a facility capable of producing the required waste effluent quality.

The University has had a continuous agreement with the City since 1927 calling for the City to treat University sewage in facilities financed and constructed by the City. The University has paid a proportion of the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities and a share of the capital costs.

When the present plant was designed in 1962, Meridian Township also entered into a similar agreement with the City. Each party determined their maximum needs based on estimated future population, and on the basis of this information, the plant was designed for an average flow of eight million gallons per day (8 MGD) made up as follows: The City 3.5 MGD, the Township 1.5 MGD, and the University 3 MGD. The following table indicates the actual flow to the plant for the years 1967, 1968, and 1969.

	<u>FLOW IN MGD</u>			
	<u>Design</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
MSU	3. (37.5%)	4.60 (59.9%)	4.90 (52.6%)	4.90 (53.8%)
Meridian Twp.	1.5 (18.7%)	1.22 (15.6%)	1.44 (15.5%)	1.56 (17.2%)
East Lansing	<u>3.5 (43.8%)</u>	<u>1.88 (24.5%)</u>	<u>2.96 (31.9%)</u>	<u>2.64 (29.0%)</u>
	8	7.70	9.30	9.10

The table indicates the serious overloading due to the rapid growth in the campus population after the plant was put into operation.

The Engineers designing the proposed expanded plant have based the new design size on the following estimated population:

	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1990</u>
MSU	48,000	50,000	55,000
Meridian Twp.	23,500	30,700	45,000
East Lansing	<u>18,000</u>	<u>24,000</u>	<u>30,000</u>
	89,500	104,700	130,000

From this population estimate they have determined the following capacities:

	<u>PLANT CAPACITY (MGD)</u>		
	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1990</u>
MSU	4.5 (51.0%)	5.5 (44.0%)	6.0 (40.0%)
Meridian Twp.	1.7 (19.8%)	3.4 (27.2%)	5.0 (33.3%)
East Lansing	<u>2.5 (29.2%)</u>	<u>3.6 (28.8%)</u>	<u>4.0 (26.7%)</u>
	8.7*	12.5	15.0

*Based on recorded data

Therefore the new plant will be designed for a capacity of 15 MGD based on 1990 population projections.

The present agreement with the City states that any necessary expansion to the present plant will be paid for by the party requiring such expansion. Because the qualitative improvements required by the new water standards are so much a part of the need for plant expansion, the City agrees that this method of financing expansion should be abandoned and a new one agreed upon. Because of the obvious inequities in the original capacity requirements, it has been tentatively agreed that the unpaid balance of the present plant and the cost of the proposed plant expansion and improvements be treated as one project. The following formula has been devised for the allocation of the total project:

The engineers, Hubbel-Roth and Clark, estimate that the useful life of the plant is approximately 40 years. It is proposed that the combined cost of the plant be divided into three periods, and allocated according to the depreciation accounted for by each party in that period.

East Lansing Sewage Plant, cont.

6. Sewage Treatment Agreement, continued

Period 1: 1974-1980 = 6 years or 15% (6/40) of total cost
 Period 2: 1980-1990 = 10 years or 25% (10/40) of total cost
 Period 3: 1990-2014 = 24 years or 60% (24/40) of total cost
 TOTAL 40 years 100%

Period 1: Use 15% of total depreciation/cost of plant

During this period, Michigan State University will utilize 51.0% of the plant's operation, and therefore, will account for 7.7% (51.0% x 15%) of the total depreciation (cost) of the plant for its use of the plant during this period.

Meridian Township will utilize 19.8% of the plant's operation, and therefore, will account for 2.9% (19.8% x 15%) of the total depreciation (cost) of the plant for its use of the plant during this period.

East Lansing will utilize 29.2% of the plant's operation, and therefore, will account for 4.4% (29.2% x 15%) of the total depreciation (cost) of the plant for its use of the plant during this period.

Period 2: Use 25% of total depreciation/cost of plant

	<u>Percentage of Use</u>	<u>Percentage of Cost</u>
MSU	44.0	11.0 (44.0% x 25%)
Meridian Twp.	27.2	6.8 (27.2% x 25%)
East Lansing	28.8	7.2 (28.8% x 25%)

Period 3: Use 60% of total depreciation/cost of plant

	<u>Percentage of Use</u>	<u>Percentage of Cost</u>
MSU	40.0	24.0 (40.0% x 60%)
Meridian Twp.	33.3	20.0 (33.3% x 60%)
East Lansing	26.7	16.0 (26.7% x 60%)

In summary, the unpaid balance of the present plant and the cost of the new plant would be allocated as follows:

	<u>Period 1</u> <u>(15%)</u>	<u>Period 2</u> <u>(25%)</u>	<u>Period 3</u> <u>(60%)</u>	<u>Total</u>
MSU	7.7%	11.0%	24.0%	42.7%
Meridian Twp.	2.9%	6.8%	20.0%	29.7%
East Lansing	4.4%	7.2%	16.0%	27.6%
	<u>15.0%</u>	<u>25.0%</u>	<u>60.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

The cost of the Waste Water Treatment Project has been estimated at approximately \$10,050,000. Under present laws it is anticipated that combined Federal and State grants will provide \$7,500,000 of this amount. Assuming a 6% rate of interest the City has determined a total project cost, including estimated interest for a 25-year amortization period, of \$2,550,000 for principal and \$2,437,164 in interest, making a total of \$4,987,164. This amount, together with an unpaid balance of the present plant of \$4,453,686, makes a total project cost of approximately \$8,272,145.

Michigan State University's share of the project cost using the 42.7% developed in the above formula will be \$3,532,205. This amount can vary somewhat depending on actual construction cost and final interest rates.

On motion by Trustee Thompson, seconded by Trustee Carrigan, the Trustees unanimously approved the proposed new agreement with the City of East Lansing for the expansion of the East Lansing Sewage plant and authorized the officers of the University to make a supplemental budget request to the State for funds to cover the University's share of the expanded sewage plant.

7. Asking Budget for MERIT Computer Network Project

Vice President Muelder presented the MERIT Computer Network Project budget request for fiscal 1972-73. A copy of this budget request is filed in the Secretary's Office and is made a part of these minutes.

Motion was made by Trustee Carrigan, seconded by Trustee Huff, to approve the MERIT budget request. Unanimously carried.

Adjourned.

1972-73 Budget Request for MERIT approved