

Minutes of the Special Meeting
of the
Oakland University
Board of Trustees
April 21, 1984

The meeting was called to order at 8:10 a.m. by Vice-chairman Alex Mair in Lounge II of the Oakland Center.

Present: Trustees Patricia Hartmann, Alex Mair, Wallace Riley, Arthur Saltzman, and Howard Sims

Absent: Trustees David Handleman, Richard Headlee, and Ken Morris

Mr. Mair turned the meeting over to President Joseph E. Champagne.

President Champagne stated that the special meeting was convened to review the proposed addition to the Kresge Library. The concept of expanding the Kresge Library has been under consideration for many years. The original library was designed for approximately 5,000 students and the University's current headcount is about 12,084 students with an FYES enrollment of approximately 9,300 students. The library is undersized and the State, recognizing this fact in 1977, approved a program statement and schematic plans for an addition to the library that would have added approximately 79,770 square feet of assignable area. The project was not approved for final construction by the State since the University determined that its first priority was the construction of a classroom/office building which resulted in the construction of O'Dowd Hall in 1981. Subsequently, the State postponed the approval of all "new construction starts" due to fiscal constraints.

Recognizing the economic problems in the State, Oakland University recommended to the Legislature that the library addition could be built in phases. Last year \$25,000 was appropriated by the State to study the feasibility of a phased approach. It was determined by Rossetti Associates that a phased approach is feasible and the firm suggested several different concepts to accomplish the project. All of the concepts would add approximately 55,000 net assignable square feet at a cost of about \$8 million. The existing structure has about 55,000 net assignable square feet. The recommendations of the architect are

set forth in a document entitled Feasibility Study, Kresge Library Expansion dated July, 1983. The Legislature has now authorized the expenditure of \$48,000 for the development of schematic plans.

President Champagne presented to the Board charts showing each plan from the feasibility study with its advantages and disadvantages.

During the presentation Mr. Sims asked if the original library addition plan had been prepared in a time period where there may have been a different attitude toward campus buildings since the addition completely enveloped the existing structure. He also asked if the library addition had been under consideration during the development of O'Dowd Hall.

Mr. De Carlo stated that the library addition project was somewhat contemporaneous to the O'Dowd Hall project. The architect would have reflected the attitude of the University administration at the time the library addition plans were drawn. No objections were made to the style of the library.

Mr. Robert Swanson, Vice President for Developmental Affairs, verified Mr. De Carlo's statement.

Mr. Saltzman interjected that O'Dowd Hall was a very controversial building, and he reminded the Board that he and other individuals voiced objection to its design. When the library addition was proposed, Oakland University wanted to have an architect with creativity. The "wrap-around" concept was one of several drawings proposed. It was the most forward-looking concept presented. The Board approved the concept.

Mr. Sims stated that O'Dowd Hall is not a "bad building; it just is not the right building for its setting".

Mrs. Hartmann stated that in her opinion there is no similarity between the Kresge Library and O'Dowd Hall. She informed the Board that she drove around the campus looking at all the buildings and found no two alike. There is no set pattern.

President Champagne stated that he wished to bring the Board up to date on the status of the Kresge Library addition and seek its approval for the location of the new addition. He

considered this meeting to be very important since it would guide the administration in its development of the campus.

President Champagne stated that when he came to Oakland University three years ago many staff members said that the library needed to be expanded as quickly as possible. In 1981 and 1982 the State did not have funds for capital construction. The University decided to undertake a development campaign for new programs and buildings. The key to this fund raising campaign is the library. President Champagne approached the architect with the concept of phasing the library and, as more money is acquired in the future, constructing another addition.

The first suggestion to the architect was to build the first floor of the proposed "wrap-around" structure. This was determined to be too costly. A twin tower was considered but this idea did not work out because of utility problems, and the librarians did not believe that there would be adequate staff and student control.

Upon further consideration, it was decided that an intensive study of the phasing concept was required. It was also realized that some critical decisions had to be made about the future size of the University. Also, there were new technical developments in the library profession such as computers and microfiche records. Space needs are not as great as in the past due to these technical developments. If the present space were doubled, critical current needs could be met for quite some time into the future. The administration agreed that the addition should be built in such a fashion that the space could be doubled again, if necessary, in 1990, 1995, or 2000.

Many different plans were considered and, basically, two alternatives, a front or back addition, are under discussion today. It is important to remember that it is not necessary to limit ourselves to these two approaches, but these were the two discussed at the University & Development Committee meeting. As a result of the questions raised at that meeting, it was decided that the full Board should be involved in this decision.

The University has recently received authorization from the State to spend \$48,000 for schematic plans. We must now guide the architect regarding our needs and preferences in design. We do not want any Board member to feel as some do about O'Dowd Hall, nor do we wish to start an architectural trend that

is not consistent with Board opinion. From an administration point of view, we have narrowed the decision on the addition to either a front addition or an addition to the back of the present library building.

President Champagne then displayed drawings on the various plans which are on file in the Office of the Board of Trustees.

He stated that the front addition preserves the main structure but adds a new front and wings on either side. It gives the appearance of a new structure. This plan would double the size of the current library. The next phase would extend the wings around the back of the building and provide a square building again. He stated that from a functional point of view, the library staff preferred the front addition since it provides for a central entrance for control purposes.

President Champagne then asked the Board to consider if it wished to keep the library addition compatible with existing buildings, or try to achieve something totally different. He did not anticipate a great amount of building in the near future. There may be an addition to Dodge Hall, or possibly a science building.

The President noted that the administration wishes to raise \$4 million for the project to be matched by the State. This fact will encourage the Legislature to appropriate the remaining funds. If we try to raise money, a front addition may have a significant image impact on a potential donor.

President Champagne informed the Board that in a meeting with the Kresge Foundation a design was requested before further consideration on funding this project. The Foundation will not consider a concept but requires schematic plans. The Kresge Foundation does not become involved in the design of a building, but the organization is concerned about the purpose of the structure.

Mr. Riley asked if the Kresge Foundation were interested in retaining the name on the library.

President Champagne responded that he thought that the Foundation would want us to retain the name but would not object to a joint name.

President Champagne then reviewed drawings indicating the addition to the back of the existing library building. This design retains the character of the front of the current building.

President Champagne stated that the central question is whether we want to change the front so the building looks different, or go with the back plan and keep the facade the same. In terms of flow and control, the library staff prefers the front as opposed to the back addition. He acknowledged that the entrance could be put in the back.

Mr. Sims stated that he was not a trustee at the time in 1977 the Board approved a design which would completely surround the present building. Now the Board is looking at options to "mask" or "beard" the front of the building. These are not the only options available. He stated that the current library is a "decent" building. If it had historical significance, we would not "mask" the front. One of the difficulties in libraries is theft, and it is increasing every year. In the front addition proposal you have points of traffic distribution ahead of the circulation desk, which impairs the security system. How do you develop security systems when people walk in and out of a building without passing the circulation desk?

President Champagne asked Ms. Suzanne Frankie, Dean of University Library, or Mr. George Feeman, Vice Provost, to answer the question.

Dean Frankie stated that it is essential to minimize the traffic area around the circulation desk and the exit, but everyone should pass the circulation desk for a check prior to leaving the building. The area between the desk and the door would not contain materials, but serve as a lobby or for some other functional purpose without books.

Mr. Sims stated that his reaction to the two concepts presented is that we are not bound by the directions taken by the feasibility study. These are merely concepts. He questioned the practice of "bearding" buildings. The library as it exists is a decent structure for which we should not be embarrassed. If we start the practice of covering or "bearding" our buildings, where do we stop? It could become chaotic in the future. We need to keep the continuity of the campus and not disrupt it unless

absolutely necessary. We may have been misled as to the "infrastructure or functional problems". The real issue here is whether or not to "beard" the building for image or development purposes. Mr. Sims stated that he wished to see good reasons for taking this action before he would concur. In his opinion, functionally, any one of the schemes in the feasibility study could work. He also stated that the architect would do a good job for the University. He noted that O'Dowd Hall is not a bad building. It is, in his opinion, inconsistent with the rest of the campus. He did not wish to repeat this problem by dramatically changing architectural styles.

Mr. Riley stated that with the original square building, there are many options for an addition. There could be additions to the side as well as a separate structure.

Mrs. Hartmann stated that she saw nothing wrong with changing a building as long as it is compatible with surrounding structures.

Mr. Mair stated that putting the addition on both sides of the library is "bearding" the building in a sense because it changes its appearance.

Mr. Sims said all of these options are some form of "masking" or "bearding" the existing building. There are other options. He is concerned about the final outcome or appearance of the building.

Mr. Mair asked if we could get a model of the new proposed addition to see what it will look like.

President Champagne stated we were only in the schematic stage and there were no funds for models.

Mr. Sims stated that even a model would not be an accurate guide to appearance. He questioned again the premise of a new facade on the front.

Mr. Mair observed that if we expand and do not go underground, there is no way around a new facade on some portion of the building.

Mr. Sims said most of the functional elements of the building come in large units. If the existing center core is

used, distant units can be tied to the core, or towers can be linked to the existing structure.

President Champagne asked if the Board could come to a conclusion on whether it wished to have a front or back addition on the existing building. He also suggested that perhaps Mr. Sims, who is an architect, could work as liaison between the University and the architectural firm.

Mr. Sims stated that Rossetti Associates is a good firm and they "do not need another architect" to assist in the project. They do need direction from the University. They are fully capable of executing a good design.

Mr. Saltzman asked Mr. Sims if, in his judgment, he would like to preserve the existing architectural integrity of the campus.

Mr. Sims answered that he would. The library is a structure with merit. He questioned putting new facades on buildings.

Mr. Saltzman asked if the University needs to have an architectural co-ordinator on campus.

Mr. Sims replied that good judgment is all that is necessary to maintain a sense of unity with the buildings on campus.

President Champagne asked if the Board felt that the idea of the front addition should be abandoned. He stated that the architect likes the plan for the front.

Mr. Sims stated that he would maintain the integrity of the existing building.

Mrs. Hartmann asked why it is necessary to maintain the integrity of the library since, in her opinion, "it is not the greatest building" she has seen.

Mr. Mair stated that if he were contributing to the building he would first look to see if it were a good building. If he contributed toward an addition on the back, he would feel that it was an addition. If his money went for the front, he would have the feeling he "got his money's worth" and it would be more appealing.

Mrs. Hartmann stated that if it were her money, she would want the addition to be on the front.

Mr. Sims commented that donors may "question the integrity of the institution and the longevity of their gifts". Donors would question constant "bearding" or changing of buildings. It is a mistake to think in terms of only these two alternatives. There are many ways to go about achieving this addition.

Mr. Saltzman cited the Birmingham Library as an example of a building addition that it not compatible with the existing structure. When you put on a new facade, you do not know the result until it is built. We want to preserve the character of the campus and existing buildings.

Mrs. Hartmann suggested that the addition could also turn out to be a "great structure".

Mr. Saltzman stated that adding onto a building is always a gamble. He noted that O'Dowd Hall is too radical a structure compared to the other buildings on campus.

Mr. Riley reminded Mr. Saltzman that not everyone dislikes O'Dowd Hall and that the continuity of the campus has been maintained except for that building.

Mr. Riley quoted from Mr. De Carlo's letter of April 16, 1984 to the Board members regarding the present meeting on the Kresge Library addition:

What plan or policy does the Board of Trustees wish to follow with respect to the overall architectural nature of the campus? Does it wish to have some unified and compatible campus theme or does it wish to have a series of structures that are totally different from each other and, perhaps in some instances, incompatible?

President Champagne asked if the Board is in consensus on maintaining the campus theme.

Mr. Sims noted that a policy of compatibility does not mean that every building has to be the same.

President Champagne stated that Varner Hall is somewhat different than other campus buildings, but is compatible. This same effect could be accomplished with the library.

President Champagne said that the East Campus should also be included in any campus planning policy adopted by the Board.

Mr. Mair stated that such a policy needs to be established before proceeding with the Kresge Library addition.

Mr. Sims said a general policy statement would address President Champagne's concern on the Riding Hall building and other structures on the East Campus.

President Champagne proposed the following resolution:

It is the policy of the Board of Trustees that as buildings on the entire campus are constructed, added to or remodeled, such projects should be architecturally integrated into the campus in such a fashion as to be compatible with existing structures in order to maintain the architectural integrity, theme and plan of the campus.

Mrs. Hartmann moved to accept the resolution. Mr. Sims seconded the motion which the Board voted on and passed.

Mr. Mair then read the following quotation from Mr. De Carlo's April 16 letter to the Board members:

After making a policy decision on the overall plan for campus buildings, the Board should give some guidance to the architect with respect to whether the library addition should be on the front, back or along the lines of one of the other plans in the feasibility study. In addition, some direction should be given to the architect with respect to the appearance of the addition, i.e., should it be compatible with existing structures or totally different as determined by the architect and the institution.

There followed an extensive discussion on the various concepts set forth in the feasibility study. The advantages and disadvantages of each proposal were discussed.

Mr. Mair asked if the Board had enough information to make a specific decision on the addition. In his opinion a policy decision had been made to maintain campus architectural unity. It appears that we need to ask the architectural firm to include the elements of the Board policy into the new design. He asked for a recommendation.

Mr. Sims reminded the Board that this is the stage at which the architect will be working on a detailed design. The feasibility study was only prepared to determine the possibility of a phased concept. Mr. Sims stated that the policy adopted by the Board will permit the integrity of the present building to be maintained. The policy would allow either the front addition or the back addition or another plan.

Mr. Mair asked President Champagne if he could proceed with discussions with the architect on the basis of the Board's discussion.

President Champagne said that perhaps another Board resolution is not needed. As work with the architect proceeds, it will become obvious what design will work best to meet University needs. He stated that he understood that the Board's direction to him is to proceed to work with the architect, retaining the basic theme of the campus and, as much as possible, the theme of the existing library building. In moving in this direction, it is recognized that we may end up with a concept we did not anticipate. The schematics will not be rejected if they comply with our policy and objectives. As we move through the process, the University and Development Committee will be the Board's advisory body to the administration on the project. He asked if this understanding was acceptable to the Board.

Mr. Sims stated that there is some unfinished business. The policy statement did not reflect some of Mr. Saltzman's concerns. Because of the prominent location of the library, something in addition to the general policy is necessary. We need guidance to follow Mr. Saltzman's previous statements.

Mr. Saltzman stated that one of the criteria of the design should be to maintain the integrity of the present Kresge Library.

Mr. Mair asked if Mr. Saltzman meant by "integrity" the actual appearance of the existing front of the library.

Mr. Saltzman moved to direct the architect to come up with a design that meets the needs of the University and the policy adopted at this meeting and also maintains the integrity of the present building. He stated that he did not want to specify to the architect which design to consider. It is the desire of this Board that the architect should consider the functional needs of the library in the development of the design.

Mr. Sims seconded the motion.

Mr. Sims added that this specific motion says the addition can be on the front or elsewhere. The "sense" of what you now see architecturally, remains.

Mrs. Hartmann stated she does not now see the library as the focal point of the campus. Do we want it to be the focal point of the campus?

Mr. Mair said he was experiencing difficulty in bringing this issue to resolution. The Board is being asked to vote on a motion to expand the library without specific direction to the architect. Mr. Mair added that he could not conceive of how to expand the building without changing its appearance unless the addition is put underground. An underground addition has been suggested and rejected. All the plans in the feasibility study change the appearance of the existing building.

Mr. De Carlo said that the purpose of the feasibility study was to determine if, from a financial and construction standpoint, the addition could be phased, or if it would be necessary to retain the full expansion plan adopted in 1977.

Mr. Sims stated that the feasibility study is not intended to design the building. That stage is beginning now.

President Champagne agreed with Mr. Sims' statement.

Mr. Sims said that all of the plans would work. His concern was that the architect and Board maintain some sense of architectural integrity on the campus. It is not a good practice to "beard" existing buildings. We do not want to get into the practice of trying to have every building designed to have a "look at me" result. All of the buildings should be integrated into the campus. It is better to have a "pedestrian" appearing

building that fits in with the rest of the campus than to have an outstanding building that does not fit in and calls attention to itself.

President Champagne suggested the possibility of adding a straight wing on either side of the existing building and still doubling the square footage and keeping the same entrance.

Mr. De Carlo stated that as to this option, the architect expressed concern that the new brick would not match the old brick.

Mr. Sims then asked how the space could be doubled in view of the fact that the plan does not add elevators and other core units.

Dean Frankie stated that of the two existing elevator shafts, only one is currently used. Restroom facilities will not be a problem.

Mr. Sims also questioned whether the existing vertical circulating system would be adequate. These are all questions that have not been raised. There is no functional superiority of one plan over another from the data presented to date. Since the systems were built for 5,000 students and we now have 9,000 students enrolled, either the systems are presently very over-utilized or were over-designed originally.

President Champagne emphasized to the Board that there was a great deal of planning with library staff through all of the study stage. All of these issues were discussed.

Mr. Mair reminded the Board that President Champagne needs guidance in his conversations with the architect.

Mrs. Hartmann stated that in her opinion, to preserve the integrity of the present building, it would be necessary to have a separate building or to go underground.

President Champagne stated that an underground structure is not as attractive to a potential donor.

Mr. Saltzman re-stated his earlier motion.

President Champagne reminded the Board that the motion needed five votes to pass.

Mr. De Carlo paraphrased the motion as requesting the architect to provide the University with a design that meets the functional needs of the library and maintains the integrity of the present facility. This constraint should not limit the architect with respect to design or plan format.

President Champagne stated that the University has three months to obtain the design from the architect for fund raising purposes.

Mr. Riley said that if the architect is given a free hand, he will probably put a front on the building. There is some question as to the plan which will best serve function.

Mr. Sims said the Board is not trying to tie the hands of the architect. There are other alternatives.

Mr. Mair stated that, before voting, the Board should consider the motion in terms of the adequacy of the motion as to guidance to the architect.

Mr. Sims stated that he had confidence that the architectural firm can do something along the lines of the policy and the present recommendation.

President Champagne said the architect should be given the direction to have a proposal ready for the May Board meeting. In three weeks the architect should have an answer for the Board.

Mr. Sims stated that he believed the architect had some idea in mind to maintain the integrity of the building in every one of the plans suggested.

Mr. Mair reminded the Board of the motion on the floor.

Mr. Sims said he believed the May 16 deadline of the President is too restrictive on the architect. The Board should go along with whatever the architect's normal time table would be on such projects.

Mr. De Carlo was asked to draft and then read the resolution under consideration. The resolution follows:

RESOLVED, that Rossetti Associates shall provide the Board of Trustees with a design for the Kresge Library addition which will maintain the integrity of the existing building in accordance with the previously approved policy. This constraint shall not limit the architect as to number of designs to consider. It is the desire of the Board that the architect shall strive to maintain the integrity of the present building in developing a new design and meet the functional requirements for the library.

Mr. Saltzman wished to emphasize the word "strive" in the resolution. The architect should let the Board know if this condition is impossible to accomplish.

The motion was voted on and defeated by a vote of four to one. Mrs. Hartmann voted against the proposal.

Mrs. Hartmann stated that we could end up with a more impressive building if we did not constrain the architect.

Mr. Riley asked President Champagne if he would go ahead with the original 1977 addition plan if he had the funds.

President Champagne responded that if he had the money, he would ask the architect to start over. The University and the library's needs have changed since 1977.

Mr. Sims stated that a motion is not needed since we have a general policy on maintaining the campus plan. The discussion this morning was important in order to adopt a general policy and to air the issues regarding "bearding" buildings.

President Champagne expressed concern as to the next step to be taken since the Board has not resolved its position on the specific plan. The question is what is the sentiment of the Board on maintaining the "integrity" of the existing building? If the architect comes up with a plan that alters the building, will it be rejected?

President Champagne stated that the first policy which was adopted refers to maintaining the integrity of the campus.

Is that sufficient guidance to the architect? Is the first resolution enough to satisfy the Board?

Mr. Sims said that it is an overall policy and not addressed specifically to Kresge Library. It covers the current project.

Mr. Sims stated that what is really at issue is whether or not to take a position which says we are going to get a "new image". Do we want to get into the business of putting "beards" on buildings?

President Champagne stated that the purpose of this meeting was to review various proposals. The administration's recommendation was the front addition. We would like to go ahead with this plan with an addition that is compatible. President Champagne added that the project did not start with the premise of "masking" the building. Any addition may look like an "add-on" unless a facade is put on the front of the building. Materials cannot be matched.

Mr. Saltzman asked what is wrong with having a separate structure as long as it meets the needs of the library.

President Champagne stated that all the alternatives were presented and discussed and the two plans (front or rear additions) under consideration met all the objectives. The front plan is better according to our library staff. These two plans are being presented to the Board and guidance is being requested. President Champagne also stated he is not comfortable because he did not know what he would tell the architect except the Board's policy regarding compatibility with the existing structures on campus.

Mr. Sims said that more building consistency is needed. The project should not be undertaken with the premise of "bearding" the building. He said he was also skeptical about the strength of the functional arguments regarding the front design.

Mr. Riley asked Mr. Sims how he would feel about adding two wings without a front facade.

Mr. Sims stated he was not objecting to a facade. He objects to starting out with the premise that a facade is desirable.

Mr. Sims said that the options should have been presented to the Board on the basis of functional superiority. The Board is "sidetracked" in a discussion of architectural design.

Mr. George Feeman, Vice Provost, stated that to say the project was started on the premise of wanting to "mask" the building is incorrect. We needed a project within the cost range of \$8 million and we had an objective on the square footage required. The architects were given a free hand to come up with our objectives. A separate tower was considered. After consultation with the library staff, the two options presented to the Board this morning were chosen from a total of six or seven proposals. The University did not start with the premise of "masking" the building. Unfortunately, the feasibility study had to be shortened to the form presented to the Board. Mr. Feeman emphasized that the choices were carefully considered and function was considered.

Mr. Sims stated that "there is no disrespect intended to the people who worked on this project". He noted, however, that most of the advantages and disadvantages presented did not specifically relate to functional concepts.

Mr. Feeman said that while this process was going on, a new dean for the library was being sought. Since Dean Frankie joined the University, she has reviewed all the plans with respect to function.

Mr. Mair asked if the advantages of the rear addition plan overcome the negative parts of the plan.

Mr. Saltzman stated that the question is not rear versus front. Do we want to instruct the architect to design a false front or to maintain the integrity of the building? He said he does not particularly like new facades. It is possible to end up with something less desirable than the existing building.

Mr. Riley asked for some additional information on the nature of the expenditure of \$48,000 for schematic plans.

Mr. Sims said that schematics are the early design stage drawings. Schematic plans will give us something to look at and plan the "mass of the building".

Mr. Riley asked if plans could be made showing the addition both with and without the front facade.

Mr. Sims replied that they could accomplish this purpose but, in his opinion, that is not the issue. The only issue is where the Board stands with respect to preserving some sense of unity on the campus and the present building.

Mrs. Hartmann said that what the Board wants is the most functional construction, which is still compatible with the campus. If the library staff prefers the front plan, she would have to vote for what they believe is most effective.

President Champagne stated that he was still not clear as to the direction to the architects. He said he knows the Board wants to maintain the integrity of the campus, but what is the Board's desire regarding the Kresge Library addition in particular?

Mr. Mair said the Board has decided to have some unity in appearance. The architect can be instructed to observe the Board's first resolution regarding the maintenance of the architectural theme of the campus. Superimposed on that resolution can be instructions to maintain the integrity of the Kresge Library building with attention given to its ultimate functionality. He suggested the following two requirements:

1. Meet functional requirements of the library
2. Maintain appearance of existing library building

This should give President Champagne the guidance he needs.

Mr. Sims concurred and stated that the Board could not provide further guidance at this time.

Mrs. Hartmann said that if the plan is not the best in terms of function, she will not vote for its approval.

President Champagne expressed concern that at some point in time he may bring back a design which is believed to be consistent with the campus theme and have the Board reject the

proposal. If this is as much guidance as the Board can provide, he asked if the Trustees would accept the administration's design judgment so that when schematics are presented to the Board there would be only minor changes.

Mr. Sims said the Board could not give the administration an "insurance policy" for such approval at this stage. If there are errors, the plan will have to go back. However, he does not have a sense that this will happen since we have a good architectural firm. The Board's confidence in the administration has been reinforced many times and he does not see any probability that the administration is going to make a misstep on the design of this project.

President Champagne asked if all the Trustees agreed that he should proceed with the general policy and the guidelines set forth by Mr. Mair.

The trustees agreed unanimously.

President Champagne stated that if problems are encountered with the plan, the Board will be notified. He shall operate on the premise of "campus consistency" with some discretion with "building consistency". Also, the design must meet the functional needs of the library.

Mrs. Hartmann stated she would like to see the functional advantages and disadvantages of each design in more detail.

President Champagne said he would work with the library staff as to function. Dean Frankie will prepare a report for the Board.

Mr. Mair asked if the President was comfortable with this decision and permitted action on the matter.

President Champagne responded that he was and thanked the Board for their time and guidance.

Mr. Mair adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Approved,

John De Carlo, Secretary
Board of Trustees

Alex Mair, Vice Chairman
Board of Trustees

Date _____