

A G E N D A

SAGINAW VALLEY COLLEGE

MONTHLY MEETING OF BOARD OF CONTROL

Saturday - March 11, 1967 - 10 a.m.

**SVC Conference Room
2250 Pierce Road**

- 1.) Call to Order by Chairman
- 2.) Approval of Minutes of February 11, 1967 Meeting
- 3.) President's Report
- 4.) Committee Reports
 - a.) Academic
 - b.) Building
 - c.) University Center Planning Commission
- 5.) Communications
- 6.) Other Business
- 7.) Adjournment

MINUTES

BOARD OF CONTROL
SAGINAW VALLEY COLLEGE

REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

S.V.C. Conference Room
March 11, 1967

Present: Brown
Curtiss
Fox
Groening
Treadway
Zahnow

Others

Present: Driver
Gross
Kearns
Kendall
Marble
Press (2)

Absent: Arbury, excused
McCree, excused

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Groening called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

II. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

BM-85 Mr. Fox moved that the minutes of the February 11, 1967 meeting be approved as submitted. Mr. Brown seconded.

Ayes: Brown, Curtiss, Fox, Groening, Treadway, Zahnow

Absent: Arbury, McCree

Motion carried.

III. REPORT OF PRESIDENT

A. State Appropriation

In commenting on the Governor's budget for higher education, the President noted that salary increases would amount to only 3%. The Governor's budget also allows an increase of 4½% in the cost of materials and supplies.

Specifically, SVC is allowed to continue to purchase books next year at the same rate it has purchased books this year. Also, a small increase has been given for faculty appointments. Although faculty recruitment is far below the request made by SVC, he commented that six universities in the State received no funds for additional faculty this coming year. This would appear to be in line with a growing belief that some large schools may be reaching maximum capacity, and that the State intends to give greater support to new and smaller institutions.

B. Admissions

As of March 1st, 91 applications have been received for the fall semester of 1967 in comparison to 14 at this same time last year. It would appear possible to meet the objective of 400 students for the fall enrollment.

C. Library

A report on the progress of the library during the month of February was distributed. At the present time, there are 4,573 volumes cataloged and in the SVC library. The report indicates that the circulation of books increased noticeably during February and use of the Reading Room doubled.

D. Board of Fellows

This group seems to be developing in an acceptable way. Reports will be forthcoming in the future.

E. Miscellaneous

A draft of the Constitution of the Student Government of SVC prepared by members of the Student Council was distributed.

The President reported that during the past week he spent two days in Washington visiting the offices of the U.S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and also the University and College Associates. On the basis of his visit, applications for assistance under two Federal programs have been made with the possibility of applying for two more.

The President expressed gratitude to members of the Board, faculty, and student body for the memorial fund in memory of his mother. The Memorial Fund has been transmitted to the Vice President with the suggestion that flowering trees be planted on the campus.

IV. REPORT OF COMMITTEES

A. Academic Committee

No report.

B. Building Plans Committee

1) Building Plans
Mr. Brown reported that the Building Division recommended that the boiler capacity be increased from 300 to 600 h.p. and a pad be provided for a third boiler. On this basis, the Building Division accepted the building plans and instructed SVC to proceed.

A proposed floor plan for a dormitory was shown by Mr. Brown. He said that the Building Committee and administration of the college have decided on three housing units of 72 each, with the exception of one unit which is reduced to provide for a house mother, providing a full component of 212 student units, with an average cost per student of \$4,000.

Mr. Brown indicated that there has been some question as to who should have responsibility for the location of roads, parking lot, sewers, and sidewalks in the campus: the Campus Planners or the Architects. A contract drawn up with Alden Dow had included the roads. The Building Division seemed to feel the responsibility for site development was up to the Campus Planners, but they would go along with the Board's decision. Mr. Brown recommended that the road, parking lot, sewers, and sidewalks to serve the first academic building be the responsibility of the architect; and that the Campus Planners supervise future campus development.

Mr. Brown called on Mr. Curtiss to comment. Mr. Curtiss said that he agreed with Mr. Brown's recommendations that the Board decide the division of responsibility between the architects and the campus planners. The campus planners, Mr. Curtiss said, should supervise overall campus development, which would include the elevation of roads and decide whether the parking lot should be recessed, as this is part of overall campus development and independent of any particular building. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Curtiss if he could clarify his recommendations, and expressed concern if the responsibility was divided between two firms for the first building. He indicated the need for hiring an administrator of buildings and grounds to assist in these matters.

Mr. Groening felt that a decision should be made to define responsibility between architect and campus planners for the first academic building, and then look ahead to a long-range decision for future construction. Mr. Curtiss objected to Mr. Groening's recommendation in that he felt the long-range planning should definitely be considered at this time. The campus planners should have responsibility for everything outside the first building--or five feet away from the walls--whatever the Board decides.

Mr. Zahnow felt that on an overall basis, the campus planners have given reasonable consideration to the provision of parking lots, roads, etc., but it should be kept in mind that the membership of the Board of Control will change from time to time and the campus planners cannot commit future Boards who may have varying points of view. Mr. Fox and Mrs. Treadway expressed the opinion that the arrangement with the campus planning firm should be on a long-term basis.

Mr. Groening expressed his impression that the hiring of a campus planner by the Building Division was not intended to commit the College on an indefinite basis to use that firm for all work outside of the walls of the buildings. The Building Division certainly did not reveal to the Board of Control they were forcing us into an almost permanent tie. Mr. Groening felt that the work of the planner was done when his report was turned in. A member of the administrative staff assisting the President in the capacity of Administrator of Buildings and Grounds should, by reason of education and experience, have the responsibility of coordinating the work of the campus planners and the architects, rather than to have this continuity invested in a campus planning firm.

BM-86 Mr. Brown moved that SVC retain Johnson, Johnson & Roy as a campus planner or consultant, and that the Dow firm be instructed to go ahead with the road and parking lot in conjunction with the first building; and that Johnson, Johnson & Roy do general campus landscaping in accordance with landscaping contract. Mr. Zahnow supported.

Mr. Curtiss felt that Johnson, Johnson & Roy or some campus planner should decide on parking lots, etc.

It was suggested by President Marble that the matter be discussed in a Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting.

Mr. Groening said that in an effort to make both short-range and long-range decisions, we are, at the same time, bottling up the problem at hand, and that he had never had any other idea but that Johnson, Johnson & Roy were to prepare a basic plan, and if the SVC Board accepted it, from that point on the Board had to carry it out. He said he would like to have the first academic building project done on a "no-precedent" basis, and get on with the job. He felt it appropriate to continue long-range planning but not try to make a decision at this meeting.

BM-87 Mr. Brown moved to withdraw original motion, and arrange a meeting with Johnson, Johnson & Roy and Alden Dow Associates to try to resolve the matter. Mr. Curtiss supported.

After some discussion, the motion was changed to read:

BM-87 Mr. Brown moved that the Board meet with the firms of Alden B. Dow Associates, Inc., Johnson, Johnson & Roy, and a member of the Buildings Division sometime next week to get the matter resolved. If the matter could not be resolved, the contracts for the parking lot, roads, and utilities would be given to Dow and the project continued.

Mr. Curtiss withdrew his support of second motion.

Mr. Brown thereupon withdrew the revised motion.

Mr. Brown asked to put first motion before Board for decision.

Mr. Zahnow said he would be willing to go back to first motion provided the Board agreed to sit down within the next thirty days with the campus planners and have a thorough discussion that would lead to some acceptable agreement for the next year and for future building.

Mr. Groening recommended a dissolution of the Dow and Johnson, Johnson & Roy contract arrangement. Mr. Brown agreed.

The motion was changed to read:

BM-37 Mr. Brown moved that the Board continue to honor the existing purchase order issued by the Buildings Division to the firm of Alden Dow for roads, parking lots, etc., and also that the Board meet with the firms of Alden B. Dow Associates and Johnson, Johnson & Roy, and a member of the Buildings Division sometime as soon as possible within the next thirty days to reach an acceptable agreement for the coming year. Mr. Zahnw supported.

Ayes: Brown, Groening, Zahnw
Nays: Curtiss, Fox, Treadway
Absent: Arbury, McCree

The motion failed.

2.) Condemnation Proceedings

Mr. Kendall, Counsel for the College, spoke concerning the condemnation proceedings. He stated that a motion had been filed by an attorney for one of the condemnees to dismiss the present proceedings, which motion the Attorney General felt was meritorious. Therefore, Mr. Kendall recommended that the College acquiesce in the dismissal and that new proceedings be commenced in which jurisdictional defects would be corrected. Mr. Kendall then thereupon recommended the Board consider for adoption a new resolution meeting the statutory requirements for a new condemnation proceeding.

RES-²¹~~20~~ Mrs. Treadway offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Saginaw Valley College is a Constitutional Corporation of the State of Michigan having been established as a state supported institution of higher education by Public Act No. 278, 1965, as amended by Public Act No. 14, 1966; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 4 of said Public Act, as amended, the board of control of Saginaw Valley College, with the approval of the state board of education and the Michigan legislature, is responsible for the selection and acquisition of a suitable site for the location of the Saginaw Valley College; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 5 of said Public Act No. 278, as amended, the said board of control has vested in it all powers customarily exercised by the governing board of a college or university; and

WHEREAS, the board of control of Saginaw Valley College in cooperation with the state board of education and the Michigan legislature made extensive surveys of the appropriate site location for the college; and

WHEREAS, such surveys evidenced a need for locating the college facilities in a proper and coordinated plan for college and campus development requiring at least an entire section of land; and

WHEREAS, the said board of control under date of February 12, 1966, designated the entire Section 23, Township 13 North, Range 4 East, Kochville Township, Saginaw County, Michigan, as the site for the location of the College; and

WHEREAS, on or about February 12, 1966 the Michigan legislature approved the selection of the entire Section 23, Township 13 North, Range 4 East, Kochville Township, Saginaw County, Michigan, as a suitable site for the College; and

WHEREAS, under date of March 9, 1966 the state board of education approved the recommendation of the board of control of the College in the selection of the entire Section 23, Township 13 North, Range 4 East, Kochville Township, Saginaw County, Michigan, as the site for the location of the College; and

WHEREAS, substantially all of said Section 23 has been heretofore purchased through private negotiations between the owners of record and the said board of control; and

WHEREAS, the board of control of Saginaw Valley College has endeavored to purchase the herein described land from the respective owners thereof, the same being all remaining land in said Section 23, and is unable to do so at a price commensurate with its value; and

WHEREAS, under date of September 12, 1966, the board of control adopted a resolution the intent of which was to officially authorize eminent domain proceedings to be undertaken for the said remaining unpurchased real estate in said Section 23; and

WHEREAS, proceedings were instituted in January, 1967, to effectuate such authorization; and

WHEREAS, it would appear that certain legal deficiencies exist in the said prior resolution authorizing said taking; and

WHEREAS, the board of control wishes to perfect the said authorization so as to be compatible with the statutory requirements of eminent domain proceedings;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the board of control of Saginaw Valley College, a State of Michigan institution of higher learning, with principal facilities presently located in Section 23, Township 13 North, Range 4 East, Kochville Township, Saginaw County, Michigan, pursuant to authority heretofore granted to it by the State of Michigan to select a suitable site for the location of the College, does hereby declare that it deems it necessary to take the hereinafter described three parcels of private property including all structures and improvements thereon for the purposes of its incorporation or for the public purposes within the scope of its powers, namely as a suitable site for the location of Saginaw Valley College:

PARCEL "A"

Beginning at the Southwest corner of the Northwest 1/4 of the Northwest 1/4 of Section 23, Township 13 North, Range 4 East, Township of Kochville, County of Saginaw, and State of Michigan, and running thence North 208 feet along the West section line, thence East 660 feet more or less to the center of Branch of Goetz Drain hereafter described, then Southerly along the centerline of said drain 208 feet more or less to the South line of the Northwest 1/4 of the Northwest 1/4 of said section, then West along said eighth line to place of beginning, subject to State Highway right of way and also subject to a 10 foot easement along the Southern and Eastern boundaries thereof for the said Branch of Goetz Drain.

Said survey line of said Drain is described as entering Section 23, Kochville Township, Saginaw County, at a point 1 foot East of the North quarter post of said Section, thence South 26 feet; thence West 1230 feet and cross the West 1/8 line of Section 23, 26 feet South of the North line of said Section; thence continuing West 652 feet; thence South 1287 feet and into the Southwest 1/4 of the Northwest 1/4 of Section 23, thence West 600 feet to a point located 22 feet East and 10 feet South of Southwest corner of NW-1/4 of NW-1/4 of Section 23, Kochville Township, Saginaw County, Michigan, and there end.

PARCEL "B"

The Northwest 1/4 of the Northwest Quarter of Section 23, T 13 N, R 4 E, Saginaw County, Michigan, EXCEPT the South 208 feet of the West 660 feet thereof; A.K.A.

The North 1320 feet of Reserve lot 1, EXCEPT the South 208 feet of the West 660 feet thereof; containing 36.84 acres, more or less.

PARCEL "C"

The South 132 feet of the North 277 feet of the East 240 feet of the North 22 acres of the South 42 acres of Reserve Lot 4, Section 23, T 13 N, R 4 E, Saginaw County, Michigan, containing .73 acres, more or less.

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the board of control of Saginaw Valley College does hereby further declare that the said taking is for the use and benefit of the public;

FURTHER RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Attorney General of the State of Michigan; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the board of control of Saginaw Valley College does hereby further direct the Attorney General of the State of Michigan, or any of his assistants, to institute the necessary proceedings in its behalf for the acquisition of the above described lands by the exercise of the power of eminent domain in the Circuit Court of the County of Saginaw, Michigan, the same being the County in which the said private property sought to be taken is located;

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Attorney General of the State of Michigan, or any of his assistants, or the Secretary of the board of control of Saginaw Valley College, are hereby authorized and directed to sign any and all pleadings and papers necessary for the commencement of and prosecution of such proceedings for and on behalf of the said board of control of Saginaw Valley College;

FURTHER RESOLVED, the action of the board of control under date of September 12, 1966, authorizing institution of eminent domain proceedings be and the same is hereby superseded.

Mr. Curtiss supported.

Ayes: Brown, Curtiss, Fox, Groening, Treadway, Zahnow
Absent: Arbury, McCree

Resolution adopted.

Mr. Zahnow asked the Chairman if he might impose on time of Board to return to the discussion of campus planning to see if some possible solution might be worked out. Mr. Groening granted the request.

Mr. Zahnow asked to refer to original Board motion, approved on August 8, 1966, requesting the State Buildings Division to enter into a contract with Alden Dow Associates for campus improvement project including water, sewage, roads, and lighting at a total estimated cost of \$723,000. Mr. Zahnow suggested that the Board have a meeting with Alden Dow Associates to see if plans as prepared are in agreement with campus planners, and then enter into an contract with whoever the Board decides.

BM-88 Mr. Curtiss moved that Alden Dow Associates be awarded contract to design parking lot to service the first academic structure, the design being subject to approval of the campus planners, the firm of Johnson, Johnson & Roy. Mr. Zahnow supported.

Ayes: Brown, Curtiss, Fox, Groening, Treadway, Zahnow
Absent: Arbury, McCree

Motion carried.

3.) University Center Regional Planning Commission

Mr. Curtiss reported that the Commission will not receive any planning money during the fiscal year of 1967. The Commission has been given a higher priority for consideration for funds during 1968. The State is setting up a rating process, and the Commission should be in good shape.

V. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Kendall said that a letter has been received from the Internal Revenue Service indicating that the SVC Development Fund as a charitable institution is tax exempt under Section 501-C3.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Curtiss called attention to a recent Board Resolution requiring the signature of two officers of the school to witness the assigning of stock certificates for sale, which creates some problems in the handling of certificates. The matter was referred to the College Counsel for discussion.

Mr. Driver asked the Board to consider authorization of paying an amount not to exceed \$700 to Donald A. Leuenberger for damage to bean crop where the College purchased some of his land.

BM-89 Mr. Curtiss moved that an amount not to exceed \$700 be paid to Donald A. Leuenberger for damage to bean crop. Mr. Fox supported.

Ayes: Brown, Curtiss, Fox, Groening, Treadway, Zahnow
Absent: Arbury, McCree

Motion carried.

Mr. Kendall was instructed to provide release before payment is made.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

On motion, the meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles B. Curtiss - Secretary


Gladys A. Kearns - Recording Secretary

SDM
gak:kar