FRED MEDART MANUFACTURING CO.

STEEL LOCKERS – STEEL SHELVING – STEEL WARDROBES
GYMNASIUM APPARATUS – PLAYGROUND APPARATUS
GYM SEATS – SWIMMING POOL EQUIPMENT
METAL SPECIALTIES

NEW YORK OFFICE
16 WEST 61ST STREET

CHICAGO OFFICE
326 W. MADISON ST.

GENERAL OFFICE AND FACTORY
POTOMAC AND DE KALB STREETS

ST. LOUIS, MO.

May 9, 1939

Dr. Forrest C. Allen
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Dear Dr. Allen:

We have given some discussion to the results of the New York meeting and also the demonstration in Chicago last Friday, which was attended by Mr. Porter and about forty of the local coaches. Mr. Chervenka attended the Chicago meeting.

Mr. Chervenka brought back with him the following information, which we are passing along to you for consideration.

We understand there will be another meeting of the Rules Committee some time this Fall, possibly August. Is this correct?

Mr. Porter was of the opinion that a modified (for size) backboard would eventually be approved as optional equipment by your Committee.

Porter seems to question whether a convex board would be approved as optional because of the question in the minds of the members of the Association to whom your questionnaire is directed, as concerns the effect a convex surface would have on the individual's game, or possibly I should say the individual ability of the player who has been training on a flat board. This opinion was advanced by him nothwithstanding the fact that the Rules Committee in New York expressed themselves favorably as regards the convex surface and as relayed by you to Mr. Medart and the writer.

Mr. Porter provided Geo. Chervenka with dimensions for two other sizes of boards, which Mr. Chervenka understood were included in the Rules Committee minutes.

We are attaching a copy of our drawing ME-845-B, which covers, in addition to the three backboards in your possession, two additional boards which are drawn per the information supplied by Mr. Porter in Chicago last week.

All of the foregoing leaves us a little bit hazy as to the next procedure and we are approaching you for any suggestion that you may have to offer. For example, we would not want to build additional backboards of the dimensions used to construct the three in your possession in the event that either one of the two other boards we show on our drawing are likely to be favored. We have written Mr. Bunn, per your suggestion and along these lines. Likewise, we have written Mr. Maguire of Harrisburg. Both of these men have expressed a desire to have some of these demonstration boards placed in their possession for test