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ADJOURNMENT
A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in Rooms 327-28, Michael J. Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m., March 25, 1983, by the President of the Board, Mr. Robert C. Ingalls, and on roll call the following answered present:

- Mr. John W. Alltucker
- Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter
- Mrs. Harriett J. Flanagan
- Mr. Randal D. Gill
- Mr. Louis B. Perry
- Mr. Marlon T. Weatherford
- Mr. Loren L. Wyss
- Mr. Robert C. Ingalls

Absent: Mr. Petersen was absent for business reasons. Mr. Batiste and Mr. Harms were out of the state.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor William E. Davis; Secretary Wilma L. Foster; J. I. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning, Clarethele Kahananui, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; W. T. Lemman, Vice Chancellor for Administration; Wil Post, Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs; Melinda W. Grier, Compliance Officer; Jerry Casby, Assistant Attorney General; Larry Pierce, Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Strategic Planning; Susan Weeks, Coordinator of Planning Studies; Kay Juran, Legislative Liaison; Judi Pearson, Assistant to the Director, Interinstitutional Library Council; Tim Marsh, Information Representative, Public Services and Publications.

Oregon State University--T. D. Parsons, Vice President for Administration.

University of Oregon--President Paul Olum; Richard J. Hill, Provost.

Oregon Health Sciences University--President Leonard Laster; J. T. McGill, Vice President; M. A. Lockwood, Executive Assistant to the President.

Portland State University--President Joseph C. Blumel; James E. Todd, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Orcilia Forbes, Vice President for Student Affairs; Margaret J. Dobson, Vice President for Academic Affairs; J. K. Harris, Budget Director; Clarence Hein, Director, News and Information Service.

Eastern Oregon State College--President David Gilbert; James C. Lundy, Dean of Administration.

Oregon Institute of Technology--John Smith, Dean of Administration; William W. Smith, Dean of Academic Affairs.

Southern Oregon State College--President Natale A. Sicuro; Ernest E. Ettlich, Dean of Academic Affairs; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration.

Western Oregon State College--President Richard Meyers; James Beaird, Provost; William Neifert, Acting Dean of Administration.

Others--Jenelle Post, Corvallis; T. K. Olson, Executive Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Ross B. Thompson, Chairman, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Bob Watrus, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Tom Benjamin, Portland Student Services; Robert E. Hamill, Associate Superintendent, Oregon Department of Education, George Mitton, Assistant Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission.
The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on February 25, 1983, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Perry, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

At the request of the Chancellor, Mr. Lemman stated that at the September 1982 Board meeting, the Board was advised that Larry A. Dotson, a faculty member at Southern Oregon State College, had requested the Board to review a non-disciplinary personnel action under the provisions established in the Board's Administrative Rules. The Board referred the matter to the Chancellor to take action as provided by OAR 580-21-390 (4). The Administrative Rules limit such requests to appellate review of alleged errors by the appointing authority with respect to procedure, adherence to administrative rules or applicable laws, and fair consideration of the facts. The review does not include a de novo review of the judgment exercised by the President. At the September meeting, the Board reserved discretion to take further action when the Chancellor reported his recommendation or unless the matter was otherwise resolved prior to that report.

Mr. Lemman presented the report of the review on behalf of the Chancellor. The report is on file in the Board's Office. He recommended that no further review as described by OAR 580-21-390 be undertaken. It was indicated that the Chancellor's designee, Vice Chancellor Lemman, had heard Dr. Dotson's grievance under the collective bargaining agreement as provided in Article 16 and intended to issue a decision shortly.

The Board approved a motion to accept the report of the Chancellor regarding the request of Larry A. Dotson of Southern Oregon State College for Board review of a non-disciplinary personnel action, and that further review pursuant to OAR 580-21-390 be denied. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Perry, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Dr. Lawrence Pierce said the third draft of the Strategic Plan was being proposed to the Board for consideration and approval of the recommendations. The plan has been discussed with many persons throughout the state in public hearings. More than 1,000 suggestions have been received in telephone and written communications. The process has been a dialogue with the public about higher education, and much has been learned about the public's attitudes and expectations for higher education. The document initially was intended to be an educational document. To some extent it has become a major political document and has brought to the surface concerns and frustrations that have been smoldering for a number of years. The purpose of the plan was to develop a course of action for higher education consistent with the economic and educational environment anticipated during the next four years. Some people wanted a grand design that created an innovative solution as to what higher education could become; others wanted a disaster plan as a contingency in the event everything went wrong. The plan seeks a middle ground consistent with the assumptions that can be made about the state and its economy and education during the next four years.

Dr. Pierce said the fiscal situation facing higher education was the underlying assumption that constrained the proposals in the document. Approval of the Governor's budget proposals for higher education still would result in additional budget reductions. It is difficult to be innovative and creative in the sense of proposing major new programs or shifts of programs, because it is always more expensive to start something new than to preserve existing quality in an environment of that kind. It is within that context that the proposals in the Strategic Plan recommend ways of improving access to the State System, of improving the quality of the programs, and of reorganizing programs in ways to encourage economic development and economic diversification in the state. Dr. Pierce then reviewed the plan and the recommendations in detail.
Dr. Robert Hamill, Associate Superintendent for Community College Services, commented on the plan on behalf of Dr. Verne Duncan, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The review of the Strategic Plan by the State Board of Education resulted in recommendations where the two Boards have overlapping responsibilities. Four issues still are of concern in the third draft:

1. In the discussion of enrollment projections, there is a common concern with data, both in terms of the base data and the assumptions that lie behind the projections being made.

2. In the discussion of geographic access, the text is misleading regarding the possibility of providing community college-type services to the unserved areas. Options for this service are available through formation of an area education district or through the use of contracted-out-of-district funds. If community college service were provided to some areas without a local commitment of support, it could jeopardize the local support for the existing districts.

There is no recognition in the text of the existing joint agreement that has been an important document for the resolution of conflicts in those areas served jointly by off-campus offerings of the State System and the community colleges.

3. The State Advisory Council for Career and Vocational Education would be the appropriate group for affecting vocational education in Oregon, rather than the proposal contained in Recommendation 48.

4. The recommendations on teacher education should include some reference to the special needs of the vocational teacher in Oregon.

Mr. Hamill expressed particular interest in the inclusion of Recommendation 34 for the formation of a joint policy council to assist in cooperative efforts and discussions and in the resolution of any potential conflicts.

Throughout the presentation of the recommendations, Board members made suggestions with respect to modifications in the language. These changes have been incorporated in the Strategic Plan which will be distributed separately. A copy of the final plan will be on file in the Board's Office.

In the general discussion of the plan and recommendations, Mr. Ingalls commented that the state could ill afford two graduate schools in electrical engineering and he would not want to see a good program diluted to the extent that there were two poor programs.

Mr. Perry said that although the plan is dealing with the next four years, it should be considered every year and have an additional year added to it. The plan should change as circumstances require.

Dr. Pierce responded that the Chancellor has indicated the plan would be updated annually. The development of a new differential funding formula and an extensive academic program review are currently in progress and will become additional chapters to the plan when they are completed.

It was suggested that some identification of priorities would be helpful each year in the implementation of the recommendations. It was indicated also that the use of microcomputer technology ultimately would be addressed in terms of instructional delivery systems. However, at this time, it is more important to update the status of equipment and computer facilities with the limited funds available.

During the discussion, two important policy issues were considered. The first was the importance of a review of tuition policy in the educational segments in terms of their impact on other segments. The second was the matter of off-campus instruction and the need for the state once again to provide financial support for off-campus credit courses.
Mr. Alltucker said that the language should be chosen carefully to make the plan clear to the appropriate individuals. The Chancellor said the plan was intended as a philosophical point of view stating the logic and basis for making decisions. The statements represent critical decision points and the rationale for making those decisions.

The Board concurred in the staff recommendation to defer action on Recommendations 20 and 21 until the May Board meeting. The Board agreed that Recommendation 65 should be deleted.

The Board approved the remaining recommendations with separate motions on the recommendations included in Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. On each of the five motions, the following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Perry, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None. It was understood that the amended language suggested during the discussion of the individual recommendations would be incorporated in revised recommendations to be distributed to Board members. A final version of the Strategic Plan will be prepared for distribution as the Board's plan.

Mr. Ingalls then invited Dr. Terry Olson, Executive Director of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, to comment. He indicated that because the Strategic Plan was a planning document and because the Commission was charged with being the statewide planning coordinative agency and the statewide policy unit in education, it was assumed that the Strategic Plan is to be referred to the Commission as a planning document. He then cited ORS 348.725 with respect to the Commission's comprehensive planning responsibilities. He said the Commission takes the charge in the statutes seriously and expects to have adequate resources to complete these responsibilities in cooperation with the governing board.

Dr. Olson commended the Board and the staff for the process that has raised the level of public and institutional awareness of the importance of planning and the sensitivity in making other boards and segments aware of the elements of the plan.

Mr. Ingalls asked whether the Commission believed that it had been consulted adequately in the preparation of the plan. Dr. Olson said a presentation had been made to the Commission and there had been subsequent staff discussions. There are continuing differences of opinion about some aspects of the manner in which the information is presented. He indicated the Commission had had ample opportunity, individually and collectively, to present its views, both formally and informally. There are fewer differences now, and it is expected there will be adequate future opportunity to address these issues. The present concerns may not be the result of a different position on the part of the Commission but rather that the Commission is aware of some potential areas of conflict between the State Board of Higher Education and some of the community colleges in terms of their possible posture.

Mr. Perry said one interpretation of the statute might be that the Commission would do all the planning, although he said the statute was not clear. Dr. Olson said the Commission is responsible for insuring that the planning process takes place. It is responsible for articulating and promulgating a statewide educational policy. The Commission is not responsible for internal planning within any single segment or institution. That is the statutory and common sense task of the governing and statutory board. The Commission's task is to assist that planning process by setting some parameters within which common planning can take place.

Mr. Perry then asked whether the Commission's role was one of advocacy with the Legislature or one of objectivity in helping them understand what is happening. Dr. Olson said that in planning the Commission clearly has an advocacy position. It should articulate for the public some aspirations for education, some targets and goals related to the reality of the resources which are likely to be available. The Commission also has the responsibility to assess with some degree of objectivity what others are trying to do.
Mr. Wyss said recent statements regarding funding for education had resulted in some confusion. He asked whether the Commission believed that its mission was only to study what happens to state money because the Commission was a state agency overseeing the appropriation of state money into state agencies, or was it concerned about the total funding that is coming from both the state and the local school districts, or about the total amount from both public and private sources going into all segments of education. As the Commission and the Boards attempt to cooperate in reaching some of these bases of data on applicable funding comparisons, it is important to know the point from which each agency is starting.

Mr. Ross Thompson, Chairman of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, said the Commission is concerned basically with total resources that the boards of education have available to them. He said the importance of that was demonstrated earlier when there were discussions of an across-the-board cut of 10% in one of the special sessions. The Commission pointed out that a 10% cut in higher education was a great deal larger than a 10% cut for the community colleges and the elementary and secondary schools, because a larger part of the higher education budget comes from the state appropriation. To some extent that would modify what was done by the Legislature. He indicated that to some extent some of the confusion comes about because the Commission must be responsive to requests for information from Legislative committees, and legislatures are more concerned about the state appropriations. For that reason, some of the questions deal with state appropriations and not with total budget resources. He said the Commission itself is primarily oriented toward that total resource picture from whatever source. Dr. Olson stated that the Commission had provided numerous studies covering most of the available resources.

Mr. Wyss said it was his recollection that the Commission had concluded that most of Oregon higher education had been funded at an inadequate level but had stated some very strong feelings about how the efficiency of delivery might change.

Dr. Olson said state General Fund support for higher education is not overly generous compared to other state agencies and probably in terms of what would be desirable in terms of aspirations for education. This has been more than offset in some circumstances by the use of other funds, and the policy issue is whether that is a healthy situation. The Commission would support the position that it is unhealthy to have such a high percentage of the cost being borne by the students. He pointed out that the total resources available to the State System because of the availability of other funds are still substantial on a per student basis.

Mr. Ingalls asked whether there was any quarrel with the percentages of the national averages which have been cited for the various segments of education. Dr. Olson responded that the real issue was how much was spent per student from all sources in comparison to other states to achieve the objectives. The amount spent per student in Oregon for the State System of Higher Education is not 80% of the national average in terms of the state appropriations, but is much higher on the list of 50 states in terms of the amount of money spent per student. The difference is clearly the amount charged to the students to make up the difference. The Commission believes that is poor public policy.

Mr. Thompson said the comparison of total revenue as against only one source of revenue is the question. Perhaps the comparison of total revenue in both cases is what should be presented. Dr. Olson said charts had been prepared showing appropriations and appropriations per student and total expenditures versus total expenditures per student. In terms of total expenditures, the elementary and secondary school funding in the state is comparatively high, but it is not comparatively high in the context of direct state appropriations to elementary and secondary education.
Mr. Ingalls asked whether there was any difference to the taxpayer if the support is paid through property or income taxes. Dr. Olson said the money might be from the same taxpayer, but in terms of the choices to allocate a certain amount of money to the competing segments of education, there is, therefore, a legitimacy in looking at the relative amounts that the state is putting in per student. He said the contrast in terms of those two elements was not that great. Community colleges are not funded generously from state appropriations, nor is the state appropriation per pupil in elementary and secondary particularly generous. When the local tax contribution is added to the state appropriation, the amount is rather more generous, but that element is a local choice made each year by local patrons. The Legislature has no control of those decisions.

Mr. Alltucker asked Dr. Olson whether the low ranking for state funding of elementary and secondary education was being used as an argument to increase state funding for those segments.

Dr. Olson responded that he was using the argument for the State System that the state funding ratio to the total cost should be greater because tuition is too high. The same option is in front of the Legislature relative to the state funding for secondary and elementary education concerning other resources. For example, if the Legislature believes that the costs of elementary and secondary education are being borne too much by the local property taxpayers, alternatives to continued increases of those costs would be a reduction in the total cost of education so that nobody was paying more, or to have the state pick up a larger share. The problem the Legislature faces in trying to address an increase in the state's share is that it is the largest single appropriation in state government. A relatively modest percentage increase requires a substantial amount of money from the General Fund. Currently, one-third of the cost is paid by the state, and the state policy has been to try to support 40% of the cost for elementary and secondary. If the state share is increased without decreasing the local share, there is an even larger amount available per pupil at those levels. The local property tax relief programs is also a subsidy for the local school districts, so some portion of the property tax relief money represents a state contribution to the local school districts.

Dr. Olson then cited appropriations per pupil in comparison with national averages but indicated that comparisons were difficult because information on property tax relief programs for other states was not complete.

At the conclusion of the discussion, it was indicated that individuals designated to resolve the differences in the data being presented to the Legislature would be meeting the following week.

Report on Reciprocity Legislation

Dr. Olson also reported that a bill had been passed by one of the two houses of the Washington Legislature. The bill authorizes the Council of Post-Secondary Education in the State of Washington to negotiate, on behalf of the State of Washington, a reciprocity agreement on tuition with the State of Oregon.

The bill would permit negotiating an agreement which would provide reciprocity between Oregon and Washington at any point between the authorization in the existing agreement to elimination of the border for purposes of reciprocity. Oregon legislation would not be required for the agreements because both the Board of Higher Education and the community colleges have statutory authority to establish tuition for out-of-state students. Dr. Olson indicated he would be negotiating with Washington officials this spring after consultation with the Chancellor and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

W. Post, Appointment as Vice Chancellor

The Chancellor recommended that the Board approve the appointment of Wil Post, Acting Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs, as Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs, at an annual salary of $53,000 for the next fifteen months. The salary would be effective April 1, 1983, and would reflect any salary adjustment that would be made in July.
The Board approved the recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Perry, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

On several occasions in 1982 the Board was advised that Congress had appropriated $20,790,000 for the planning, constructing and equipping of facilities for a proposed Institute for Advanced Biomedical Research at the Oregon Health Sciences Center. At the May 28, 1982, meeting, the Board ratified the grant application which had been filed with the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services a few days earlier. The application had been prepared by institutional officials with the assistance of Zimmer-Gunsul-Frasca Partnership, Architects, and their consultants. Consistent with statutory requirements, a request was made to the State Emergency Board for authorization to make application for the federal funds and was approved on June 4, 1982, with the understanding that the request for expenditure authorization could be reviewed by the Legislature in 1983.

Notice of the grant award was issued by the federal agency on September 17, 1982.

As reported in the minutes of the October 22, 1982, Board Meeting, arrangements were made with the architects for the design and contract administration of the project, and the firm was authorized to proceed with the schematic design phase of planning with the assistance of several consultants:

Geotechnical engineering - Dames and Moore, Portland
Structural engineering - kpff, Portland
Mechanical and electrical engineering - Bouillon, Christofferson and Schairer, Seattle, Washington
Laboratory design - Earl M. Walls Associates, LaJolla, California
Vibration isolation and building acoustical design - Cerami and Associates, Inc., Long Island City, New York
Programming assistance - GPR Planners Collaborative, Inc., White Plains, New York
Civil engineering - CH2M/Hill, Portland
Field surveying - Compass Corporation, Milwaukee
Radiation shielding - Health Physics Northwest, West Linn

Inasmuch as the schematic design phase of planning has been completed, institutional officials have requested Board approval so that the architects can be authorized to proceed with the design development phase. A model of the building and other visual aids will be available for presentation to the Board at the time of the meeting.

The planning has been undertaken in accordance with the guidelines and principles which the architects outlined within the Framework Master Plan for the Oregon Health Sciences University (reviewed and approved by the Board on September 10, 1982).

As proposed, the building would be a five story concrete structure, including basement, sited between and attached to both the Basic Science Building and the Medical Research Building near the northwest edge of the campus. It would contain a gross area of approximately 72,442 square feet plus a service tunnel, courtyard development and connections to existing utility services. The net assignable (program) areas would total about 45,803 square feet, thus providing an efficiency factor above 63%.

The basement level would be devoted to mechanical and central support facilities, including housing and procedure rooms for small animals, central glass washing, media preparation and building storage. The animal area would have its own sterilization and quarantine vestibule to maintain isolation, but would be directly connected via service elevator to the first and second levels of the Medical Research Building where complementary facilities already
exist. The delivery of animals and major equipment would be made through a receiving dock serviced by the existing access road at the north side of the Medical Research Building. All other supplies and waste products would be routed through a new service tunnel to the south over to the loading dock at Mackenzie Hall. Central glass washing and media preparation areas would be located opposite the central elevator core, thus maximizing convenience for all floor levels above. Building storage and various shop services would be located in this area also, and there would be direct connection to the second level of the Basic Science Building (below grade).

Inasmuch as the primary spaces within the proposed facilities for the Institute are the laboratory floors, a design goal of the architects has been to establish the maximum flexibility for the use of these areas and still provide the necessary spaces for administration, seminars and conferences, a library/resource center and a lunchroom. The schematic design contemplates that the laboratories would be within four 18-foot high floors, including a 5-foot interstitial space for utilities, stacked over the mechanical rooms within the north portion of the building and that the other activities would be accommodated in lower ceiling areas, some of which are identified in the plan as mezzanines, at the front (south end) of the structure. The lateral connection between the laboratories and these more public spaces would be achieved by grouping the laboratory floors into two couplets, each served by a two-story lounge/meeting space located either 9 feet up or down from the laboratory floors. The open stair connections are intended to encourage casual interaction between the various researchers located on separate floors. The architects comment that "While maintaining this important connection between floors, the character of the two types of spaces is allowed to be very different—state of the art laboratories with extensive mechanical and electrical services and ultimate flexibility contrasting sharply with comfortable wood-panelled meeting/lounge spaces overlooking the courtyard. The relationship of these two functional spaces is the essence of the building's organization."

Various laboratory arrangements have been studied for typical bays, but at this stage of planning, the interior allocations of space within the research suites have not been defined. Each of the four 85 foot-by-100 foot laboratory floors would be totally flexible and allow variation in space layouts. It is expected that the central bay would be 25 feet wide in the east-west direction. It would be more rigid structurally than the flanking 30-foot bays and generally would be utilized for support services such as instruments requiring the highest degree of environmental control including vibration isolation. The 25-foot dimension was determined by the depth required for standard environmental rooms accessible from each side. The 30-foot laboratory bay dimension was determined from the aggregate requirements for an efficient laboratory layout including 6-foot wide perimeter corridor, fume hood, 10-foot laboratory bench, 4-foot internal circulation and technician's desk space. A variety of other laboratory configurations would be possible. Structural bays would be 20 feet wide allowing one subdivided laboratory module per bay. A sealed window at the exterior wall of each 10-foot work area would provide natural light and view. Lateral circulation could be placed in a variety of locations—between laboratory and support, at the exterior wall, or a combination of the two. Plan layouts could vary from floor to floor and could be modified quite easily when and if program requirements change in the future. Mechanical and electrical services would be placed overhead in a 5-foot-deep accessible ceiling space so that changes could be made easily. General lighting would be provided by movable lay-in fluorescent fixtures in an exposed ceiling grid. Partitions and laboratory furnishings would be placed on top of a continuous acid-resistant sheet vinyl flooring membrane with welded seams and integral base so that accidental spills could be confined to the floor on which they occur. Drain stubs would be placed on 10 foot modules so that services could be provided to lab benches at this spacing either during construction or after completion. The investigators' offices likely would be located at the north end of the laboratory floors to take advantage of the view, but they could be located anywhere within the laboratory.
As noted above, conference and meeting rooms would be located typically on mezzanines midway between the main laboratory floors. The first and third mezzanines would provide a total of four conference rooms with lounge spaces, linking the lower two laboratory floors and the upper two laboratory floors into pairs. This pairing would be reinforced by residential-scale stairways providing easy access to the mezzanines from above or below. Although connected to all levels by the elevators, it is expected that these mezzanines would be used primarily by persons assigned to the adjacent paired laboratories. A lunchroom at the level of the second mezzanine would accommodate about 80 persons and would function as a connector between the third floor of the Medical Research Building to the east and the fifth floor of the Basic Science Building on the west. The library/resource center would be located on the fourth mezzanine, overlooking the proposed landscaped courtyard. It would serve as an access point for data and material associated with the Institute's research as well as provide tele-conferencing spaces for groups up to 20, conventional stack space for 50 journals, computer terminals for access and training, traditional reading spaces and staff office. Accessible flooring would be provided to maximize flexibility and usage as a computer-supported facility.

The administrative area would be located on the ground floor and first mezzanine with immediate access from the building lobby. Reception, secretarial pool, accounting, mail, file, storage and reprographics areas would be placed on the ground floor, and the director's suite, conference room and adjoining terrace would be on the first mezzanine. Toilet rooms would be located on each of the four laboratory levels and there would be small convenience facilities adjacent to the administrative and library/resource center also.

A botanical greenhouse would be located on the south portion of the roof.

The structural foundation of the building would be based upon drilled piers bearing on hard sub-grade basalt. These piers would be placed in groups and would be interconnected by concrete caps and grade beams. The current design concept utilizes shear walls for lateral support. The east-west loads would be resisted by interior shear walls at the stair shafts in the north and south portions of the building, and the north-south loads would be resisted by the exterior bearing/shear walls on the east and west faces of the building. The proposed cast-in-place concrete floor system would consist of pan-joints north of the administrative office area and a flat slab south of this area. Exterior north, east and west walls would have exposed cast-in-place concrete, and the south wall would be of brick and terra cotta. All windows in the laboratory/support areas would be tinted, reflective insulating glass units in anodized aluminum frames. The architects' schedule of other finish details reflects selections typical for the various kinds of spaces to be provided within the building. The building and its service tunnel would be served by four elevators (two large passenger/freight elevators which would stop at all floor levels, one freight elevator at the south end of the service tunnel for materials handling between the tunnel and the Mackenzie Hall loading dock, and one service elevator connecting the basement level animal facilities with the existing animal facilities on the first and second floors of the Medical Research Building). Utility and mechanical systems would be designed to meet all requirements of jurisdictional agencies and to minimize energy usage. Heating hot water would be provided by a combination of heat recovery chillers and modular gas-fired hot water boilers.

The estimated direct construction costs, including integral artwork and built-in equipment, correspond with the budget of $17,050,000 reflected in the federal grant application. The architects have assumed that the construction of the project would be bid in two phases. Phase One would be scheduled for bidding this Summer and would include excavation, shoring, drilled piers and substructure to the basement level. Phase Two for the balance of the project would be scheduled in the Fall of 1983. This time table may be affected by reviews required by various agencies, including the City of Portland for the processing of a conditional use permit.
All of the estimated expenditure requirements of $20,790,000 are expected to be financed from the grant approved by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OHSU Institute for Advanced Biomedical Research
Architects - Zimmer-Gunsul-Frasca Partnership, Portland
Board's priority - No. 28 in 1983-1985 (Educational and General Plant)
Legislative authorization - Being requested in 1983
Estimated total gross area - 72,442 square feet
Estimated total project cost $20,790,000
Estimated direct construction cost:
  Total, including site work and utilities $17,050,000
  Building, including integral artwork and fixed equipment $14,585,581
  Average per square foot - $201.34
Tentative schedule:
  Bidding - Summer and Fall 1983 (Phases I and II)
  Completion - December 1985
Tentative financing plan:
  Grant from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services $20,790,000

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the schematic design phase of planning which Zimmer-Gunsul-Frasca Partnership, Architects, and their consultants have completed for the proposed facilities for the Institute for Advanced Biomedical Research at the Oregon Health Sciences University be approved and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to instruct the architects to proceed with the design development phase of planning for the project within a direct construction cost allowance of approximately $17,050,000.

Board Discussion and Action

In the discussion, it was indicated that part of an anonymous gift pledge of $5 million had already been received and the institution was expected to continue its efforts toward a total endowment of at least three times that commitment. Annual operating costs have been projected at $7.35 per square foot, a major portion of which is expected to come from indirect cost allowances generated from the research activities which occur within the building. The expenditure authorization for the project will be sought from the 1983 Legislature, but it was clearly understood in the review of the grant proposal with the Emergency Board that state tax funds would not be utilized for the maintenance and operation of the building. Mr. Hunderup and the architect described the provisions which will be made to dispose of waste materials, some of which might be harmful. Since the particular types of research to be housed in the building are not yet known in detail, specific provisions for waste disposal will be developed more fully later in the planning.

In response to a question, President Laster described the faculty groups which have been involved in the preparation of the plans. He said he believed it was fair to say that there is great enthusiasm for many of the features and in
particular for the entire plan generally. From a scientific point of view, the flexibility that has been described is essential. Equally exciting is the fact that the activity should be integrated into the life of the university and that the heart of research is communication. The architectural features facilitate communication.

Mrs. Carpenter inquired whether the researchers would be used as teaching faculty if they so desired. President Laster indicated the recommendation from the committee was that about 80% of the staff of the institute would want to have graduate students. The graduate programs will be retained in the School of Medicine so that faculty wishing to have the privilege of teaching graduate students would apply for a position in an existing department in the School of Medicine.

Mr. Perry asked whether it had been possible to allay some of the initial fears that this institute would result in a conflict for funding. President Laster said it was his feeling the institute has been socialized to a very great degree although he was sure there was some concern about the competitive situation. Those concerns will only be allayed with time and as a collaborative relationship develops between the staff and the faculty.

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Perry, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon actions of the Executive Committee of the Oregon State University Foundation on February 22, 1983, institutional officials have recommended that the Cultural and Conference Center (more recently identified as the OSU Foundation Center) be named the LaSells Stewart Center in honor of the late LaSells David Stewart and Jessie Hills Stewart, the parents of Loran L. "Stub" Stewart and Faye Stewart of Eugene and Dorothy Chapman of Cottage Grove, who have pledged $1 million to enhance programs within the new facility.

As noted in the report which was made to the Board on October 23, 1981, title to the Center was accepted from the Foundation on September 30, 1981. The planning, constructing and equipping of the building, which is located on the campus at Southwest 26th Street and Western Boulevard, had been made possible through the gifts of alumni and other friends of the institution who provided more than $4.8 million for it.

The new name would honor a family with close ties to the University and to Oregon's wood products industry.

Lt. Col. LaSells D. Stewart was born on June 10, 1876, at St. Francis, Minnesota. He came to Oregon in 1903, settling first in Grants Pass and later at Fall Creek where he was foreman for the Booth-Kelly Lumber Company. He was married in Portland on March 31, 1908, to Jessie Hills (a member of an early Lane County pioneer family). After they moved to Cottage Grove in 1910, he became one of the founders of what is now the Bohemia Lumber Company and remained active in that business until 1946.

During World War I, he enlisted in the army and was commissioned a first lieutenant. He served in France with the 20th Engineers and was decorated with the purple heart and citations by General Foch and General Pershing. He was commanding officer of the local National Guard Battery for several years and during World War II was recalled to duty with the Oregon State Guard, ultimately being commissioned as lieutenant colonel.

At the time of his death on June 13, 1964, at the age of 88, many tributes were paid to his thrift, energy, ingenuity, humor, generosity, humility, warmth of personality and public service. Editorially, the Eugene Register Guard commented that "Written as fiction, the full life story of LaSells Stewart would seem so improbable as to be difficult for an author to market. He was, indeed, one of the last of a vanishing breed, and it is we who are the poorer because this is so."
The administration of the University concurs in the request of the Foundation to honor the parents of Mrs. Chapman and her brothers (both of whom graduated from OSU, and L. L. Stewart served on the Board) in this way.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Cultural and Conference Center on the campus of Oregon State University be named the LaSells Stewart Center in honor of the parents of L. L. "Stub" Stewart, Faye Stewart and Mrs. Dorothy Chapman.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Perry, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Request for Ratification of Grant Application for Proposed Extension of KSOR Signal and Replacement of Equipment, SOSC

Staff Report to the Board

In order to meet a filing deadline of February 28, 1983, an application was filed with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration within the U.S. Department of Commerce for grant assistance of approximately $30,906 to cover three-fourths of the estimated cost of $41,208 to extend the broadcast signal by a translator to serve west Mt. Shasta, McCloud, Dunsmuir, and rural areas of south Siskiyou County in northern California and to replace certain outmoded portable recording equipment of FM Radio Station KSOR at Southern Oregon State College. The state matching fund requirements of $10,302 are expected to be provided from contributions from the KSOR Listeners Guild. The application included a caveat that it is subject to review by appropriate State agencies such as the Board and the Joint Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to ORS 291.375.

While the population of these communities located adjacent to or near the major highway route of Interstate 5 south of Ashland is not of sufficient size to support a public radio station, there is considerable interest in having such service available. KSOR already serves the northern portion of Siskiyou County and is in the initial stages of construction of a translator on Park Mountain to serve Weed and portions of the city of Mt. Shasta. The extension of KSOR's signal via translator would be a simple and cost-effective way of providing public radio programming to this additional area. An application has been filed with the FCC to construct an FM translator station on Gray Butte Summit to relay the signal of KSOR-FM to provide service to McCloud and Dunsmuir, California.

Over the years, listeners have come to rely on KSOR, the only public radio station in the region, for programs which feature the talents of local artists and regional arts organizations such as the Rogue Valley Symphony, the Oregon Shakespearean Festival, and the Peter Britt Music Festival. Because of KSOR's inability to finance the replacement of certain major equipment items necessary for gathering quality recordings or mixing for live broadcasts, this service by the station has diminished. Consequently, the second component of the project for which grant assistance is being requested, is the replacement of the outdated equipment to permit the recording of programs at remote locations and facilitate quality mixing from a large studio space that does not have this equipment installed on a permanent basis.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Board ratify the application that has been filed with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to extend the KSOR signal into additional communities of northern California and to replace portable recording and mixing equipment. The proposal seeks grant assistance of approximately $30,906 for three-fourths of the estimated cost of $41,208 to extend the broadcast signal by a translator to serve west Mt. Shasta, McCloud, Dunsmuir and rural areas of south Siskiyou County and to replace certain outmoded recording equipment of FM Radio Station KSOR at Southern Oregon State College. The state matching fund requirements of $10,302 are expected to be provided from contributions from the KSOR Listeners Guild. No state tax funds are involved.
Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Perry, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Petition of K. J. Rohde

Kermit J. Rohde, Professor of Psychology at Oregon State University, has requested a Board review of his salary status. Dr. Rohde alleges that he has received unreasonably low compensation since 1968 as a result of:

1. Discriminatory application of the criteria for Faculty Evaluation, and Post-Tenure Review as described in the Board's Administrative Rules OAR 580-21-135 and OAR 580-21-140, respectively, resulting from the exercise of his rights of free speech.

2. Failure to follow Board procedures as described in OAR 580-21-135 and OAR 580-21-140 as well as appropriate procedural due process.

Dr. Rohde filed a complaint with President MacVicar. On March 13, 1979, President MacVicar denied Professor Rohde's request for salary adjustment. Further attempts to resolve the dispute have not been successful.

We are advised by Oregon State University as well as by our legal counsel that Dr. Rohde has exhausted all the available internal procedures. Dr. Rohde requests a hearing under the Board's Administrative Rule 580-21-390, Discretionary Review of Academic Nondisciplinary Personnel Decisions, which provides for appellate review by the Board upon recommendation from the Chancellor or his designee.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that such a review be provided. If the Board concurs in this recommendation, adoption of the following motion would be appropriate:

In the matter of the appeal of Kermit J. Rohde, regarding nondisciplinary academic personnel action by Oregon State University submitted by letter or document dated February 7, 1983, pursuant to OAR 580-21-390, it is moved that the Board of Higher Education refer the matter to the Chancellor or his designee for examination and informal settlement, if possible. Upon completion, the matter should be returned to the Board for determination regarding further proceedings, if any, pursuant to OAR 580-21-390(3).

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Perry, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

The University of Oregon requests authorization to establish a unit to be called the University of Oregon Strategic Management Institute. The unit will be administered by the College of Business Administration. Purpose of the Institute would be to coordinate and foster activities of the College in serving Northwest industries through research and consultation in areas of strategic management. The Institute is to be supported by private funding sources. The University's request is found on pp. 8-10 of the document distributed for the Board meeting January 28, 1983. Development of the Institute was discussed by institutional presidents and deans of business at a meeting February 24, 1983. The concerns about the Institute expressed earlier by some institutional personnel have been resolved.
If the University's request for establishment of the Institute is approved, the College of Business Administration will appoint an independent board of distinguished individuals from business, labor, and government to advise the College in the development and direction of the Institute. Activities proposed for the first year, which would draw upon the substantial expertise in areas of strategic management existing in the faculty of the College of Business Administration and its Graduate School of Management, include:

- Extensive discussions with Northwest industry to facilitate development of workshops covering critical issues in corporate strategy, organizational effectiveness, and leadership;
- Strategic market planning studies to identify expanded market opportunities for existing Northwest industries, with special emphasis on retail and service sectors;
- Economic impact studies on the effect of state and local regulatory policy on the growth and development of the region's economy;
- Applied research and consultation in areas such as alternative means of funding necessary public services, productivity and quality of work life, and funding of residential housing;
- Marketing research to identify new wood-using industries compatible to the Northwest, including conversion of existing industries to new products.

The Institute will not offer instructional programs carrying degree credit. A tentative first-year budget for the Institute totalling $254,638 is presented on p. 9 of the document. The College of Business believes the budget is realistic and attainable. The position of the person who would serve as director of the Institute is presently funded with non-state funds. The Institute budget would provide private funding to release a portion of the time of a professor to serve as research director, and to purchase released time of faculty members participating in the Institute's research activities.

The establishment of the proposed Institute will not prevent other institutions coordinating their resources in management and related areas to provide services to business and industry, and, indeed, this coordination is underway. Moreover, it is anticipated that the establishment of institutes and centers at one or more institutions will not only make these resources more visible and accessible to the public, but will identify and provide a vehicle for interinstitutional cooperation.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The Board's staff recommended that the Board authorize the University of Oregon to establish the University of Oregon Strategic Management Institute, with the provision that funding for the Institute is to be obtained from non-state sources.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Wyss asked precisely what would be the purpose of the institute. Mrs. Kahananui explained that the staff would be engaged in consulting and research. The Director and Research Director are both present staff members, and professors in the School of Business Administration presently are engaged in consulting and research and have expertise in the area of strategic management. This organizational structure is expected to be effective in promoting this type of service which could be provided by the University of Oregon. The designation of an organizational unit with a wide array of expertise would be very valuable in getting research funds. Recommendations for similar consultation and research organizations are anticipated from Oregon State University and Portland State University.
Mr. Perry said there might be an additional factor in promoting financial development through centering administratively with one person the responsibility for contacting the business community and providing certain services in a more coordinated fashion than has been the case in the past. He asked what would be done with any money that was received.

Mrs. Kahananui indicated that funds would go into a state account for this particular purpose. It would provide released time of the faculty. Funds thus released could then be used to purchase other instructional faculty to meet the instructional load. There is still interest in developing a strategic management institute through cooperation of the three schools of business as a long-range objective. It is believed that the organization of the Strategic Management Institute at the University of Oregon is a short-range objective which might facilitate the achievement of the long-range goal. Representatives from Oregon State University and Portland State University indicated that similar requests probably would be made to the Board from those institutions before the end of the year.

Dr. Richard Hill, Provost, commented that in defense of duplication there were some significant differences in the emphases and strengths in the three schools of business. The present request is built upon the current strengths of the existing faculty at the University of Oregon. Although many of the faculty members are doing these things now, there is a continuity to an institute, particularly in support staff and equipment investments, that the individual entrepreneur simply would not have.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Perry, and Weatherford. Those voting no: Directors Wyss and Ingalls.

In response to a request from the Board, Mrs. Kahananui distributed a document entitled, "Requests of the Institutions for New Degree or Certificate Programs Being Held in the Board's Office." A copy of the full report is on file in the Board's Office.

The document described the Board's general powers and responsibilities with respect to curriculum and instruction and reviewed the evolution of the curricular allocations concept in Oregon. It also provided other background information. The document provided program descriptions of those programs currently being held in the Board's Office. A list of the programs included in the document follows.

**Programs Currently Being Offered as Options in Authorized Degree Programs or as Undergraduate Minors**

- MA/MS in Marine Resource Management, OSU
- Certificate in Gerontology, OSU
- Certificate in Twentieth Century Studies, OSU
- Certificate in Marine and Maritime Studies, OSU
- BS in Surveying, OIT

**Programs Directly Related to Economic Development**

- BA/BS in Computer Science, SOSC
- BA/BS in Computer Engineering, PSU
- MA/MS in Engineering-Civil; MA/MS in Engineering-Electrical; MA/MS in Engineering-Mechanical; PSU

**Other Programs Being Held**

- BA in International Studies, SOSC
- BA in International Studies, WOSC
- BA/BS in Regional Planning, SOSC
- MS in Education: Gifted Education, WOSC
- BA/BS in Theater Arts, WOSC
- BS in Agricultural Business Management, OSU
- MS in Environmental Health Management, OSU
- Ph.D. in Nursing, OHSU
Board Discussion and Action

It was indicated that these programs had been held in the Board's Office because it had been decided that during a time of budget cuts, it was not appropriate to consider the approval of new programs. This has been very frustrating for the institutions and the students.

Mr. Weatherford questioned the necessity for certificate programs to go to the Board and suggested that approval of the Chancellor's Office might be sufficient.

Mrs. Kahananui explained that a certificate must go to the Board under the present regulations. She said the Board awards degrees and certificates by law, so it would seem appropriate for the Board to approve the programs for which degrees and certificates are to be awarded. The Board could delegate to the Chancellor's Office approval of certificates as it has done in the case of courses and course changes for programs that have been approved by the Board. However, she said Board approval does provide an element of control in limiting the number of minors requested. She said she would prefer to have the Board retain its approval of certificates.

Mrs. Carpenter said Board approval was very important for the Board's educational function in the broad perspective of its responsibilities.

The Board then discussed the procedure for considering the three groups of programs currently being held. It was agreed that the first five programs would be considered in the April Board meeting because they essentially represented name changes or slight changes in emphasis. With respect to the programs directly related to economic development, it was agreed that the BA/BS in Computer Engineering at Portland State University would be considered in a meeting of the Instruction Committee, with other Board members in attendance, on Thursday, April 21, 1983. The remainder of that group would be scheduled during the spring and early summer as the data is completed. The final group will be brought to the Board later in the year as completed.

The Chancellor asked the Board what guidelines it wanted used with respect to dropping courses or programs when requests for new offerings were received. In the discussion, it was stated that when new programs come forward, there should be an accompanying analysis of where the resources for the programs would be obtained, and also whether any other offerings would be dropped.

Mr. Alltucker said he would want to know how many students need a particular type of training on a statewide basis and which campus can offer the program best in terms of available resources and the quality of the program that might develop.

Mr. Perry inquired whether the 5% admissions provision for students who could not meet regular admission requirements was still in effect and whether any consideration had been given to reducing that to 3%.

Mrs. Carpenter said public school personnel had expressed concern that the admission requirements would block access for many students, and the 5% provision had been very reassuring.

Mrs. Kahananui indicated a report is being prepared and will be brought to the Board in the near future.

Mr. Ingalls reported several items of correspondence which he had received. These included letters from the Oregon Music Association relative to the new admissions requirements and the adequate provision for electives. There were also letters inquiring about the consideration of the semester system for the University of Oregon.
A notification of the approval of the MS degree in toxicology at Oregon State University had been received from the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission.

Two additional letters were received and referred to staff for further information.

**Staff Report to the Board**

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and KEI/Kruchek Engineers, Inc., project engineers, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for the Basic Science Building Hot Water Pipe Replacement project on the campus of the Oregon Health Sciences University was accepted on behalf of the Board as of February 8, 1983, subject to the completion of minor unfinished items.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on December 17, 1982:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/8/83</td>
<td>12/17/82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - Fullman Company, Portland</td>
<td>$89,453</td>
<td>$88,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>11,547</td>
<td>7,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes minor modifications within one approved change order.

The work of the contract included the removal of existing galvanized hot water piping and the reinstallation of new insulated copper hot water supply and return lines within Floors B through 4 of the Basic Science Building, the installation of domestic hot water supply and return risers, and the improvement of hot water service in toilet rooms.

Funds for this project were provided from resources available to the institution from savings of $55,328 from earlier phases of the hot water pipe replacement project, involving the 5th, 6th and 7th floors, and from building use credits of $53,672.

**RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE**

Project - OHSU Basic Science Building Hot Water Pipe Replacement

Engineers - KEI/Kruchek Engineers, Inc., Portland

Board's priority - Not applicable

Legislative authorization - Not required

Estimated total project costs | $109,000

Estimated total direct construction costs | $89,453

Tentative financing plan:
- Reallocation of state funds made available for prior phases of the work | $55,328
- Building use credits | $53,672
- Total | $109,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and KEI/Kruchek Engineers, Inc., project engineers, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for the Incinerator with Heat Recovery project on the campus at the Oregon Health Sciences University was accepted on behalf of the Board as of February 3, 1983, subject to the completion of minor unfinished items.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on May 28, 1982:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget 2/3/83</th>
<th>Original Budget 5/28/82</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - Michael J. Watt, Inc., Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$258,343</td>
<td>$243,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>220,866</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>40,785</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>30,006</td>
<td>26,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes slight change in location of the building, additional excavation, and other minor modifications within three approved change orders.

The work of the contract included the installation of an incinerator within a new structure close to the south campus utility plant. The project enables the institution to incinerate most of the contaminated, non-contaminated and low-level radioactive wastes from the hospital and clinics and to convert the heat captured in the process into steam for the central distribution system.

Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds of $205,000 were applied to supplement a federal energy grant of $172,500 and the state matching funds of $172,500 allocated from the General Fund appropriation within Chapter 290, Oregon Laws 1979, to cover the estimated total expenditure requirements of $550,000.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OHSU Energy Conservation and Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects (Incinerator with Heat Recovery)

Engineers - KEI/Kruchek Engineers, Inc., Portland

Board's Priority - portion of No. 5 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorizations - Emergency Board action on February 1, 1980, pursuant to Chapter 290, Oregon Laws 1979, and Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

Estimated total project costs (this portion only)
- Energy Conservation $345,000
- Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations 205,000 $550,000

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $258,343
Financing plan:

USDOE grant $172,500
General Fund appropriation within $172,500
Chapter 290, OL 1979
Subtotal (Energy Conservation) $345,000
Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds $205,000
Total $550,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of Portland State University, and in accordance with the provisions of OAR 580-50-020, arrangements have been made with James D. Graham & Associates, Inc., Portland, to provide electrical engineering consulting services under a retainer-type contract during the calendar year 1983.

Such professional assistance shall be provided for feasibility studies, for the preparation of drawings, specifications, cost estimates and other services relating to minor capital improvement and/or rehabilitation projects at the request of appropriate institutional officials. Compensation shall be based upon time and materials within a stated limitation authorized by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.

Funds required for these services, including expense reimbursements, are being provided from the institution's budgeted resources.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Jeppesen, Miller & Tobias, project architects, Corvallis, the work of the prime contractor for Base Bid "A" of the fourth and final major phase of remodeling within the Memorial Union Building on the campus at Oregon State University was accepted on behalf of the Board as of February 1, 1983, subject to the completion of minor unfinished items. The work performed for Base Bid "B" had been accepted previously under date of August 18, 1982.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on February 26, 1982:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/1/83</td>
<td>2/26/82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Bid &quot;A&quot; - Dale Ramsay Construction Co., Corvallis $1,307,972</td>
<td>$1,243,244</td>
<td>$64,728 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Bid &quot;B&quot; - C. A. Lantz Construction Co., Salem 58,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal for direct construction costs</td>
<td>$1,365,972</td>
<td>$1,301,244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Professional services fees</th>
<th>Furnishings and equipment</th>
<th>Works of art</th>
<th>Construction supervision and miscellaneous expenses, including physical plant costs</th>
<th>Contingencies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>134,032</td>
<td>132,853</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,566,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>30,464</td>
<td>(6,364)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,644</td>
<td>11,644</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous expenses, including physical plant costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,252</td>
<td>27,469</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62,326</td>
<td>(62,326)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,566,000</td>
<td>$1,566,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes replacing and adding floor and rain drains, adding two shoring beams, relocating some of the fire sprinkler piping, changing electrical circuits to eight cash registers, providing a waste energy recovery system, providing installation of hot gas recovery units for three water-cooled compressor units, providing condenser cooling water circuit with circulating pumps and connections to existing cooling tower, and other minor modifications within six approved change orders.

The work of the larger contract included the following major components:

(a) Installation of fire sprinklers within those portions of the building which were not included within the Phase III project during 1979-1981, including the concealment of sprinkler piping with new suspended ceilings and the installation of new lighting fixtures as well as architectural furring in finished areas where the existing construction did not lend itself to piping concealment. These items related to fire and life safety.

(b) Revision of the kitchen, scramble-type serving area and patron seating areas in the Commons; the remodeling of the Corn Exchange dining room and Country Store; the provision of new corridors along the north wall of the mezzanine level for east-west circulation (replacing the narrow corridor just south of the rotunda); modifications to the landing area on each side of the main rotunda entry to connect with the new corridor, including ramps for wheelchair traffic; and the remodeling of the men's toilet room adjacent to the east ballroom on the ground floor to provide separate restrooms in this location for both men and women. Additional remodeling was accomplished near the east ballroom to increase the storage area.

(c) The construction of porches at the east and south entries to the bookstore and at the south entrance to the Commons.

The smaller contract was for cleaning, tuckpointing and recaulking exterior wall surfaces.

Except for items of repair and maintenance work totaling $156,000 which were charged against the building repair reserve, the project costs were financed from the proceeds of $1,410,000 from self-liquidating bonds issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OSU Memorial Union Remodel, Phase IV

Architects - Jeppsen, Miller & Tobias, Corvallis

Board's priority - No. 16 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Estimated total project costs:

- Capital construction: $1,410,000
- Repair and maintenance: $156,000

Estimated total direct construction costs:

- Capital construction: $1,229,125
- Repair and maintenance: $136,847

Total: $1,365,972
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Report of Bids and Contract Award for Steam Condensate Return Pipe Insulation, OSU

Staff Report to the Board

Financing plan:
Capital construction: Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings
and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $1,410,000
Repair and maintenance: Memorial Union Building
Repair Reserve 156,000
Total $1,566,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Following notice from the Oregon Department of Energy that the application filed under the Institutional Buildings Grant Program had been approved, the Physical Plant Department of Oregon State University prepared drawings and specifications for the bidding of the proposed steam condensate return pipe insulation project. The five quotations received for this work on January 11, 1983, ranged from $41,358.41 to $71,123.

Inasmuch as the low bid was within the pre-bid estimate and the resources available, a contract award was made to the lowest bidder and the following tentative budget was approved:

Direct construction costs - AC and S, Inc., Portland $41,358.41
Engineering and other physical plant expenses,
including construction supervision 5,500.00
Contingencies 4,141.59
Total $51,000.00

The contractor is to furnish and install the required thermal insulation on the condensate piping within the utility tunnels on the campus on the basis of unit prices quoted for the estimated quantities of various pipe sizes, valves, elbows, tees, flanges, expansion joints, etc., with the understanding that the final contract amount will reflect actual quantities incorporated in the job.

Approximately one-half of the estimated total expenditure requirements will be financed from the federal energy grant and the remainder will be charged against resources available from the institution's operating budget.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon drawings and specifications prepared by the staff of the Physical Plant Department of Oregon State University, bids were solicited for insulating the attics of various buildings on the campus in Corvallis as part of the energy conservation program for which federal grant funds were made available through the Department of Energy. Eight contractors submitted quotations on February 15 for the work within each of seventeen buildings and also responded to the invitation to enter a figure for the optional combination bid. These amounts for the combined work ranged from a low of $39,047 to a high of $93,368. Inasmuch as the sum of the lowest bids for the work within individual
buildings was slightly lower than the lowest combination bid, three contract awards were made on that basis and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs:

- Basic Bids A, B, F, H, I, J, K, M, N, O, P
- and Q - Williams Insulation, Inc., Dallas $26,322
- Basic Bids C, D, E and L - William H. Coleman Sr.
- Contractor, Portland 8,776
- Basic Bid G - Marshall’s Oil and Insulation Co., Springfield 3,933

Subtotal $39,031

Engineering and other physical plant costs, including construction supervision 14,019
Contingencies 1,500

Total $54,550

The work includes insulation within the attics of the following buildings: Apperson Hall, Batcheller Hall, Benton Hall, Bexell Hall, Covell Hall, Dryden Hall, Extension Hall, Fairbanks Hall, Langton Hall, McAlexander Fieldhouse, Milam Hall, Moreland Hall, Physical Plant Office, Shepard Hall, Waldo Hall, Wiegand Hall and the Women’s Study Center.

Approximately one-half of the costs will be financed from the federal grant and the remainder will be allocated from resources available within the operating budget of the institution.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Afseth, Jacobs & Schmitz, project architects, Medford, the work of the prime contractor for the Moehl Stadium Roof project on the campus at Oregon Institute of Technology, was accepted on behalf of the Board as of December 20, 1982, subject to the completion of minor unfinished items.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on June 25, 1982:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 12/20/82</th>
<th>Original Budget 6/25/82</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - Brosterhous Construction Co., Klamath Falls</td>
<td>$165,879</td>
<td>$152,874</td>
<td>$13,005 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional service fees</td>
<td>18,403</td>
<td>15,287</td>
<td>3,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td>7,667</td>
<td>(1,478)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,643</td>
<td>(7,643)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$192,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$7,000 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes the addition of six steel exit stairs and other minor modifications within three approved change orders.

(2) Reflects adjustment authorized to finance a portion of the cost of the exit stairs. The revised budget total of $192,000 is $13,000 less than the statutory expenditure limitation of $205,000.
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The work of the contract included the construction of the Stadium roof using steel beams, girders and "H" series bar joists with exposed steel deck roofing. The roof covering measures approximately 276 feet by 63 feet, including overhangs of 9 feet over the front and back of the spectator seating area. The metal has a painted finish. Structural capacity was provided for the potential future addition of a pressbox and coaches' area on top of the central portion of the roof. In the interim, these functions will continue to be located in the initial structures which house restrooms and concession booths at the top of the grandstand. On both ends of the upper portion of the seating area, there is a 12-inch thick painted concrete block wall as a windbreak.

The expenditures for this project were charged against proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bonds issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution. No state tax funds are involved.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OIT Moehl Stadium Roof
Architects - Afseth, Jacobs & Schmitz, Medford
Board's priority - No. 22 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)
Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

Estimated total project costs $192,000
Estimated direct construction costs $165,879
Financing plan:
Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings $192,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Robert C. Ingalls, President

Wilma L. Foster, Secretary