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STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
UNOFFICIAL RECORD OF MEETING HELD IN
ROOM 338, MICHAEL J. SMITH MEMORIAL CENTER, PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PORTLAND, OREGON

December 8, 1970

MEETING #391-1 A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in Room 338, Michael J. Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M., Tuesday, December 8, 1970, by the President of the Board, Mr. George H. Layman, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. George H. Corey
Mr. John D. Mosser

Mr. Robert D. Holmes
Mr. Loran L. Stewart

Mrs. Elizabeth H. Johnson
Mr. John W. Snider

Mr. Philip A. Joss
Mr. George H. Layman

Absent: Mr. Chas. R. Holloway, Jr., was absent for business reasons.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities—Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Secretary R. L. Collins; Mr. Freeman Holmer, Vice Chancellor for Administration; Mr. J. I. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning; Dr. Miles C. Romney, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Mr. D. R. Larson, Assistant Chancellor; Mr. H. A. Bork, Consultant; Dr. Carl G. Paetz, Director of Campus and Building Planning; Mr. Keith L. Jackson, Budget Director; Mr. Allen McKenzie, Contracting Officer and Assistant to Vice Chancellor for Administration; Mr. Raymond F. Underwood, Assistant Attorney General; Mr. Fred Segrest, Director, Management Audit Unit; Mr. Charles Rettinger, Management Analyst, Management Audit Unit; Dr. George Diehl, Director of Communications Development; Mr. Ralph Steetle, Director of Program Coordination, Division of Continuing Education; Mr. John Richardson, Assistant to the Chancellor.

Oregon State University—President R. W. MacVicar; Mr. M. Popovich, Dean of Administration; Mr. Wilmer H. Post, Assistant to the President.

University of Oregon—President Robert D. Clark; Dr. Harry Alpert, Dean of Faculties; Mr. J. O. Lindstrom, Director of Fiscal Affairs; Dr. John F. Lallas, Assistant to the President and Director, Office of Planning and Institutional Research; Mr. George Wallman, Architect; Mr. Romney W. Cooke, Research Assistant.

University of Oregon Dental School—Dean L. G. Terkla.

University of Oregon Medical School—Dean C. N. Holman; Mr. W. A. Zimmerman, Associate Dean for Business Affairs.
Portland State University—President Gregory B. Wolfe; Dr. Joseph C. Blumel, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Mr. W. T. Lemman, Jr., Vice President for Business and Finance; Mr. Robert Low, Vice President for Administration; Dr. Clarence A. Porter, Executive Assistant to the President; Mr. J. Malcolm McMinn, Director of Facilities Planning and Operations; Mr. W. C. Neland, Director, Physical Plant; Mr. Whitney Bates, Professor of History.

Oregon College of Education—President L. W. Rice; Dr. Ronald L. Chatham, Assistant to the President.

Southern Oregon College—President James K. Sours.

Eastern Oregon College—President A. M. Rempel; Dr. R. S. Perry, Dean of Administration.

Oregon Technical Institute—President W. D. Purvine.

Others—Mrs. Maxine Warnath, Assistant Professor of Psychology at Oregon College of Education, representing the American Association of University Professors Federation; Mr. Ray Field, Auditor, Office of the Secretary of State; Mr. Michael Papadopoulos, Corvallis.

Student Representatives—Miss Valerie J. Anderson, Research Assistant and Student; Students Mary England, Jerry Keefi, Patti March, Bill Steber, Jim Nagae, all from the University of Oregon.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting of the Board held on October 26, 1970, and approved them as printed in the preliminary minutes previously issued.

Introduction of Mrs. Warnath

During the Board meeting, the Chancellor introduced Mrs. Maxine Warnath of Oregon College of Education. Mrs. Warnath will represent the American Association of University Professors Federation during the coming year.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Confirmation of Reward Offered in Johnson Hall Bombing, UO

The Chancellor reported that immediately following the recent bombing of Johnson Hall on the University of Oregon campus, it had been announced that a $10,000 reward would be offered for information in connection with the incident. The reward would be on the same basis as that previously authorized in connection with the bombing of Prince Lucien Campbell Hall and disbursements of the reward money would be made on the recommendation of a screening committee as previously discussed.

It was recommended that the Board confirm the offer of a reward in an amount up to $10,000 for information received pertaining to the bombing of Johnson Hall.

In response to a question concerning the possible relationship of the recent rock throwing incidents and the bombings, President Clark indicated that they appeared to be quite different issues. He said the people who threw the rocks were heard but not identified.
Mrs. Johnson said that this senseless destruction is of very great concern and should be looked at in an effort to determine motivation and the means of combating these acts.

The Board confirmed the offer of a reward in connection with the Johnson Hall bombing in an amount up to $10,000.

(Considered by Building Committee, November 16, 1970.)

On July 21, 1969, a report was made to the Board concerning the receipt of satisfactory bids and contract awards for the construction of the College Services Building at Portland State University within a total budget of $1,135,000 (exclusive of the requirements for Parking Structure II which had been bid and contracted simultaneously). This amount was $40,000 less than the expenditure limitation authorized by the 1967 Legislature.

During the construction of the project it became apparent that certain items of work had not been budgeted adequately to assure the most effective utilization of warehouse, shop and office areas within the building. For example, it would be desirable to provide additional shelving within the service spaces and to add certain interior finishes to the locker rooms adjacent to the warehouse and physical plant shop spaces. Furthermore, the requirements for built-in cabinet work and movable furnishings in the various office spaces were somewhat higher than anticipated, and the nominal amount of $20,252 budgeted originally for contingencies has been used to take care of some of the most critical needs.

It was recommended that the budget for the College Services Building at Portland State University be increased from $1,135,000 to $1,150,000, and that the increase of $15,000 be allocated from proceeds from the sale of bonds issued previously under the provisions of Article XII-G of the Oregon Constitution. These funds are available, and the application thereof for this purpose is not subject to further action by the State Emergency Board inasmuch as the revised project budget is well within the expenditure limitation approved earlier.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendation as presented.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Upon the recommendation of Portland State University officials and the project architects, the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning inspected and accepted as of October 14, 1970, the work performed by the three principal construction contractors for the College Services Building and Parking Structure II, subject to the completion of a few minor items. The acceptance of the construction work of the elevated walkway across S. W. Broadway at S. W. Montgomery Street, which had been contracted simultaneously, was acknowledged as of July 15, 1970. A revised semifinal budget for the combined projects is shown below in comparison with a summary of the budget reported to the Board on July 21, 1969:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>Revised Budget - 10/14/70</th>
<th>Original Budget 7/21/69</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocated To:</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coll. Serv. Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General work - Contractors, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>$574,254</td>
<td>$489,811</td>
<td>$1,064,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work - Temp-Control Corporation, Portland</td>
<td>240,480</td>
<td>32,239</td>
<td>272,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical work - Christenson Electric, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>107,308</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>126,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator - Sturm Elevator Company, Portland</td>
<td>12,436</td>
<td>12,436</td>
<td>24,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwork - Teaples and Thatcher, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>11,584</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional interior work - Physical Plant Department</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$972,102</td>
<td>$553,986</td>
<td>$1,526,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated walkway - Robert D. Morrow, Inc., Salem</td>
<td>69,730</td>
<td>69,730</td>
<td>139,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct construction costs</td>
<td>$1,041,832</td>
<td>$623,716</td>
<td>$1,665,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>56,996</td>
<td>34,693</td>
<td>91,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td>32,510</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site acquisition and clearance costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135,945</td>
<td>135,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>18,662</td>
<td>10,646</td>
<td>29,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$805,000</td>
<td>$1,955,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes various modifications requested by the City of Portland to provide additional fire protection and other safety devices; addition of sealer to concrete decks in parking areas; addition of certain hardware for security; revisions to hydraulic freight elevator hatchway; modifications to office partitions and other changes incorporated within nine approved change orders.

2. Includes modifications for fire and safety protection in response to City of Portland requests; relocation and redesign of sumps per city code and other changes incorporated within six approved change orders.

3. Includes electrical work pertaining to modifications requested by City of Portland; revisions to fourth floor offices and other changes incorporated within seven approved change orders.
(4) These items were bid separately in lieu of incorporating the work within the other prime contracts.

(5) This item is described in a separate agenda item relating to an increase of $15,000 in the total project cost.

(6) Receipt of satisfactory bids for the elevator and elevated walkways and a more precise allocation of costs by the architects and contractors between the College Services Building and the parking facilities effected a net reduction in professional services fees.

Plans and specifications for the College Services Building and Parking Structure II were prepared by Architects Engelund, Plummer & Associates of Portland. These facilities occupy the block bounded by S. W. Broadway, S. W. Mill, S. W. Montgomery, and S. W. Sixth, except for the 7,500 square foot area within the southwest quarter of the block being used for Koinonia House, the interdenominational student center. The gross area of the services building is approximately 59,588 square feet of which 11,873 square feet represent basement space for parking thirty-four cars. The remaining area is assigned to physical plant shops and warehouse space, offices and related service areas for the staff in facilities planning, personnel services and placement services.

The multi-level Parking Structure II contains a gross area of approximately 110,877 square feet, excluding the ground level warehouse space and basement parking area which are part of the College Services Building, and has a capacity to accommodate about 339 vehicles. (As contemplated by the capital outlay requests for 1971-1973, the basement parking and storage areas may be converted later to accommodate the computer center and the Centralized Duplicating Services.)

The structural system is of reinforced concrete columns and beams with steel formed waffle slab floor systems. Provision has been made for future expansion of three levels over the entire site. Exterior finishes are of exposed concrete with some brick tile insets. Mechanical systems are coordinated with the central plant at the Southeast Unit of Cramer Hall with services extended beneath the elevated walkway at S. W. Montgomery Street. Office areas are air conditioned, and mechanical ventilation is provided for lower level parking and physical plant shop spaces.

Plans and specifications for the elevated walkway were prepared by Architects Campbell-Yost & Partners of Portland. This link between the top floor of the College Services Building and the bridge between the Smith Memorial Center and Cramer Hall permits the circulation of people, the movement of materials and the installation of utility services across S. W. Broadway without conflict with vehicular traffic.

For the gross area of approximately 59,588 square feet within the College Services Building, the direct construction costs of $972,102 average about $16.31 per square foot. For the gross area of approximately 110,877 square feet within the multi-level parking structure, the direct construction costs of $553,986 average about $5.00 per square foot. For the combined facilities which have a gross area of approximately 170,465
square feet, the direct construction costs of $1,526,088 average about $8.95 per square foot. The average investment for each of the 373 parking spaces is about $2,493.

The sources of funds are outlined below in the project recapitulation.

**RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project - PSU</th>
<th>College Services Building</th>
<th>Parking Structure II (Including Land)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>Englund, Plummer &amp; Associates, Portland (except elevated pedestrian walkway designed by Campbell-Yost &amp; Partners, Portland)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative authorization</td>
<td>Chapter 404, Oregon Laws 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's priority (in 1967-1969)</td>
<td>No. 5</td>
<td>No. 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate gross area</td>
<td>59,588 sq. ft.</td>
<td>110,877 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total project cost</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$805,000</td>
<td>$1,955,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated direct construction costs (excluding elevated walkway):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$972,102</td>
<td>$553,986</td>
<td>$1,526,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (per square foot)</td>
<td>$16.31</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$8.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financing plan:**

- State funds (General Fund appropriation in Chapter 404, Oregon Laws 1967) | $796,250 | $ | $796,250 |
- General Obligation bond borrowings under provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution | 215,000* | - | 215,000* |
- Capital outlay building credits | 13,750 | - | 13,750 |
- General Obligation bond borrowings under provisions of Article XI-F(1) of Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises | 125,000 | 805,000 | 930,000 |

*Includes budget increase of $15,000 described in a separate agenda item.

The Board accepted the report as presented.
On November 16, 1970, Mrs. Johnson reported that the Committee on Academic Affairs and the Board had considered the role of Oregon Technical Institute in the 1970's at a meeting of the Committee on October 8, 1970; at a special community meeting on October 25 in Klamath Falls; and at the Board meeting on October 26, 1970. All of these meetings are reported in the minutes of the October 26, 1970, Board meeting. She said that Oregon Technical Institute fulfilled some of the responsibilities of the community colleges as well as furnishing technical education through the Bachelor of Technology degree. She said that in the Klamath Falls area interest has been expressed in expanding the opportunities for students in Klamath and Lake Counties by providing in Klamath Falls some programs comparable to those available through community colleges in other parts of the state.

She said that testimony presented to the Board at the October meeting in Klamath Falls indicated that Oregon Technical Institute is qualified to meet much of the need for community college programs but that the funding is complicated by the fact that Oregon Technical Institute is under the purview of the Board of Higher Education and community colleges are under the purview of local district boards and the Board of Education.

She stated that the representative of the Board of Education had been unable to be present at the Klamath Falls meeting because of weather conditions but that Mr. Robert F. Deich and Mrs. George Beard from the Board of Education were present at the November 16, 1970, meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee to comment on the possible function of Oregon Technical Institute in meeting some of the needs for community college programs in Klamath and Lake Counties.

Mr. Deich read the resolution adopted by the Board of Education on October 16, 1970, previously reported on page 775 of the minutes of the Board of Higher Education meeting of October 26, 1970. Mr. Deich said that subsequently the Governor's Advisory Commission on Vocational Education had pointed out the importance of offering a wide, broad, lower-division vocational or career-type program to as many students of the state as possible. Furthermore, a recent report of the Educational Coordinating Council presented statistics showing that the Klamath-Lake area is in the most populous area which still has no provision for a community college program and also is the one with the greatest potential for growth.

He said that these factors made it important to emphasize the need for the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education to work out a program for an open-door community college program in that region. He indicated the willingness of the Board of Education to help in any way possible, including the details of the financial problem.
Mrs. Beard commented that Oregon Technical Institute was uniquely situated to help in offering an expanded program of this type. She said that although certain of the community college approaches are different from those of Oregon Technical Institute, the provision of the needed additional lower-division courses would in no way weaken the position of Oregon Technical Institute but would strengthen it. She urged earnest and early consideration of this program so that community college offerings can be available to Klamath-Lake students as soon as possible.

Mrs. Beard referred to the recent report of the Vocational Education Committee and indicated that the main thrust of the Board of Education during the next year will be in the areas of vocational education. She also stated that there is a possibility of increased federal support for vocational education.

Mrs. Johnson concluded the discussion by indicating that all of the information, resolutions, requested lower-division programs, and financing methods will be considered further before the Academic Affairs Committee presents a final recommendation on the role of Oregon Technical Institute in the 1970's.

The Board accepted the report as presented. Mrs. Johnson said that a further report and possible recommendations would be presented at the January 1971 Board meeting.

(Considered by Building Committee, November 16, 1970.)

On February 18, 1969, the Board reviewed and approved basic studies which Architects Skidmore, Owings & Merrill had prepared for additional laboratory, classroom and office facilities at Oregon Technical Institute. It was indicated that the gross area thereof would be approximately 33,250 square feet and would cost approximately $1,500,000. It was indicated also that this unit, providing about 288 student stations, would be located southeast of Semin Hall (laboratory building) at a right angle to the existing building, creating a courtyard between these units, the Classroom Building and Snell Hall (administration building). The program included additional water chilling equipment, to be housed in the existing Mechanical-Electrical Building, and some modifications to the campus parking lot.

Although the project was not authorized by the 1969 Legislature, the Ways and Means Committee recommended that it should be placed in a relatively high priority position within the Board's capital outlay requests for 1971-1973. Because of the growth of the institution and the emphasis upon certain disciplines to be accommodated in these facilities, subsequent analyses of the program requirements dictated a need to increase the size of the proposed building to approximately 59,500 square feet in order to provide about 330 classroom stations, 357 laboratory stations and offices accommodating about 43 members of the faculty and staff. As enlarged, the proposed facilities, including the additional water chilling equipment, were assigned Priority No. 4 in the Board's listing of 1971-1973 capital outlay requests for the educational and general plant at an estimated total cost of $3,260,000.
Officials of Oregon Technical Institute and the architects have filed with the Board's Office copies of the schematic design phase of planning for Laboratory Building II and Water Chiller. The initial unit of this reinforced concrete building would contain two floor levels plus a partial basement and would be sited in accordance with the plan outlined in the previous basic studies. It would have capacity for the future construction of an additional floor for laboratory-type space, such as might be required for courses involving the chemical, biological and ecological sciences. Space within the basement would be assigned to institutional storage and mechanical rooms sized to accommodate future equipment necessary for the addition of the third floor. The first floor would contain space for computer related technologies (i.e., the computer shop, computer laboratories, appropriate terminal, control and storage rooms), general purpose classrooms, faculty and staff offices and related service spaces. The central portion of the building would be provided with a special raised floor to accommodate the initial installation and anticipated future growth of computer activities. The computer areas would have their own air conditioning units designed for the heavy computer loads and compatible with the special flooring which would be used as a ducting system. The second floor would contain laboratories for mechanical drafting, accounting and business, physics and chemistry, general purpose classrooms, faculty and staff offices and related service spaces. The anticipated mechanical system for this floor and for the future third floor would provide for the capability of supplying 100 percent outside air. Most of the interior partitions would be non-load-bearing so that they could be moved without affecting the building structure. Heating would be provided from the central hot water distribution system. The proposed exterior design would appear to be compatible with that of other campus buildings.

Anticipating the price level expected to prevail in mid-1971 when bids may be solicited following legislative authorization, the architects estimate that the total direct construction costs would be approximately $2,529,000. The portion thereof applicable to the building and fixed equipment, exclusive of the water chiller, other outside utilities and site development costs, would be about $2,349,506. Based upon the proposed gross area of approximately 60,375 square feet, these direct construction costs would average about $38.92 per square foot.

As noted above, the estimated total project cost is $3,260,000. It would need to be financed from state funds, either from a General Fund appropriation or from bond borrowings authorized under the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution, or a combination thereof.

It was recommended that the schematic design phase of planning for the Laboratory Building II and Water Chiller at Oregon Technical Institute be approved and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to instruct the architects to complete the design development phase of planning based upon a direct construction cost allowance of approximately $2,529,000. Funds required for the planning are being provided from the Board's reserve for architectural/engineering planning.
RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN

Project - OTI Laboratory Building II and Water Chiller

Architects - Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Portland

Legislative authorization - Being requested from 1971 Oregon Legislature

Board's priority - No. 4 in 1971-1973 (Educational and General Plant)

Estimated gross area - 60,375 square feet

Estimated total project cost $3,260,000

Estimated direct construction costs:
  Total $2,529,000
  Total (Building and fixed equipment only) $2,349,506
  Average (per square foot) - $38.92

Tentative schedule:
  Bidding - September 1971
  Completion - August 1973

Tentative financing schedule:
  State funds (General Fund appropriation and/or Article XI-G bonding) $3,260,000

During the Committee discussion, Mr. Mosser asked whether the priorities had been re-evaluated for buildings authorized by the 1969 Legislature but deferred by the Emergency Board. Mr. Hunderup responded that the priority positions of the supplemental amounts needed in the 1971-1973 proposed capital construction list for the postponed 1969 projects also represented the priority positions assigned for the total projects. However, he said it is assumed that the Emergency Board does not have the power to rescind actions of the 1969 Legislature and therefore the only amounts included for the 1969 projects in the priority listing for 1971-1973 are the incremental costs for the projects previously authorized by the 1969 Legislature.

In response to further questions concerning the location of the building and space utilization, Mr. Hunderup pointed out that conditions have changed in terms of the needs of Oregon Technical Institute since the development of the master plan for the institution. Consequently, it now appears advisable to provide the potential structural capacity for second or third floor levels in classroom and laboratory construction. It was also indicated that the building plans provide flexibility for conversion to a different function at a later time. This flexibility does increase the cost factor but allows greater opportunity for change as the curricula change.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented.
Subsequent to the November 16 meeting of the Committee on Buildings and Other Physical Facilities, the Governor issued his budget recommendations for 1971-1973, including only $6,000,000 for capital construction and land purchases relating to the educational and general plant. In view of these recommendations, it appears necessary to re-evaluate the program for the proposed Laboratory Building II at Oregon Technical Institute, perhaps limiting the initial phase of construction to a substantially smaller unit than had been contemplated by the schematic design. Consideration will also need to be given to the possible remodeling of portions of other buildings which may be used to supplement the new facilities.

It was understood that institutional and Board officials would work with the project architects to determine what modifications may be needed in the planning for the Laboratory Building II and Water Chiller before the design development phase of planning is undertaken.

On motion by Mr. Joss, the Board accepted the schematic design, with the understanding that further development of the project would be held in abeyance pending further study by institutional and Board officials and the architects. The revised plans are to be presented to the Board for review and approval.

During the Board discussion, Mrs. Johnson asked in connection with the nominal amount of construction funds recommended in the Governor's budget for 1971-1973, whether the Board had authority to lease, rent or rehabilitate space if it were available elsewhere in the community as an alternative to providing new space on the campus.

Mr. Hunderup responded that the Board has authority to lease property. The purchase or rehabilitation of property does not require legislative authorization if the cost does not exceed $50,000 and if the resources are available. At Oregon Technical Institute, the use of space away from the campus would be complicated by distance and consequently the need to provide transportation.

It was indicated that it may be necessary to consider class scheduling changes, possible bussing of students, summer programs, or other innovative means in order to meet the educational needs for space, particularly in the Klamath Falls region.

(Considered by Building Committee, November 16, 1970.)

On April 21, 1969, the Board was advised that Architects Payne and Settecase of Salem had been commissioned to assist the staff of Oregon State University in the design and construction supervision of approximately 150 additional units of married student housing. It was indicated that this project had been assigned Priority No. 23 in the listing of auxiliary enterprises recommended for 1969-1971 and that the estimated total cost was $2,020,000. Inasmuch as legislative authorization was not obtained in 1969, the project has been included in the auxiliary enterprise requests for 1971-1973 and appears as Priority No. 8 at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.
The Board will recall that Oregon State University has constructed a total of only 94 units of married student housing -- all since 1960. These units are identified as the Orchard Court Apartments and are located east of 35th Avenue between Orchard and Jackson Streets. They include 22 one-bedroom units, 62 two-bedroom units, and 10 three-bedroom units. The average investment, exclusive of land, was approximately $9,436 per unit.

The need for additional units of married student housing, particularly for graduate assistants, is substantial and it is necessary to replace as soon as possible the 56 temporary wood-frame war surplus units brought to the campus after World War II.

Institutional officials and the project architects have filed with the Board's Office a copy of the schematic design phase of planning which has been completed for the new units. Consistent with the program and the long-range development plan for the campus, these apartments would be constructed on University-owned property located north and west of the intersection of Western Avenue and 35th Avenue. The site contains approximately 8.96 acres of land purchased for this purpose in 1968. Considerable fill has been placed on the site, utilizing material excavated from major campus buildings in order to bring the level of the ground up to a more acceptable grade. The project budget includes the estimated requirements for a substantial amount of site development costs, such as utility services (electricity, water, sewer, etc.), landscaping, roads, walks and other improvements.

Within the total of 150 living units planned for construction, there would be 14 one-bedroom apartments and 136 two-bedroom apartments, in a combination of one-, two-, and three-story structures that have been grouped around storage, laundry and multipurpose facilities and with adequate parking spaces. The planning has evolved around the concept of modular-type construction in which representatives of both the wood and concrete prefabricated housing industries have participated. The buildings would be designed in such a way that they may be constructed of either wood or concrete materials, or a combination of the two, with emphasis placed upon performance rather than upon the particular material selected by the contractor. It is anticipated that the duplication of many features within the structures would result in extremely favorable competitive bidding. For example, it will be noted from the schematic design that bathroom and kitchen areas lend themselves ideally to prefabricated or shop-fabricated systems.

Based upon the schematic design, it is estimated that a total gross area of approximately 131,818 square feet would be constructed. Each of the twenty-four single story two-bedroom units would contain about 723 square feet. Within the eighty-four two-story townhouse apartments, the two-bedroom units would average about 925 square feet. The one-bedroom units on the first level of each of the 14 three-story buildings would have about 635 square feet; and the two-bedroom units on the second and third floors would each contain approximately 723 square feet.
The direct construction cost estimate of $1,516,000 for the buildings and fixed equipment would average about $11.50 per square foot. These amounts exclude the $260,000 budget item for site development of utilities, but do include the areas and costs applicable to the laundry, multipurpose and storage buildings.

It is acknowledged that the project budget of $2,200,000 is extremely tight for the total of 150 living units because of the major site development costs required, but institutional officials and the architects believe that with the interest and assistance of representatives of the construction industries in refining details of the program, it is feasible. The average investment per unit would be about $14,667, exclusive of land.

It was recommended that the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed married student housing project at Oregon State University be approved and that the appropriate Board and institutional officials be authorized to investigate alternative methods of proceeding with construction either by the Board, directly or indirectly, or by others such as Adult Student Housing, Inc., the nonprofit corporation currently sponsoring similar projects at Pacific University, Mt. Hood Community College and Clatsop Community College. It was also recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning be authorized to instruct Architects Payne and Settecase to proceed with the design development phase of planning if it appears likely that such plans would be utilized in the development of the project. However, before the construction documents phase of planning would be undertaken, a more complete report would be presented to the Board to outline specific recommendations for implementing the program, including a financing plan. Tentatively, on the assumption that the project would be undertaken by the Board in the usual manner, it is expected that approximately $100,000 would be available from cash reserves from the operation of other married student housing at the institution and the remainder would be financed from proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution. Funds required for the architectural planning are being provided from balances on hand from family housing operations.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN

Project - OSU Married Student Housing

Architects - Payne and Settecase, Salem

Legislative authorization - To be requested in 1971

Board's priority - No. 8 in 1971-1973 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Approximate gross area - 131,818 square feet

Estimated total project cost $2,200,000
Estimated direct construction costs:
- Total, including site development and utilities: $1,776,000
- Buildings and fixed equipment: $1,516,000
  Average (per square foot) - $11.50

Tentative schedule:
- Bidding: July 1971
- Completion: August 1972

Tentative financing plan:
- Balances available from married student housing operations: $100,000
- General obligation bond borrowings under provisions of Article XI-F(1) of Oregon Constitution: $2,100,000
- Total: $2,200,000

During the Committee discussion, the following points were made:

1. Further study will be made in an effort to lower the investment for the apartments by reducing the size and number of the two-story town-house apartments. Other alternatives will also be explored.

2. The site is a difficult site in that all of the basic utilities must be provided, thus adding to the cost.

3. There is a critical need for additional married student housing at Oregon State University.

4. Surveys of the students who will occupy the apartments may result in modifications to the schematic design in terms of the number of each type of apartment to be included in the final project.

5. There is a need for long-range planning of married student housing, the reasons for building it, and the capacity of private enterprise to supply it.

6. Criteria for student occupancy of the apartments should be developed.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented.

In response to a question during the Board discussion, Mr. Hunderup indicated that payment for the schematic plans already prepared by the architects at the direction of the Board would be the responsibility of the Board. However, if private enterprise were to construct the married housing, the State System plans would not be used and the private organization would be responsible for the entire cost of planning and construction of any housing units provided by them.

Mrs. Johnson said that the basic question goes back to the whole philosophy of building housing for students. She said that every effort should be made to encourage private enterprise to develop housing for both single
and married students, particularly since federal assistance may be available to certain groups to assist in the construction of housing. In addition, she urged that the housing policies be re-examined and clarified in the light of the present situation, and that specific guidelines be established for the priority of occupancy.

Mr. Hunderup indicated that the greater part of the need for married student housing is now being met through private enterprise. He pointed out, however, that while one-sixth of the student body at Oregon State University is married, there are only 94 permanent apartments available for married students compared to over 4,000 dormitory spots for single students. The additional units proposed will help to provide some of the need for low rental housing for married students.

Mr. Stewart suggested that alternate methods of financing be explored because it was his opinion that much of the student housing could be accomplished with federal assistance.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented. Mrs. Johnson voted against the motion.

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board, arrangements have been made to acquire the Burkhart property located within the approved projected campus boundaries of Oregon State University at 3036 S. W. Orchard Street, Corvallis. The property consists of a lot containing approximately 5,000 square feet improved with a small 45-year-old frame residence and a single-car garage. The purchase price of $11,900 was in line with appraisals obtained by the institution. The property is in an area designated for the future expansion of the Food Technology Building and the funds to finance the acquisition are being provided from the General Fund appropriation authorized in Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969, or its equivalent.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

At the Building Committee meeting on November 16, 1970, consideration was given to the schematic design of the facilities for the proposed Bio-Social Colony at the University of Oregon. In discussing this project, the Committee requested that the Board's Office develop further background information as to the uses which would be made of the facilities, the costs and sources of funds for the maintenance of the facility, and the relationship of the proposed activities to be carried on in the facility to the curricular allocations to the University of Oregon by the Board.

In response to this request, Vice-Chancellor Romney prepared a report entitled Proposed Bio-Social Colony at the University of Oregon, dated December 8, 1970. This report is included as Appendix A to these minutes. The discussion of the report is included with the discussion of the Schematic Design of Facilities for Bio-Social Colony, University of Oregon.

The Board accepted the report as presented and expressed appreciation to Dr. Romney for the information provided.
On October 26, 1970, the Board was advised of the appointment of Architects Zaik/Miller of Portland for the design and construction supervision of the proposed additional animal research facilities at the University of Oregon. Funds for the project, identified as the Bio-Social Colony Facilities, have been provided in the amount of $246,000 from the recently approved extension of the Science Improvement Grant from the National Science Foundation.

As noted in the application for the federal grant, the "bio-social colony will fill a long-standing need at the University for versatile animal facilities that will allow extensive research in comparative behavior and physiology. This facility will encourage a multi-disciplinary approach to the study of mechanisms underlying behavioral and physiological adjustment of different species to their bio-social and physical environments." In the past, because of the lack of adequate animal research facilities, the University has had to send students of anthropology, biology and psychology to other institutions for such multi-disciplinary training opportunities.

Institutional officials and the architects have filed with the Board's Office a copy of the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed facilities reflecting a three-part building complex, containing a total gross area of about 3,853 square feet, plus several fenced in animal runs, on a 2-1/2 acre site in the northeast section of the campus, north of the millrace and south of the Southern Pacific Railroad line.

One part of the complex would contain the director's office, a graduate student seminar room, reception area, storage and toilet rooms. A second part would contain the experimental laboratories, such as preparation and work rooms, environmental chambers for closely controlled temperature and light conditions, a surgery, quarantine rooms, and related service spaces, including food storage. The third unit would provide the animal quarters, including cages, observation rooms and storage areas, connected to some of the animal runs.

The office building would be of wood-frame construction with wood roof trusses. The proposed exterior finish would be cedar shingles, and the interior finishes would include gypsum wallboard, painted, with some use of wood paneling on selected wall areas. The experimental laboratory area and the animal quarters would be constructed using concrete block bearing walls with wood roof trusses. The exterior wall surfaces would have dash coats of stucco with integral waterproofing and coloring agent over the concrete blocks. Cooling, heating and ventilation air would be provided from air handling systems located in attic mechanical spaces.

The architects' estimate for direct construction, including the exterior facilities and landscaping, is $210,000, of which $145,000 is for the building complex, and $65,000 is for the exterior work. For the gross area of 3,853 square feet within the buildings, the direct construction costs of $145,000 would average about $37.63 per square foot. Sophisticated mechanical and electrical systems within the relatively small areas contribute to the high unit cost of these proposed facilities.
It was recommended that the schematic design for the Bio-Social Colony at the University of Oregon be approved and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to approve the design development and construction documents phases of planning, solicit bids and award a construction contract within the budget of approximately $246,000, subject to the approval of the State Emergency Board.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGNS

Project - UO Bio-Social Colony Facilities

Architects - Zaik/Miller, Portland

Legislative authorization - To be requested from the State Emergency Board

Board's priority - Portion of Priority No. 24 (Educational and General Plant) in 1969-1971

Approximate gross area - 3,853 square feet

Estimated total project cost - $246,000

Estimated direct construction costs:
Total $210,000
Total (building and fixed equipment only) $145,000
Average (per square foot) - $37.63

Tentative schedule:
Bidding - May 1971
Completion - December 1971

Financing plan:
Federal grant funds from the National Science Foundation - $246,000

During the Committee discussion, Dr. John C. Fentress, Assistant Professor of Psychology and Biology, described the project. He said that one of the major concerns of individuals in the natural, biological and social sciences is the question of how various organisms adjust to their environment. He said that the term "bio-social" was used to indicate that this question was to be approached from two different points of view, and also that there are two aspects to the question: (1) how organisms adjust through behavioral sequences and organization; and (2) how the potential of the organism develops as a result of interaction between genetics and experience in various stages of development. The need for a facility for this research was proposed to the National Science Foundation in an initial request for $110,000. The National Science Foundation has asked that the proposal be doubled.

The proposed program for the facility will merge the efforts of various departments, primarily anthropology, biology, and psychology, and will serve three functions: (1) teaching; (2) research; and (3) public service, including open-house days for the general public.
Dr. Fentress said that there are presently no facilities for the type of studies which will be carried on in the proposed facility. Students presently interested in these programs must go elsewhere to carry on their research or transfer to another institution. The facility will be used for studies by graduate students in anthropology, biology, and psychology, and it is anticipated that there will be from twelve to twenty graduate students. It will also be used as a teaching facility for the general biology course which has an enrollment of approximately 700 students.

In response to a question, Dr. Fentress stated that there is nothing like this anywhere else in the United States. He said that the National Science Foundation had been very enthusiastic about the proposal, both because of previous University strength in the area of behavioral biology and because the facility is unique in that it will be the first time that any institution has brought together the various departments on a program directed to behavioral adjustment to a complex environment. It was indicated that other programs that appear to be similar are designed for different types of investigation such as those that are primarily oriented to physiological investigations.

With respect to the need for staff and funds to operate the center, Dr. Fentress indicated that present staff members would use the center and no new staff would be required. Indications are that operating funds for animals, supplies, and animal care would be provided from a subsequent research grant when the facility is completed.

President Clark said that the proposed program was within the presently authorized curricula except that it crosses several disciplines. He said it was especially appropriate at the University of Oregon because it would serve the advanced programs in anthropology, psychology, and biology. With respect to financing, he said that in the area of scientific research, the National Science Foundation is most favored in the federal government. The National Science Foundation is now supporting interdisciplinary research. He stated further that the characteristic of the National Science Foundation is to assist a program over a period of time. If the grant support did not continue and if it were necessary to retrench to stay within the limits of state commitment to the educational program, this center would probably not be adversely affected.

Dr. Romney commented that the proposal takes advantage of strengths which have been allocated and developed at the University of Oregon, and it provides an opportunity for shared use and combining of resources.

The Committee discussed the possible uses for the site on which the proposed facility would be located. It was indicated that the proposed use of the total site will be under study but that the location for this particular project would not interfere with other possible uses for research, construction or housing. It was agreed that additional information should be available to the Committee, the Board, and the State Emergency Board prior to the completion of final planning and the awarding of contracts for construction. A separate report is being prepared to provide the supplemental information indicated above.
The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the physical arrangements involved in this recommendation and the preceding item for the rededication of land uses, subject to presentation of a report covering the academic policy decisions, the details of funding including recurring operating costs and financial implications, and the relationship of the Bio-Social Colony program to other programs of a similar nature.

During the Board discussion, Mr. Hunderup commented that the proposed facility was one of three capital outlay projects funded by a grant of $2,700,000 from the National Science Foundation to assist the University of Oregon in accelerating its program of excellence in science. The grant for this particular project was not a separate grant application but was part of a total package for science improvement.

It was indicated that if the proposed facility were completed, most of the animals used at the University of Oregon in research would be transferred to the new building with the exception of some of the rats and mice used for research in such departments as psychology and biology. The proposed facility would be considered to be an integral part of the teaching and research effort of a substantial group of scientists in the fields of anthropology, psychology and biology.

Mr. Stewart suggested that perhaps the term "Bio-Social Facility" could be substituted for "Bio-Social Colony." President Clark said the University would be willing to change the name.

Mrs. Johnson said that in some instances federal grants have led to obligations for future expenditures for facilities, maintenance, and operations. She asked if this project is really the informal beginning of a new institute and if it would ultimately lead to the development of an interdisciplinary degree.

Dr. Romney responded that frequently two or more departments will cooperate in research which the departments are not able to pursue independently. He said that when an institution has a major allocation in the departmental fields concerned and the individuals in those departments cooperate in a research program, it is a natural development of the programs in the departments rather than a new program, even though it may result in the creation of an institute.

Mrs. Johnson said that it seemed imperative that there should be some report to the Board when curricular developments involved physical facilities, new programs or a proposed interdisciplinary degree, so that the Board could consider possible future implications of the new developments.

The Chancellor said that the grant application for this project was submitted in accordance with the present gifts and grants policy statement adopted by the Board in 1964. The current policy requires the Board's Office to approve grant applications which include the purchase of land or the construction of a building, structure, or
other improvement requiring the total outlay of $10,000 or more, regardless of the source of funds. He indicated that the Board may wish to change this policy to state that applications for grants involving this kind of capital must be approved by the Board before the application is filed. He added that the application for the project had been approved on the basis of its being interpreted as appropriate to the approved academic program of the University of Oregon.

In response to a further question about city approval, the Chancellor indicated that the University of Oregon had assured the Board's Office that noise, odor and pollution problems had been discussed and cleared with the City of Eugene.

Mrs. Johnson said that it would be helpful for the Board to study certain departments in an effort to obtain a more definitive answer to the opinion expressed in some national publications that research rather than instruction is the primary interest of many of the people on university campuses.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented, with the understanding that the word "colony" would be deleted from the title and a substitute word used to designate the project.

Rededication of Land Use of Portions of Foster-Silva & Eugene Sand & Gravel Properties, UO

(Considered by Building Committee, November 16, 1970.)

As noted in a separate agenda item, the University of Oregon desires to construct additional animal research facilities, identified as the Bio-Social Colony Facilities, on a 2½ acre site which is located in the northeast part of the campus, north of Franklin Boulevard. The property was acquired several years ago and constitutes part of the tract of land referred to as the "Foster-Silva Properties."

When the grant application for these construction funds had been filed with the National Science Foundation as part of the request for an extension of the Science Improvement Program, it was indicated that it was the intent of the University to site the proposed research facilities along the south bank of the Willamette River on a portion of the property which the University had purchased from the Eugene Sand and Gravel Company. Subsequently, the Campus Planning Committee and institutional officials proposed that the site be changed to the location now reflected in the plans.

Inasmuch as the Foster-Silva properties had been purchased with funds earmarked for auxiliary enterprises and the University desires to rededicate a portion of such land for educational and general purposes, approval would be needed from the Board.

The following information may be useful as background to the recommendation, which appears later, for Board action:

1. Silva Property - On April 23, 1963, the Board authorized the acquisition of the Silva property consisting of 7.91 acres and the improvements thereon. Later, at the March 9-10, 1964, meeting, a report was made to the Board that the property had been purchased for $100,000, without condemnation, and it was intended to be used for student housing.
Funds for the purchase of the property, including acquisition expenses, were provided from proceeds from the sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds. No state tax funds were used.

2. Coca-Cola (Foster) Property, exclusive of an access road from Franklin Boulevard - On April 23, 1963, the Board authorized the acquisition of 6.12 acres of land owned by the Coca-Cola Bottling Company, adjacent to the Silva property and which was exclusive of substantial additional acreage for which ownership was being retained by the Company.

Subsequently, on June 21-22, 1965, a report was made to the Board of the acquisition of the property at a value of $60,965 determined by a court through condemnation action.

Moneys for the acquisition of the property, plus the court costs, attorney fees and other expenses, were provided from the proceeds of Article XI-F(1) bonds for single student housing. No state tax funds were used.

3. Coca-Cola Access Road - Pursuant to Board authorization granted on June 14-15, 1966, a private roadway was purchased from the Coca-Cola Bottling Company for $15,000, permitting the University to have direct access from Franklin Boulevard, subject to a perpetual easement in favor of the Company to allow continued access to the privately-owned land. This improved road is about 311 feet long and about 30 feet wide, thus having an area of about 9,330 square feet. Funds required for the purchase were provided from Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings for single student housing.

The Board minutes of the June 14-15, 1966, meeting include a statement to the effect that a portion of the 6.12 acres of land previously acquired from Coca-Cola had been designated as the site for economy living residence halls.

4. Eugene Sand & Gravel Company Property - As reported to the Board at the July 23, 1968, meeting, this property was acquired, without resorting to condemnation at a purchase price of $311,000. It was indicated that the unimproved usable land above the river level approximates 28.5 acres, in addition to submerged and sloping bank land of about 34.5 acres.

The property was acquired for automotive parking and also for educational and general purposes. Half of the purchase price was provided from proceeds from the sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds and the other half was provided from a General Fund appropriation. The report of acquisition stated, however, that the source of funds for the purchase would be adjusted in accordance with "the ultimate use of the property, with interest at 4.5 percent, the current rate of interest on bond borrowings for the State of Oregon."
Board policy with regard to rededication of property originally intended to be used for auxiliary enterprises projects, and the purchase of which was financed from the proceeds of the sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds or related restricted funds, may be described somewhat as follows:

Reimbursement is to be made to the fund or account which financed the cost of acquiring the property if there is to be a rededication of the use thereof as between the auxiliary enterprise category and the educational and general plant category. In addition, compensation is to be granted for interest, compounded semi-annually, based upon the interest rate prevailing on Higher Education bonds at the time of the initial purchase.

It is the opinion of the Board's attorney that "the University of Oregon, subject to Board approval, may designate land, acquired with Article XI-F(1) bond building fund money, for educational and general use (rather than auxiliary enterprise use) by the University if University land of equal current value, which had been acquired for educational and general use is designated for auxiliary enterprise use by the University." His opinion further states that "the University and Department of Higher Education records would need to be appropriately amended and documented to reflect the 'exchange' at equal current values."

It was recommended that the University of Oregon be permitted to (a) rededicate the approximate two and one-half acre parcel of land in the "Foster-Silva" area from auxiliary enterprises (single student housing) to the educational and general plant; and (b) rededicate the land from the "Eugene Sand and Gravel" property of equal current value from educational and general plant use to auxiliary enterprises use (presumably for automotive parking). Following approval of the recommendation and the determination of the exact amount of the former Eugene Sand and Gravel property affected by the exchange, University of Oregon and Oregon State Board of Higher Education records would be amended appropriately to reflect the results of the rededications. A report of such action would be made to the Board, possibly at the time that contract awards are made for the construction of the proposed Bio-Social Colony facilities.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented. (These recommendations were considered together with the Schematic Design of the facilities for the Bio-Social Colony, and the Committee discussion of both topics follows that item.)

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.
Final Planning of Administrative Services Building, UO

(Considered by Building Committee, November 16, 1970.)

When the preliminary plans for the proposed Administrative Services Building at the University of Oregon were approved by the Board on June 10, 1969, it was indicated that a request would be presented later for authorization to Architects Wolff/Zimmer/Cunsul/Frasca/Ritter to proceed with the preparation of final plans and specifications so that the construction of these facilities could be started immediately following legislative authorization in 1971. (Similar arrangements had been made in the previous biennium for the new Administration Building at Oregon State University making it possible to save several months' time in the bidding and scheduled completion of that project.)

The Administrative Services Building has been assigned priority No. 3 in the 1971-1973 capital outlay requests at an estimated total cost of $4,050,000. This amount includes $3,234,000 for the direct construction costs of the building, exclusive of site development and utility costs, assuming the price level expected to prevail in June 1971.

In view of the high priority assignment for this project and the urgency of need in replacing the administrative office spaces in Emerald Hall as soon as possible, it was recommended that the final plans and specifications for the Administrative Services Building be authorized at this time. The funds required for such planning would be advanced from the Board’s reserve for architectural/engineering planning.

The Building Committee recommends that the Board approve the recommendations as presented.

Subsequent to the November 16 meeting of the Committee on Buildings and Other Physical Facilities, the Governor issued his budget recommendations for 1971-1973 including only $6,000,000 for capital construction and land purchases relating to the educational and general plant. These recommendations appear to require a re-evaluation of the program for the proposed Administrative Services Building at the University of Oregon, perhaps limiting the initial phase of construction to those areas required for the accommodation of service units now using Emerald Hall. Consideration would also need to be given to the possible remodeling of portions of other buildings which may be used to supplement the new facilities.

It was understood that institutional and Board officials will work with the project architects to determine what modifications may be needed in the planning of the Administrative Services Building before final plans and specifications are prepared.
On motion by Mr. Joss, the Board approved the recommendations as presented, with the understanding that further development of the project would be held in abeyance pending further study by institutional and Board officials and the architects. The revised plans would be presented to the Board for review and approval.

Schematic Design for Erb Memorial Union Addition and Alterations, UO

As reported to the Board on September 8, 1969, Architects Charles Colburn and George Sheldon, Portland, and Lutes and Amundson, Associated Architects, of Springfield, joint venturers, were commissioned for the design and construction supervision of the proposed Addition and Alterations to the Erb Memorial Union at the University of Oregon. It was noted that the services of the architects were also to include assistance in the master planning of student union facilities for the University, including determinations of the capacities of the site and the present Erb Memorial Union building to accommodate future additions and to propose the physical siting of such additions.

Various alternatives for the initial construction phase were explored early in the planning process, including consideration of satellite facilities removed from the Erb site in an effort to avoid incurring extremely high costs in the remodeling of the present building. Following a thorough study of these alternatives, involving about seven different locations within the campus boundaries, the Campus Planning Committee, with unanimous support of the student representatives, decided that the "satellite" should be centrally located adjacent to the present building and should be considered as an addition to the Erb Memorial Union with very limited remodeling of existing spaces. Sites to the north, south and east of the present building were then evaluated using the following criteria:

1. Existing and estimated future pedestrian movement to and through the site;
2. Vehicular and service traffic to the site;
3. Development of optimum functional relationships to the existing building;
4. Full utilization of the site amenities, such as sun orientation, views, existing trees, etc.;
5. Potential for future expansion on the site.

The site selected for the project is on the east side of the Erb, utilizing a portion of the open quad facing Carson Hall on the east, Thirteenth Avenue on the north and Straub Hall on the south. A portion of Onyx Street (from Thirteenth to Fourteenth Avenue) would need to be vacated to accommodate the addition.
Institutional officials and the architects have filed with the Board's Office a copy of the schematic design phase of planning for the project involving construction of approximately 52,303 square feet within a three-level structure linked to the Erb Memorial Union. The north wall of the addition would extend the north wall of the existing building facing Thirteenth Avenue.

The plans call for lowering the northwest forecourt to provide a new entryway to the basement activity areas of the existing union. This new lobby and entrance would tie in with the lower level of the proposed new building and would provide an exterior pedestrian route for persons moving between other areas of the campus who wish to by-pass spaces within the union, thus relieving substantially the congestion within the circulation areas on the first floor of the existing building. (Currently, there are large campus pedestrian movements through the "Fishbowl," lobby, snack bar and dining areas for access to other areas of the building and for access to other sections of the campus.) In addition to providing this exterior lobby and pedestrian route, the lower level of the proposed addition would contain a number of student activity office spaces, arts and crafts areas, married student center with an adjoining exterior court, and related service spaces.

The second level of the addition would contain meeting rooms, dining areas, lounges and deck areas, the relocated store, a service dock to serve the new facility and the existing mail room, and related service areas. This level would be physically attached to the existing building at the north end and also would connect to the existing lobby through an enclosed passageway arranged on a northeasterly-southwesterly diagonal above the lower level pedestrian mall. Remodeling of the Erb Memorial Union at this level would consist of the removal of the store and the relocation of the information desk to integrate the connector with the enlarged lobby, and modifications to the food service areas to provide a scramble-type arrangement.

The third floor level of the new building would contain several meeting rooms, additional food service areas, exterior deck spaces for outdoor dining, lounging and studying, and related services spaces. The dining areas on this floor and the second level would be arranged at staggered levels around a central sky-lighted opening between floors, accessible by a series of ramps. A walkway would be provided from the southern deck areas to the existing second floor of the Erb Memorial Union. Remodeling of the upper floor of the existing Erb Memorial Union would consist of modifications to partitions in the present student office areas to provide new air-conditioned office spaces for the staff of the Oregon Daily Emerald.

The roof level of the addition would contain only mechanical space.

The structure would be designed for two-way slab and post reinforced concrete construction, permitting economical cantilevers for exterior terraces. Brick to match the existing building is proposed for the
north wall only. The balance of the exterior would be exposed concrete with color anodized aluminum and glass window walls. The interior walls would be of wood or gypsum board. Some of the floors - would be carpeted, others would feature industrial wood flooring or be left as exposed concrete.

Opportunities for future expansion of the union facilities on the Erb site would be available east of the proposed addition and/or south of the existing building.

Based upon the price level expected to prevail in early 1972, the direct construction costs for the proposed addition are estimated to be approximately $2,199,412, excluding site work, utilities and landscaping. For the gross area of approximately 52,303 square feet of enclosed space, these direct construction costs would average about $42.05 per square foot. (If 25 percent of the area of covered walkways or open decks were included, as has been done in other similar circumstances, the "adjusted" gross area would be approximately 54,955 square feet, and the direct construction costs of $2,199,412 would average about $40.02 per square foot.) Remodeling costs are budgeted at $336,000, including built-in food service equipment. The estimated total project cost is $3,395,000, as indicated when the capital construction program for 1971-1973 was approved on September 8, 1970.

Funds for the Erb Memorial Union Addition and Alterations are expected to be provided from self-liquidating bond borrowings to be issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

It was recommended that the schematic design phase of planning for the Erb Memorial Union Addition and Alterations at the University of Oregon be approved and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to instruct the architects to complete the design development phase of planning.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGNS

Project - UO Erb Memorial Union Addition and Alterations

Architects - Colburn and Sheldon, Portland, and Lutes and Amundson, Springfield, associated architects

Legislative authorization - To be requested from the 1971 Oregon Legislature

Board's priority - No. 9 in 1971-1973 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Approximate gross area - 52,303 square feet (excluding about 12,816 square feet of remodeling)

Estimated total project cost $3,395,000
Estimated direct construction costs:
Total (including site development and utilities) $2,800,600
Addition (building and fixed equipment only) $2,199,412
Average (per square foot) - $42.05
Remodeling -
Average (per square foot) - $26.22

Tentative schedule:
Bidding - April 1972
Completion - February 1974

Tentative financing plan:
General obligation bond borrowings under provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $3,395,000

During the presentation of this project to the Committee, Dr. Paetz indicated that student groups had participated fully in the planning of this building.

It was indicated that the kitchen in the existing student union has the capacity to provide the food preparation for the additional dining area and that this was one of the real advantages in locating the proposed addition close to the present building. In response to a question, it was indicated that the food would be transferred from the central kitchen by carts or trucks as it now is from the Carson Hall kitchen to other dormitory dining rooms.

President Clark said that the present Union is a beautiful building in an excellent location but that congestion in the circulating areas of the building has limited its usefulness. He said the design solution appeared to relieve much of the congestion which presently exists, particularly in the lobby area.

Mr. Dennis Petrequin, Student Member of the Erb Memorial Union Addition Committee, emphasized the crowded conditions in the lobby area at present and expressed the opinion that the proposed addition would open up spaces in the older portion of the Union that are not presently being used effectively. He said it will also get students onto the other floor levels so that they are aware of activities in the building which are not on the main floor.

Miss Elizabeth Struchens, Student Administrative Board Chairman, said that her position involves scheduling of the public areas and the meeting areas in the Union. She said that the Union is not being used fully because of the congestion and that the new area underneath the building will open up the crowded conditions in the present lobby. She said she also was enthusiastic about getting the student government offices onto the main floor where they are more accessible and available for student involvement. These offices are presently virtually hidden on the third floor.
Mr. John Teasdale, Student Member of the Student Union Planning Committee, also mentioned the solution to the problem of congestion and the availability of the student government offices. He pointed out the arts and crafts center and the day care center which will provide added services for students and also flexibility so that the spaces can be changed as student needs change.

Mr. Teasdale mentioned the fact that the building also serves faculty, staff and the community. He said the new spaces will help to provide an attractive, centralized location for conferences, symposiums, and other state-wide meetings.

Mr. Richard Reynolds, Director of the Erb Memorial Student Union, described some of the circulation patterns for traffic and food service. He stated that three types of food service will be provided when the new addition is completed. The "Fishbowl" would offer fountain service with donuts and wrapped sandwiches. The present main food service would continue as a cafeteria, and the new food service in the added area would provide mainly hot sandwiches, large main course sandwiches, and salads, some fountain service, and a high quality soup. This type of menu will be easy to prepare in the main kitchen and transport to the new area. He said that the kitchen and servery in the new addition will meet the needs of the new technology of food preparation, primarily designed for heating already prepared frozen foods.

In discussing the day care center, both Mr. Teasdale and Mr. Reynolds stated that the center would provide married students with an opportunity to participate more fully in University activities and would meet one of the needs which has long been expressed by married students. It is intended that the day care center would provide care daily for about 50 to 60 children of married students. The center would have a rated capacity of approximately 30 children at one time, but it is not intended that the children would be left for an entire day but for shorter periods.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented. Mrs. Johnson indicated that she would abstain from voting because she was serving on the Committee in a substitute capacity and both Mr. Corey and Mr. Stewart had indicated some reservations in connection with this project.

During the Board discussion, Mr. Stewart said that he had visited the present student union building and had been convinced that the proposed addition was necessary to relieve the crowded conditions for the present enrollment at the University of Oregon.

Mrs. Johnson said she recognized the need for the addition but questioned the cost per square foot and the amount of food service facilities being provided. Mr. Hunderup responded that the cost per square foot was a reflection of the escalation of construction costs and that it was not the result of providing higher quality facilities than were available in the student unions on other State System campuses. He also indicated
that the major portion of the additional space will be for student
government offices rather than food service facilities, although food
service spaces will be added and improved.

Mrs. Johnson said that she had grave reservations about the day care-
center for children of married students and also whether the building
would have sufficient flexibility to meet the needs of a changing
student body in the years ahead.

Mr. Hunderup responded that the character of the design would lend
itself to flexibility as the needs of the students change, including
possible changes in the use of the space being planned for the
children's day care center.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.

Demolishing of
Veterans'
Dormitories,
UO

Mr. Hunderup indicated that it was intended to approve the request from
the University of Oregon to demolish the Veterans' Dormitories at the
University. He indicated that they have exceeded their useful life and
have now become a liability. They are located on a portion of the site
for the Behavioral Science Complex and the space will be needed in the
near future.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Report of
Appointment of
Campus
Planning
Consultants,
UO

Upon the recommendation of officials of the University of Oregon, arrange-
ments have been made with the Center for Environmental Structure, a non-
profit corporation with principal offices in Berkeley, California, for
the professional assistance of Christopher Alexander and others affili-
ated with the Center in the preparation of a long-range general develop-
ment plan for the University. The consultants' work shall include the
preparation of interim and final reports, drawings, and such other
material as may be necessary (a) to determine cooperatively the basic
assumptions and objectives upon which the plan is to be based and (b) to
describe and illustrate the plan and its components. Furthermore, the
consultants shall conduct or attend meetings necessary to coordinate
the development plan with city, state and other governmental agencies,
as appropriate.

In anticipation of the interest of members of the Board in the formula-
tion and review of the basic assumptions and objectives upon which the
planning will evolve, the consultants have been advised that their
recommendations are to be submitted in sufficient time to allow appro-
priate reviews by the staffs of the institution and the Board's Office
for referral to the Board before decisions are reached which would have
a major impact upon the development of the master campus plan for the
University.

For their services, the consultants shall be compensated on a time and
materials basis, including travel reimbursements, in an amount not to
exceed $35,000. A maximum of $20,000 thereof would be advanced from
the Board's reserve for architectural/engineering planning and the remainder would be provided from balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Inasmuch as the final plans and specifications for the proposed completion of certain "undesigned" and "unfinished" spaces within the Science Building, Second Addition, at the University of Oregon are in substantial agreement with the preliminary plans which the Board reviewed and approved July 27, 1970, they have been accepted by the Board's Office. Authorization to proceed with the project within the recommended expenditure limitation of $340,000 was obtained from the State Emergency Board on November 19, 1970.

The work involves alterations to approximately 6,476 square feet within the second and third floors of the Science Building to provide additional laboratories, offices, conference rooms and related service spaces for the Institute of Molecular Biology and for Organic Chemistry. All of the funds required are being provided from the Science Improvement Grant approved by the National Science Foundation.

Tentatively, bids for the work are scheduled to be received on January 14, 1971.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF FINAL PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS

Project - UO Alterations to Science Building, Second Addition for Organic Chemistry and Molecular Biology Spaces

Architect - William B. Burnett, Eugene

Legislative authorization - State Emergency Board (November 19, 1970)

Board's priority - Portion of No. 24 in 1969-1971 (Educational and General Plant)

Approximate net area to be completed - 6,476 square feet

Estimated total project cost $ 340,000

Estimated direct construction costs $ 221,700

Tentative schedule
  Bidding - January 1971
  Completion - August 1971

Financing plan:
  Grant from National Science Foundation $ 340,000

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Easement and Right-of-Way for The Millrace Restaurant, UO

At the January 24-25, 1966, meeting, the Board granted a five-year non-exclusive easement and right-of-way over a 16-foot roadway to Mr. and Mrs. Albert R. Powell, doing business as The Millrace Restaurant. The roadway, which extends approximately 100 feet from Franklin Boulevard, is adjacent to the property which they own. They desire a continuation of the access rights.

It was recommended that the President and the Secretary of the Board be authorized to execute a two-year non-exclusive easement and right-of-way to the Powells for roadway purposes for an annual consideration of $300 per year.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Acceptance of Stevenson Track of Hayward Field, UO

Through the generosity of the late Donald M. Stevenson of White Salmon, Washington, and members of his family, in providing gifts totaling $100,000 through the University of Oregon Development Fund, substantial improvements have been made to the track and infield facilities at Hayward Field, including the installation of an all-weather surface manufactured by Professional Products, Inc. The dedication of the new track occurred at an invitational meet on June 5, 1970, when officials of the University of Oregon recommended that the facilities be named the Stevenson Track of Hayward Field.

It was recommended that the improvements be accepted by the Board, that the facilities be named the Stevenson Track of Hayward Field, and that appropriate acknowledgment be made to the donors.

Mr. Corey said that the name "Stevenson Track of Hayward Field" was a somewhat cumbersome title. President Clark responded that references to the track would probably be shortened to "Stevenson Track."

Mrs. Johnson said that the Board needs to look at its general policy in naming buildings or other areas because many people do make substantial gifts as a memorial and that some designation of spaces or equipment provided through a memorial gift is appropriate. However, without a definite policy, memorial designations can be overdone.

The Chancellor said that the present Board policy relates primarily to the naming of building facilities. He said memorial designations are useful in maximizing gifts and grants to the state.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.
On September 8, 1970, the Board reviewed and approved the preliminary plans which Architects Morin-Longwood-Edlund had prepared for the proposed restoration and rehabilitation work within the Men's Physical Education Building at the University of Oregon as a result of the fire damage which occurred on February 16, 1970.

It was indicated that the direct construction costs of the proposed restoration work would be approximately $262,000, and that in addition thereto there would need to be some allocation from the Board's reserve for plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay to cover the estimated requirements for certain alterations which should be undertaken simultaneously and to cover items of cost which would not be eligible within the fire loss claim filed with the State Restoration Fund. Such items would include the structural capacity for potential future additions, improved ventilation and air cooling of certain rooms, the enlargement of restroom facilities in areas adjacent to the spaces destroyed by the fire, and other minor remodeling which would permit better circulation and greater utility of the instructional and service areas.

The architects and institutional officials have filed with the Board's Office the completed final plans and specifications for the project which conform to the previously approved preliminary plans. They have indicated that the direct construction cost estimate for the restoration work would be approximately $266,864, and that the proposed improvements to be undertaken simultaneously would cost approximately $71,579, making a total of $338,443. This excludes the general demolition work and the replacement of flooring within an activity area which was accomplished under separate contracts. Of the total project budget requirements of approximately $418,000, it is anticipated that a request will be made to the State Restoration Fund for at least $337,000. Funds available from the 1967-1969 capital outlay budget for Phase II of Central Cooling will be allocated in the amount of $6,800, and the remainder of approximately $74,200 required for the restoration and rehabilitation work would be financed from building use credits available to the institution, supplemented to the extent necessary by an allocation from the Board's reserve for plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay.

Before a construction contract award would be made, it would be necessary to obtain the concurrence of the State Emergency Board. It is also expected that following the receipt of bids and a determination of the amount to be obtained from the State Restoration Fund, a report would be made to the Board, or to the Executive Committee of the Board, for review and approval.

**RECAPITULATION UPON THE COMPLETION OF FINAL PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS**

Project - UO Men's Physical Education Building Restoration

Architects - Morin-Longwood-Edlund, Eugene

Legislative authorization - To be obtained from the State Emergency Board
Approximate area to be remodeled - 22,624 square feet

Total project costs $418,000

Estimated direct construction costs:
  Restoration $266,864
  Improvements 71,579 $338,443

Tentative schedule:
  Bidding - December 1970
  Completion - August 1971

Tentative financing plan:
  State Restoration Fund $337,000
  Article XI-G bonds (for portion applicable to Phase II of Central Cooling) 6,800
  Building use credits for capital outlay )
  Board's reserve for plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay )
  Total $418,000

Mr. Hunderup indicated that the report on the final plans for the Restoration of the Men's Physical Education Building would require Board action because there would be some modification in the cost estimates and the portion of the costs to be financed from Board Funds following the receipt of bids on December 11. It was recommended that the Board authorize the Executive Committee of the Board to approve the project following the receipt of the bids received and the determination from the State Restoration Fund of the amount of restoration funds available to meet the major portion of the project costs.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Report of Bids for Recreational Facilities, UO

Based upon revised plans and specifications prepared by Architects Unthank-Seder-Poticha, and in accordance with authorization granted by the Board on October 26, bids were received in Eugene on December 2 for the construction of the proposed recreational facilities at the University of Oregon. The quotations submitted by six local contractors ranged from a low of $538,812 to a high of $627,400, including all of the additive alternates. Inasmuch as the low bid was well within the direct construction cost allowance and would provide for the construction of nine covered tennis courts and eight handball courts, it was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to award a contract to the low bidder and proceed with the project within the following budget:

Direct construction costs - Howard Nelson Construction Co., Eugene $538,812
Professional services fees, including soil investigations and model testing 43,256
Movable equipment 8,000
Site work, including landscaping 5,500
Construction supervision and other Physical Plant costs, including removal of inflatable building Contingencies (3 percent of direct construction costs) Total  
18,268 16,164 $ 630,000

The revised plans were basically the same as those previously reviewed and approved by the Board except to omit one of the handball courts and to make some substitutions in certain of the materials, such as changing the exterior walls of the tennis courts to wood in lieu of concrete and using standard chain link fencing for the woven wire fencing originally specified.

The total budget of $630,000 equals the expenditure limitation approved by the State Emergency Board. Except for $50,000 of state funds appropriated for the replacement of the tennis courts on the site of the College of Education Building, the project would be financed from balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS

Project - UO Recreational Facilities

Architects - Unthank-Seder-Poticha, Eugene

Legislative authorization - Emergency Board (June 19, 1970)

Board's priority in 1969-1971 - Part of No. 14 (Educational and General Plant) No. 29, (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Estimated gross area - 67,000 square feet

Total estimated project cost $ 630,000

Estimated direct construction costs: Total $ 538,812

Average (per square foot) - $8.04

Tentative schedule:

Contract award - December 1970
Completion - October 1971

Tentative financing plan:

State funds (General Fund appropriation in Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969 and/or Article XI-G bonding) $ 50,000

Balances available for auxiliary enterprises:

Commingled student building fees 145,000
Excess sinking fund reserves from student housing 435,000

Total $ 630,000
During the Board discussion, Mrs. Johnson indicated that she was going to vote against the project for the following reasons:

1. There is a need to look at a policy for self support for these recreational facilities;

2. If they cannot be completely self-supporting, consideration should be given to establishing a user fee to help pay for the maintenance, upkeep and staffing of the facilities;

3. The building as presently proposed is a lesser building than originally planned; and

4. The cost per unit is high.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented. Mrs. Johnson voted against the motion.

(Considered by Finance Committee, November 16, 1970.)

The University of Oregon reports that LeRoy H. Klemm, Professor of Chemistry, Wayne O. Johnson, former staff member currently with Rohm and Haas Company, and Danny V. White, former staff member now with American River Junior College, Sacramento, invented a process entitled "The Conversion of Dimethyl-Pyrindines to Thiophenopyridines," which has been evaluated by the Research Corporation and considered to be suitable for patenting. The invention grew out of research which was funded in part by National Institute of Health grants. The federal government is being contacted to determine if it is willing to release its rights in the patent to the institution.

The University of Oregon, through its Patent Committee, has negotiated with the inventors for an assignment of invention and patent rights in which each inventor is to receive 10 percent of the total net patent income, if any, derived by the Board as royalty from any patent received on the invention. Such a distribution is consistent with the Board's patent policy, as defined in Section C-10-D(1) of the Administrative Code. Moreover, it is expected that the federal government's release, if obtained, will require that the maximum paid to the inventors will not exceed 50 percent of the first $3,000 gross royalty under patent, 25 percent of the gross royalty between $3,000 and $13,000, and 15 percent of the gross royalty in excess of $13,000.

Pursuant to Section C-10-E(1) of the Administrative Code, it is recommended that the Board officials be authorized to enter into an agreement with the inventors for an assignment of invention and patent rights for the discovery and to execute necessary agreements with the Research Corporation in regard thereto within the limits described.

The Finance Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented. Mr. Holmer said that a report would be prepared for the December 8 Board meeting indicating the status of all current patent negotiations. (See Report on Patent Policy on a subsequent page.)

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.
Revised of 1971-1973 Capital Outlay Requests for Educational & General Plant

(Considered by Building Committee, November 16, 1970.)

On October 26, 1970, when a report was made to the Board of actions taken by the State Emergency Board on September 24 in deferring until 1971 the construction of several major capital outlay projects, it was indicated that a recommendation would be presented to integrate into the 1971-1973 budget requests the incremental costs for the delayed projects so that they could go forward in accordance with the program approved by the 1969 Legislature.

In recognition of substantially greater increases in projected construction costs over those which had been estimated in 1968 when the 1969-1971 capital outlay program was formulated, institutional officials and the project architects have estimated that adjustments of approximately $2,235,000 will be required for the projects listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Revised Project Cost</th>
<th>Expenditure Limitation (per Ch. 664 O.L. 1969)</th>
<th>Difference in 1971-1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO Utility Extensions</td>
<td>$635,000</td>
<td>$635,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Classroom, Office, Teaching Center: SW Campus (Behavioral Sciences)</td>
<td>4,600,000</td>
<td>3,765,000</td>
<td>835,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO College of Education Building (and Central Cooling)</td>
<td>3,865,000</td>
<td>3,270,000#</td>
<td>595,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>$8,465,000</td>
<td>$7,035,000</td>
<td>$1,430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE Classroom, Laboratory &amp; Office Building (Fine Arts)</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
<td>$1,475,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE Street Construction Project</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>$1,975,000</td>
<td>$1,565,000</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Earth Sciences Complex</td>
<td>$2,845,000</td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$13,920,000</td>
<td>$11,685,000</td>
<td>$2,235,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Any incremental cost for this project may need to be absorbed within the 1971-1973 request for UO Physical Plant Utility Improvements. #Excluding $50,000 released for tennis court replacement.

No adjustment has been proposed for the OSU Horse Center which had been assigned Priority No. 39 in 1969-1971. It is assumed that any increase in the cost thereof would need to be offset by additional gift funds or by reductions in the scope of the project.
A supplemental request of $435,000 for the EOC Education Building had been anticipated in the 1971-1973 listing approved on September 8, 1970, so no further adjustment is proposed for it.

It was recommended that the 1971-1973 capital outlay requests for the educational and general plant which the Board approved on September 8, 1970, be amended to include the supplemental amounts in the priority positions indicated above, thus protecting the relative priority rankings which the Board had approved for these projects in the 1969-1971 listing.

It was recommended also that the revised listing give effect to the most current estimates of federal grants, rounded to even $5,000 amounts, for UOMS MacKenzie Hall and Administration Building Alterations, UO Marine Biology Facilities at Charleston, and SOC Nursing Education Building and Science Remodel, and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to advise the Executive Department of these changes, all of which have been incorporated within the attached columnar schedule entitled "Revised Priority Listing of Capital Construction and Land Purchases during 1971-1973 To Be Financed from State Funds and/or Federal Grants."
## OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
### REVISED PRIORITY LISTING OF CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION AND LAND PURCHASES
**DURING 1971-1973 TO BE FINANCED FROM STATE FUNDS AND/OR FEDERAL GRANTS**
(Cost Estimates in Thousands of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority No.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>State Funds (Incl. Art. XI-G Bonds, Offsets)</th>
<th>Specific Federal Grants or Gifts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Est. Gross</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Cum.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Cum.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Cum.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sq. Ft Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Const. (Remodeled)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UOMS Furnishings &amp; Equipment for Basic Science Classroom &amp; Laboratory Building &amp; Teaching Hospital Addition</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UO Physical Plant Utility Improvements &amp; Utility Tunnel Extensions Supplemental</td>
<td>$695*</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UO Administrative Services Building</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>5,045</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OTI Laboratory Building II and Water Chiller</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>8,305</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UO Classroom, Office, Teaching Center: Southwest Campus (Behavioral Sciences) and College of Education Building (and Central Cooling) Supplemental</td>
<td>1,430*</td>
<td>9,735</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OCE Classroom, Laboratory &amp; Office Building (Fine Arts) and Street Construction Project Supplemental</td>
<td>$410*</td>
<td>10,145</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OSU Earth Sciences Complex Supplemental</td>
<td>$395*</td>
<td>10,540</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SOC Classroom Building (Education) and Perimeter Road, including land</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>13,530</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PSU Services Building Completion</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>14,235</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>335</td>
<td>14,570</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UOMS Mackenzie Hall and Administration Building Alterations</td>
<td>$(41,240+)$</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>15,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EOC Education Building Supplemental</td>
<td>$435</td>
<td>16,240</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OCE Laboratory, Classroom, and Office Building</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>18,745</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SOC South Campus Utility Improvements</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18,895</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SOC Churchill Hall Remodel</td>
<td>$(29,000)$</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>19,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>UO Physical and Biological Sciences: Restoration and Completion and Science III Residual</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>21,820</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**December 8, 1970**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority No.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Est. Gross Sq. Ft Area</th>
<th>State Funds (Incl. Art. XI-G Bonds, Offsets)</th>
<th>Specific Federal Grants or Gifts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Chemistry Building - Phase I</td>
<td>71,855</td>
<td>$3,760</td>
<td>$25,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Veterinary Isolation Facility</td>
<td>17,160</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>26,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Professional Schools Center - Phase I</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>30,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UODS</td>
<td>Dental School Building Addition and Alterations</td>
<td>(36,328)</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td>33,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Various Land Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td>335</td>
<td>33,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Physical and Biological Sciences: Science III Expansion</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>35,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Chemistry Building - Phase II</td>
<td>23,145</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>36,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Agriculture Science and DCE Building</td>
<td>155,517</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>44,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Electrical System Revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>44,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Marine Biology Facilities, Charleston</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>45,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Professional Schools Center, Phase II</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>47,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Architecture Building and Equipment Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>47,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>OTI</td>
<td>Library Building</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>48,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Classroom Building (Speech-Theatre)</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>51,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>Physical Education Building, Phase II</td>
<td>54,480</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>53,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Old Main Alterations</td>
<td>(135,052)</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>55,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Nursing Education Building and Science Remodel</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>55,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>OTI</td>
<td>Roads B and D</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Physical Plant Boiler Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>56,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>Office and Studio Building, Second Addition, Portland</td>
<td>18,644</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>57,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Feed Barn - Dairy Center</td>
<td>11,520</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>57,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Research Vessel Facilities, Yaquina Bay</td>
<td>14,980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Marine Science Center Improvements</td>
<td>33,607</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>59,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: $59,510 | $4,345 | $63,855

* Exclusive of amounts authorized for these projects by Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969

Office of Facilities Planning
November 16, 1970
During the Committee discussion, Mr. Hunderup indicated:

1. That it was important to emphasize that not all of the increased costs result from the last deferral of projects by the Emergency Board, but also result in part from higher cost increases for construction than could have been predicted in 1968 when the requests for the projects were prepared for the 1969 Legislature.

2. If the incremental costs are not obtained, it would be necessary to provide substantial bid alternates and thus reduce the program from that anticipated for the projects when they were originally authorized by the 1969 Legislature.

3. The 1971-1973 capital construction program is now based upon the assumption of an eight percent annual cost increase.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.

Authorization for Allocation of Funds for Plant Rehabilitation and Minor Capital Outlay

(Considered by Building Committee, November 16, 1970.)

In accordance with the suggestion made at the October 26, 1970, meeting of the Board, the following proposal has been drafted for inclusion in the Administrative Rules:

The Chancellor has authority to allocate funds from the Board's reserve for physical plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay. The Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning is assigned the responsibility of recommending such allocations to the Chancellor with appropriate report to the Board at the meeting following such action, subject to the following conditions:

1. The work to be financed from such allocations is needed and relates only to buildings or facilities owned and operated within the Educational and General Plant;

2. The allocation for any project shall not exceed the following limitations:

   (a) For the repair, rehabilitation or minor improvement of a state-owned residence occupied by the Chancellor or an institutional executive $ 5,000

   (b) For all other physical plant rehabilitation or minor capital improvements $ 25,000

3. The work does not involve the restoration of damaged areas following a fire or other casualty which is covered fully or partially by the State Restoration Fund;
4. The work does not involve contractual arrangements with or assessments by other units of government (e.g., the improvements of streets or highways, the installation of traffic signals, the construction of sewer systems, etc.);

5. The nature of the work is such that in the judgment of the Chancellor no major policy questions would be raised by the Board concerning the use therefor of funds appropriated from the General Fund of the State.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.

Allocation of Unexpended Balances Carried Forward from 1969-70

(Considered by Finance Committee, November 16, 1970.)

The Comptroller's Office reports that unexpended budget balances of $600,399.87 remain on June 30, 1970, upon completion of the 1969-70 fiscal year. Of that amount, $38,754.00 resides in the Board's Unappropriated Fund and has been reported in financial statements. The remaining $561,645.87 derives from balances in institution and other Board's Reserve accounts. Under Board policy these funds revert to the Board of Higher Education for distribution during year 1970-71 to cover urgent fiscal needs of the institutions. The entire amount is within the 1969-1971 biennial expenditure limitation set by the 1969 Legislature and does not include tuition income collected in excess of budget estimates.

The Chancellor recommended that the funds be allocated for the following purposes:

1. Overrealized FTE Enrollments for 1970-71 at Oregon State University, Oregon College of Education, Southern Oregon College and Oregon Technical Institute and Eastern Oregon College $ 280,000

Final enrollment and tuition information is still being developed. If tuition income is apportioned on the basis of estimated FTE enrollment in excess of estimates, the amount involved would be approximately $280,000.

2. Planning Funds for Nursing Program, OTI $ 10,000

Costs incurred are expected to total about $20,000, part of which will be recovered through a federal grant. It is proposed that Board funds be made available to proceed with planning until grant funds become available. An amount of $10,000 is proposed, with any unused balance to be returned to the Board.
3. Added Legal Services

To fund additional legal services at Portland State University, University of Oregon, Oregon State University and Southern Oregon College, it is proposed that $60,000 be reserved for these institutions to provide services through June 30, 1971.

4. Business Office Staffing

Conversion to computer processing of personnel data, payroll, invoices and budget information is placing an excessive burden on institutional personnel.

Funds for temporary appointments of personnel to process data during the conversion process are proposed. Allocations would be relative to the volume processed at the respective institutions. Amounts are proposed for classified personnel and related payroll assessments.

5. Increase Reserve for Plant Rehabilitation

The present budgeted reserve for plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay is $323,098. Total institutional needs reported to the Board's Office exceed $700,000. It appears prudent to increase this reserve.

6. Cash Reserves, Board's Unappropriated Fund

To meet contingencies for the remainder of the year 1970-71 it is proposed that the unallocated amount be added to the Board's Unappropriated Fund for distribution during fiscal 1970-71 as specific needs are brought to the Board's attention.

The Board's Unappropriated Fund currently totals $78,234. Addition of $80,745 will provide $159,979 as an emergency reserve for the remainder of year 1970-71.

During the Committee discussion, Mr. Holmer indicated that the balances did not include approximately $550,000 of overrealized fee income accumulated during 1969-70 chiefly as a result of the higher-than-anticipated retention of students. Neither did it include an estimated $275,000 of overrealized fee income during 1970-71 as a result of additional students beyond those for whom the budget was initially prepared. He said these funds are not budgeted and if expended would be in excess of the expenditure limitation established by the 1969 Legislature. The present indication is that these will be used by the State of Oregon as
part of the General Fund resources for biennium 1971-1973 although traditionally they have been made available to the State Department of Higher Education for expenditure in accordance with state law – ORS 351.310(2).

In referring to the added legal services during the discussion, it was stated that specific arrangements have been made with local attorneys for Portland State University, the University of Oregon (through the Law School), and Southern Oregon College. Arrangements are in the process of development for legal services for Oregon State University, and the needs of Oregon College of Education and Eastern Oregon College will be met through the Board’s Office unless the necessity for more immediate legal service is required. In that case the Attorney General has expressed a willingness to designate a local attorney as a special assistant attorney general to meet an urgent need.

In response to a question concerning the adequacy of the funds budgeted for legal services, the Chancellor said that this amount represents the best present estimate of the amount required, but that it could be supplemented later if necessary. The Chancellor also said that the addition of a full-time person in the central office was needed and hopefully would be available.

The Finance Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendation as presented, but it indicated concern about the urgent need to provide additional funds for plant rehabilitation beyond the recommended amounts.

In response to a suggestion from Mrs. Johnson during the Board discussion, it was agreed that a report would be made at the next Committee meeting of the estimated cost of including a one-year licensed practical nursing program at Oregon Technical Institute. The cost of this program would be in addition to the funds for the nursing program already included in the above report.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.
CONDITION OF BOARD’S UNAPPROPRIATED FUND AND SPECIAL RESERVES
Estimated as of December 8, 1970, for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1971

I. Board's Unappropriated Fund

Balance reported as of October 26, 1970 $ 79,234.00
Add: Unexpended budget balances carried forward from year 1969-70 561,645.87
Total available $ 640,879.87

Less: Docket item to allocate funds for the following purposes:

1. Overrealized FTE enrollments for 1970-71 at OSU, OCE, SOC, OTI 280,000.00
2. Planning funds for Nursing Program, OTI 10,000.00
3. Added legal services 60,000.00
4. Business office staffing 30,900.00
5. Plant rehabilitation project increase 100,000.00
6. Printing and binding of Administrative Rules 5,000.00

Balance estimated as of December 8, 1970, if the above actions are approved $ 154,979.87

II. Board's Reserve for Plant Rehabilitation Projects

Balance reported as of October 26, 1970 $ 323,097.98
Add: Docket item to transfer funds from balances in Board's Unappropriated Fund 100,000.00
Balance returned by PSU upon completion of Science Building Alteration Project 1,327.00
Balance estimated as of December 8, 1970, if the above transfer is approved. $ 424,424.98*

*Dependent upon the action of the Board concerning authorization for allocation of rehabilitation projects; planned projects will be reported or presented for approval at the January 1971 Board meeting.

Budgeting of Incidental Fee

(Considered by Finance Committee, November 16, 1970.)

The Interinstitutional Union of Students, State System of Higher Education, has requested the opportunity to present the following proposed amendment to the Administrative Code:

The "incidental fees" collected from students and used for support of Health Service, Athletic Activities, College Union and Educational Activities shall be administered by the institutions in accord with the following procedures:
(1) The duly organized and recognized student government at each institution shall appoint and delegate student representatives to meet with each institutional executive for the formulation of guidelines and procedures to be followed at that institution in the budgeting, and allocation of incidental fee income derived at such institution. The guidelines and procedures shall be reviewed by the State Board of Higher Education to determine whether such guidelines and procedures for the allocation and disbursement of incidental fee income are necessary or advantageous for the cultural and physical development of the students. In all other respects, guidelines and procedures formulated by the institutional executive and the student representatives shall be conclusive.

(2) The duly organized and recognized student government at each institution, under the guidelines and procedures adopted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall have the final authority and responsibility to recommend, in the annual operating budget presented to the State Board of Higher Education through the Chancellor, the distribution of student incidental fee income to activities funded in whole or in part by incidental fees.

(3) The executive at each institution shall have the responsibility to:

(a) Review the budget and recommend changes to the student representatives.

(b) Review the budget with respect to compliance with the established guidelines and procedures. In the event the institutional executive determines that the budget in whole or in part is not consistent with the guidelines and procedures, he shall review that portion of the budget with the student representatives. If the institutional executives and the student representatives cannot agree, the matter shall be resolved by the Board of Higher Education.

(c) Review disbursements with respect to compliance with applicable laws and regulations; and evaluate internal control with respect to safeguarding the incidental fee funds, recommending such amendments to the procedures and guidelines as may be required.

Mr. James Davis, Chairman of the Interinstitutional Union of Students of the State System of Higher Education, presented the proposal.

This proposal clearly modifies the relation between institutional executives and the Board and the budgetary responsibility of the institutional executive.
Existing Code provisions have permitted a high degree of student involvement in the development of incidental fee budgets, without altering the ultimate responsibility of the executive. The question for the Committee is whether the proposal represents an appropriate extension of the role of student governments.

It was recommended that the proposal not be adopted in its present form but that the Committee recommend (1) reaffirmation by the Board of its declared policy of encouraging the responsible involvement of student representatives in the development and execution of the budgeting of incidental fees, and (2) deferment of action on the subject until the January meeting, when the report of the Inter-institutional Fee Committee is scheduled for presentation.

The Committee heard presentations from Mr. James Davis, Chairman of the Interinstitutional Union of Students of the Oregon State System of Higher Education; Mr. Ron Eachus, President of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon; Miss Janet Bennett, member of the Interinstitutional Union of Students from Oregon State University; Mr. John Wemecken, Election Clerk, Portland State University; Mr. Richard C. Owens, Legal Counsel, ASUO; and from President Robert D. Clark.

Dr. B. Hughel Wilkens, representing the Oregon Federation of the American Association of University Professors, indicated that the faculty does have some expertise, some interest, and some responsibility in the allocation of incidental fees. He recommended that the Board give some consideration to protecting the interests of the faculty and the shared responsibility of faculty, administration, boards and students in those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.

Following these presentations and questions and discussions from the Committee and other Board members, the Committee voted to defer consideration of the allocation and budgeting of the student incidental fees to the January 1971 meeting of the Finance Committee. It was also suggested that in examining the student fee structure the Finance Committee would take into full account the presentations and other comments made during the discussion.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

In accordance with Oregon Revised Statutes, the State Board of Higher Education may acquire by gift or by purchase interests in intellectual property of any kind, whether patentable or not, including patents, copyrights, inventions, discoveries, processes and ideas. The Board may also agree to aid in the development of property acquired pursuant to ORS 351.220 through 351.250 and to pay an assignor of any interest in intellectual property a share of any moneys received on account of the Board's ownership or management of the property.

The present patent policy in the Administrative Code was adopted on September 13 and 14, 1965, by the Board. The chief executive officer of each institution may appoint a patent committee to assist and advise
him concerning the development of inventions and patents at the institution. As a condition of employment, certain employees are required to execute an agreement to assign inventions or patent rights. Employees who develop an invention, whether work-related or not, shall report findings to institutional patent committees to determine patentability of the invention. When the invention is reported, the employee enters into a patent assignment agreement with the Board if the invention was developed in the course of the employee's scope of employment and/or institutional facilities or services were used in developing the invention.

The objectives of the patent policy of the Board are to assist personnel of higher educational institutions in developing and protecting inventions, promote public welfare by patenting inventions and by encouraging the marketing of products or processes resulting therefrom to the end that there shall be the greatest possible benefit to the public, establish equities and protect the interest of all parties concerned with inventions, and promote further research.

The patent committee, after evaluating the invention for patent possibilities and appraising equities of the inventors, will refer the invention to an outside organization with which the Board has a patenting and marketing agreement. An act passed by the 1953 Legislature authorizes the Board to enter into agreements for the patenting and developing of intellectual property growing out of research done by the institutions.

The Board has patenting and marketing agreements with several firms, which include Research Corporation; Battelle Development Corporation; Cook, Inc.; Geo. J. Ball, Inc.; and Crown-Zellerbach. Research Corporation and Battelle Development Corporation are independent, nonprofit foundations which act as patent management agencies and handle patentable discoveries and inventions in the institution's behalf, as well as in the interest of the inventors among the faculty and staff who voluntarily assign their inventions to the corporations. These organizations have the necessary knowledge and personnel for preparing and processing patent applications, which in many cases require trained patent attorneys. In this way the institutions avoid the intricate technical and commercial aspects of patent management.

Inventions are sometimes discovered through research which is financed by grants from governmental and nonprofit agencies. In accepting funds from these agencies for research, the institution agrees to abide by the established patent policies of those sponsoring agencies covering such grants.

The patenting and marketing agreements with Research Corporation provide that 42-1/2 percent of the gross patent income will accrue to the benefit of Research Corporation, with the remaining 57-1/2 percent accruing to the benefit of the institution, less costs previously agreed upon in writing consisting of filing of foreign patent application, litigation in court, and extraordinary commercial development costs. The agreement with Battelle Development Corporation states that the institution shall receive 57-1/2 percent of the gross income received.
by Battelle through the development of the invention, after deducting amounts from income for its expenses of research and development, patenting and licensing.

The following are some of the major features which are incorporated into the patenting and marketing agreements between the Board and outside organizations:

1. Assignment to a corporation of all rights, interests and title in the invention from the Board.

2. The requirement of an annual report of the inventions to the Board by the corporation.

3. The termination of the agreement upon 90-days' written notice by either party.

4. The filing of patent application in the United States and other countries.

5. The securing of patents and licenses to introduce such inventions into public use.

6. The payment to the Board of a percentage amount of the gross income received from the invention, less expenses.

7. The corporation's maintenance of books of record reflecting the patent activities, with annual reports to the Board.

The active inventions which are currently assigned to outside organizations with which the Board has patenting and marketing agreements, are listed as follows:

RESEARCH CORPORATION:

Oregon State University

"Liquid-Solid Contact Apparatus," inventors are Dr. Walter Myers, Kansas State University; and Richard S. Olsen, Oregon State University Chemical Engineering. The invention was brought to the attention of two firms during 1969; however, neither firm expressed licensing interest. Research Corporation is continuing search for licensees. Each inventor is to receive 7.5 percent of any gross income resulting from use of the invention.

"Method of Reducing Diacetyl Content of Foods and Beverages," inventors are William E. Sandine and Paul R. Elliker of the Department of Microbiology, University of Oregon. An invention identical to the above was filed by two other individuals with U. S. Patent Office before the patent application of Sandine and Elliker. A concession of priority was filed on behalf of Sandine and Elliker on January 8, 1968, and the Patent Office terminated the interference on February 7, 1968, with
an award of priority to the two other individuals. The U. S. patent application of Sandine and Elliker was abandoned. However, a Canadian patent was issued in March of 1966 covering the Sandine and Elliker invention. As of date, no foreign license has been purchased. Each inventor will receive 7.5 percent of any gross income of the invention.

"Wood Projection Process and Antibiotic," inventors are Dr. Jacques L. Ricard and Dr. Walter B. Bollen. The invention was discussed with a firm but the company decided not to use the process. Another firm contacted during 1969 has not indicated whether it would be interested in a license. Each inventor will receive 10 percent of any net patent income received by the Board.

"Wood Preservation Process," inventors are Dr. Jacques L. Ricard, Mr. Richard D. Graham, and Mr. John S. Mothershead, plus unidentified employee of Bonneville Power. This invention having a patent issued, was discussed and brought to the attention of two firms; however, neither has expressed interest in purchasing a license. Each inventor will receive 7.5 percent of any net patent income received by the Board.

"Antibacterial from Pacific Hake," inventors are F. M. Stout, J. E. Oldfield, and J. Adair, of Department of Animal Science. Dr. Stout is working on refining the preparative methods for and purification of the active antibacterial material. Until suitable samples become available, further licensing efforts will be ineffective. When the material can be isolated and characterized more fully, a major licensing effort will be started. Dr. Stout will receive 15 percent and J. E. Oldfield and J. Adair each 7.5 percent of any net patent income received by the Board.

"Bleaching Fruits and Vegetables," inventors are D. V. Beavers and C. H. Payne of the Oregon State University Department of Food Science and Technology. Patent applications have been filed in the United States, plus numerous foreign countries. Four forms of licenses covering the bleaching process were devised to cover each of the four types of potential users who differ from each other in production and marketing methods. The modifications of licenses during the year resulted in offering one license to the entire U. S. industry. Steps are also under way to develop a firmer knowledge of the foreign market situation. Each inventor will receive 15 percent of any net patent income received by the Board.

University of Oregon Medical School

"Electronic Method of Detecting Blood Volume Changes," inventors are Dr. R. J. Underwood, Dr. D. Gowing and Mr. G. I. Johnston. A patent is expected to be issued during 1970. The invention was discussed with several new potential licensees in 1969, but none expressed an interest for commercial purposes. Each inventor will receive 10 percent of any net patent income received by the Board.
"Double Distilling Apparatus," inventor is Gunther Weiss. A patent has been issued in the United States. A licensing information brochure was mailed to numerous firms in the laboratory glass industry. Research Corporation received three favorable responses; one firm was forwarded a draft of a license and the corporation was waiting for a reply at the end of 1969. Inventor waived rights to portion of any net patent income.

University of Oregon

"Thiophenopyridines," inventors Dr. L. H. Klemm and D. R. McCoy, Chemistry Department. This invention was discovered through research which was financed with a Public Health Service grant. A patent application has been filed; however, none has been issued in 1969. The invention was submitted to a firm, but licensing interest was not developed by the corporation. Each inventor will receive 15 percent of any net patent income received by the Board.

"Thienopyridines," inventors are Dr. L. H. Klemm, J. Shabtai, and D. R. McCoy, Chemistry Department. This invention was discovered through research which was financed with a Public Health Service grant. A patent application was filed; however, none has been issued through 1969. The invention was submitted to a firm, but they did not express an interest for licensing purposes. Each inventor will receive 10 percent of any net patent income received by the Board.

"Conversion of Dimethyl-pyridines to Thienopyridines," inventors are Dr. L. H. Klemm, Chemistry Department; W. O. Johnson, employed by Rohm & Haas Company; and Danny V. White of American River College. This invention was discovered through research which was financed with three National Institute of Health grants. The invention has been referred to Research Corporation for patent application. Research Corporation states that additional studies will be required before it can be patented. Each inventor will receive 10 percent of any net patent income received by the Board.

COOK, INC.:

University of Oregon Medical School

"Cartridge-Loading Gas Syringe," inventors are Dr. C. T. Dotter and Dr. Marcia K. Bilbao, Radiology Department, and two employees of Cook, Inc. A patent has been issued and Cook, Inc., has generated sales since 1967. The patent licensing and marketing agreement provides that the Board will receive a royalty of 5 percent of the invoice price for the first five years, 3 percent for the second five years and 2 percent until the patent expires. The Board has received a total of $375.73 royalty under this agreement through the period June 30, 1970. Each inventor receives 15 percent of the net patent income received by the Board.
GEO. J. BALL, INC.:  

Oregon State University  

"Improvements in White Azalea Plant," inventor Al Roberts, Department of Horticulture. The patent application has been filed; however, a patent has not been issued. This white azalea plant is one of the twenty-three delivered to Ball, Inc., under the agreement between Geo. J. Ball, Inc., and the Board, dated June 30, 1965. The agreement states that the Board will receive two cents from each azalea marketed on which a patent is issued. No revenue has been generated under subject agreement. Inventor Al Roberts has assigned all rights, title and interest of invention to the Board.

CROWN-ZELLERBACH:  

University of Oregon Medical School  

"DMSO - Dimethyl Sulfoxide," inventors are Stanley W. Jacob, UCMS, and Robert Herschler, Crown-Zellerbach. Several patents have been filed on the "DMSO" invention. Crown-Zellerbach has entered into agreements with several pharmaceutical houses, permitting the firms to undertake investigational and research work with "DMSO," for which Crown-Zellerbach received $175,000. The University of Oregon Medical School received one-half of the above proceeds, or a total of $87,500, under this invention. Dr. Jacob, one of the inventors, waived rights to a portion of net patent income.

The Board accepted the report as presented.
(Considered on November 15, 1970, by the Ad Hoc Committee on Review of Administrative Rules)

Following the creation of the State Board of Higher Education by legislative act in 1929, the Board formulated and adopted the By-Laws of the Board of Higher Education. The By-Laws were concerned with the conducting of Board meetings, appointment of Board officers and committees, functions of Board committees, and the duties and responsibilities of the Chancellor and the presidents of the institutions.

During regular meetings since its creation in 1929 the Board has also adopted policy statements and rules related to the programs, projects, activities and procedures undertaken and carried on in the institutions and divisions comprising the Oregon State System of Higher Education. For convenience in use, the operating rules and some of the policy statements approved by the Board were assembled in the Administrative Code, which was published and distributed to department heads and administrative staff in all institutions and divisions.

As the institutions grew and developed in size and complexity, especially during recent years, it became apparent that the format and the contents of the Administrative Code were no longer adequate to meet the requirements of the Board and the officers and staffs of the institutions and divisions in the State System. Accordingly, the Board members, the Chancellor, and the institution executives agreed that the contents of the Board's By-Laws and the Administrative Code should be rearranged, revised and combined in a document to be entitled the Administrative Rules.

On November 15, 1970, a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Review of Administrative Rules was held at Portland State University to consider a preliminary draft of the proposed document which had been distributed to Board members, institution executives and Board's Office Staff. Present at the meeting were the members of the committee, consisting of President Layman, who acted as chairman, Mr. Joss, and Mr. Corey. Other Board members present were Mrs. Johnson and Mr. Holloway. Also present were Chancellor Lieuallen, Presidents Clark, MacVicar, Rice, and Purvine; Deans Holman and Tarkla; University of Oregon students J. S. Weiser, Joanne Van Bergen, Mike Kment, Steven A. Smith and Les Blumenthal; and the following staff members: from Oregon State University, Dean Popovich; from the University of Oregon, Planning Director Lallas; from UOMS, Associate Dean Zimmerman; from PSU, Vice Presidents Low, Blumel, and Lemman; from OCE, Planning Director Chatham; from SOC, Dean McGill and Dean Lewis; from OTI, Dean Douglass; from the Federated AAUP Chapters, Observer-Representative Wilkins; and from the Board's Office Staff, Vice Chancellors Romney, Holmer and Hunderup, Consultant Pork, Administrative Intern Richardson, and Board Secretary and Administrative Assistant Collins.

Chairman Layman opened the discussion by stating that the committee meeting was in the nature of a work session preparatory to consideration of the Administrative Rules at the December 8, 1970, Board meeting which will provide a public hearing in accordance with the provisions of the State Administrative Procedure Act. He stated that the Administrative Rules were compiled and arranged to replace the Administrative
Code and the Board's By-Laws previously in use. He noted that in the previous use of the latter two documents there had been parallel rules on some subjects and different rules on others; and that the proposed Administrative Rules would combine the two sets of rules into one. The combination, he said, would simplify both the use of the rules and any needed amendments to them in the future. He said that the proposed Administrative Rules also reflect another series of policy statements approved by the Board, but which were neither in the By-Laws nor in the Administrative Code. He stated that the Chancellor and his staff and the Assistant Attorney General then assigned to the Board's Office had held work sessions over a period of more than a year to assemble and arrange the rules included in the proposed Administrative Rules document. He said that the tentative document was then reviewed in detail with the Chancellor by Board President Layman and Board Member Joss, and was again returned to the Chancellor's Office for further checking and for inclusion of new rules and policies recently approved by the Board.

President Layman asked the Chancellor to present the proposed rules and to call attention to any substantive changes, noting that the document will probably not please everybody and that it is expected that amendments will need to be made in the future. President Layman invited Board members and others present to suggest changes during the meeting in the preliminary draft which should be made in the document before it is presented for the public hearing at the December 8, 1970, Board meeting.

As the Chancellor proceeded to present the contents of each principal part and chapter of the tentative draft of the document there were questions, comments and proposals for changes as indicated in the following paragraphs.

Chancellor Lieuallen began his presentation by indicating that the proposed document represents essentially a recodification of the rules previously contained in the Board's By-Laws and the Administrative Code, plus the inclusion of some rules and policies approved by the Board which had not previously been included in the Administrative Code. He stated that in the recodification there had not been significant substantive changes. He said that there are some changes which members of the staff believe should be made in the document, but that he believed the document should be approved with the understanding that some changes will be needed and will be recommended for Board consideration in the future.

Inclusion of Sections from State Constitution and ORS. The Chancellor indicated that there is a question as to whether selected sections from the Oregon State Constitution and from ORS should be included in the document along with rules approved by the Board. He said that those sections could be merely referred to in the text or could be included as an appendix to the document. He stated that those who advocate the inclusion in the body of the document of selected sections from the Constitution and ORS point out that this would make the Administrative Rules document more useful to institution executives and staff members. It was agreed by the three members of the Ad Hoc Committee that the selected sections from the Constitution and ORS should be included as shown in the preliminary draft, with an additional statement in the introduction indicating that those sections are included only as references and not as a part of the rules to be approved by the Board.
Sources of Rules Shown in Proposed Document. Chancellor Lieuallen said that most of the rules shown have been extracted from the Board's By-Laws or from the Administrative Code, as indicated in the preliminary draft. He said that in some instances the wording in the two source documents referred to above had been adapted for use in the Administrative Rules in order to eliminate what had appeared to be obsolete or awkward phrasing. For those sections indicated in the draft as "new," he said wording of the rules represents adaptations from actions or policy statements approved by the Board or from recommendations made by Board members and staff members during the period when the rules in the proposed document were being compiled and arranged for presentation. Some of the latter represent current practices being followed but not referred to in the Board's By-Laws or the Administrative Code. In answer to a question from President Layman, Chancellor Lieuallen stated that there had been no changes in the substance of rules or actions previously approved by the Board.

Method of Approving Future Revisions to Administrative Rules. Mrs. Johnson inquired regarding the operation of the State Administrative Procedure Act in relation to approval by the Board of future revisions of the Administrative Rules. President Layman replied that any proposed revisions will be announced to the Secretary of State in advance and a public hearing will be held on the revisions at the succeeding meeting of the Board, so that any revisions approved by the Board will be valid according to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mrs. Johnson then inquired regarding previous policy statements approved by the Board such as those related to student housing. She asked, if such policy statements are not included in the formally adopted Administrative Rules, does that mean that they have lost their force and effect. Chancellor Lieuallen stated that it is probable that not all of the decisions of the Board will be included in the Administrative Rules; and that beyond that document administrators in the institutions and in the Board's Office should continue to look in the Board minutes for guidance regarding policies previously approved in certain areas. It is expected that such previously approved Board policies will remain in effect unless rescinded by subsequent Board action. President Layman said that the Board should be sure to avoid making implied repeals of previously approved policies by Board action. He said if such policy changes are to be made, they should be correctly done (in accordance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act).

Repeal of the Board's By-Laws and Administrative Code. Mr. Joss said he assumed that the Administrative Rules, when approved by the Board, would replace both the By-Laws and the Administrative Code. President Layman agreed that when the Board approves the Administrative Rules, it should repeal the By-Laws and the Administrative Code.

Part I - Administrative Organization and Procedures. The Chancellor pointed out that, as previously mentioned, Part I includes provisions from the Board's By-Laws, the Administrative Code and some new provisions, supplemented by selected ORS sections.
Sections 13.210, 13.220 and 13.230 - Change in Wording. In the parenthetical statements following each of the three sections referred to above the committee approved changing the words, "ORS regulations" to "ORS provisions."

Part II - Academic Affairs. Chancellor Lieuallen reviewed the contents of Part II and called attention to Section 21.010, which was not in the Administrative Code and which sets forth the duties of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Part III - Student Personnel. Mr. Corey inquired about Section 30.020, Annual Review of Admission Requirements, which was indicated as a new section. He asked if there was any provision in state law or in the Administrative Code which required the Board to review and set academic admission requirements annually. The Chancellor responded that there is no requirement for annual review of admission requirements by the Board. He said the logic for the annual review statement was that there has been an understanding with the Board of Education that the Board of Higher Education would announce to the Board of Education at least a year in advance any changes in the requirements. This announcement has been made annually at the joint meeting of the two boards in September of each year. Mr. Holloway said that the Board had previously taken specific action regarding admission requirements for each institution in the State System. (As a supplement to Section 30.020, a parenthetical sentence has been added, referring to Board minutes of July 23, 1968, pp. 496 and 519.) It was agreed that probably the Board would not be making annual changes in the admission requirements. Accordingly, it was recommended by the committee that the words annual and annually be deleted from the draft of Section 30.020.

Section 31.000 - Student Health Services. There was extended discussion regarding the health service coverage for students, including eligibility for health service care and special arrangements at some of the institutions. It was agreed in general that health care at the institutions is to be provided only for students paying the health service fee, but that there would be no prohibition of dependents' care or immunization programs for staff, if such special programs were separately financed through service fees or through supplemental insurance contracts purchased by students.

Accordingly, in the draft the following changes were made (deleted words are lined through; new words are underscored):

31.020 Charges for Student Health Services

The health services are supported by student fees and are available only to all regularly enrolled students who have paid such fees.

Charges may be made for prescriptions, laboratory services, immunizations, and other special services in accordance with regulations published by the institutions. The institutions may deduct such charges from breakage fees or make whatever other arrangements for their payment as they deem advisable.
The health services will not pay or be responsible for bills from private physicians or private hospitals, except in cases of advance contractual arrangements made by the institutions.

31.030 Hospitalization

A student shall be allowed hospitalization infirmary care for limited periods in accordance with the regulations now or hereafter approved by the Board and printed in the institutional catalogs.

Section 31.110 - Purposes of Student Housing. The paragraphs presented in the draft were as follows:

31.110 Purposes of Student Housing

Student housing shall be planned for the purpose of extending educational opportunity to students of all geographical regions in Oregon.

The institutions are expected to maintain services and establish regulations which will permit residence hall living and the operation of married housing facilities to contribute to the institution's educational objectives.

Housing for single students is provided to accommodate those students needing housing in order to take advantage of educational opportunities. Housing for married students is provided to a limited extent at some of the institutions to care in part for housing needs of student families who have difficulty in obtaining suitable living quarters in privately-owned housing facilities in the communities where the institutions are located.

Mrs. Johnson said that the third paragraph shown above is vague with respect to housing for married students and is open to all kinds of interpretation and apparently at present is being interpreted differently at different institutions. She said that she questions the use of the word "suitable," for example. And she said she recollected that when the Board talked about married housing in the 1966 policy statement there was mentioned something about giving tenant preference to teaching assistants and graduate students. Mrs. Johnson said also there could be conflicting interpretations attached to "providing educational opportunity to students of all geographical regions in Oregon"; and that if you provide housing for students who do not live in Oregon, this also is open to all kinds of interpretation. Chancellor Lieuallen said that he believed this is one section for which recommended changes may be needed in the future. Mr. Layman said he agreed that the whole housing portion of the document is going to be in a state of flux and will probably be before the Board frequently. After further extended discussion, it was agreed by the committee that the statement on purposes of student housing should be retained but that the statement should be made more general in nature and that it should not be attempted in the Administrative Rules to lay out the detailed policies related to single student housing as differentiated from married student housing. Accordingly, the committee recommended that the three paragraphs of Section 31.110 on purposes of student housing be changed to read as follows (deleted words are lined through; new words are underscored):
31.110 Purposes of Student Housing

Student housing shall be planned for the purpose of extending educational opportunity to students of all geographical regions of Oregon.

The institutions which provide such housing are expected to maintain services and establish regulations which will permit residence hall living and the operation of married housing facilities to contribute to the institution's educational objectives.

Housing for single students is provided to accommodate those students needing housing in order to take advantage of educational opportunities. Housing for married students is provided to a limited extent at some of the institutions to care in part for housing needs of student families who have difficulty in obtaining suitable living quarters in privately-owned housing facilities in the communities where the institutions are located.

Part IV - Staff and Faculty Personnel. President MacVicar of Oregon State University inquired about Section 40.040 and suggested that the words "research assistant" be added to the faculty rank in paragraph 1. President MacVicar supplied a description of the position of research assistant. The committee recommended that "research assistant" be inserted in the list of academic ranks and that the description of that rank be inserted in the draft following the description for senior instructor, as follows:

Research Assistant: This rank may be used for staff appointees engaged in the conduct of research under supervision. Such appointees will normally hold the master's degree or such other degree appropriate to the field in which the research is being conducted.

In paragraph 4 of Section 40.040 regarding assignment of academic rank it was recommended by the committee that the words "and vice chancellors" be inserted after chancellor.

In Section 41.010, Appointment Procedures, the committee recommended that paragraph 2 be changed to read as follows:

2. Except as provided in AR 12.400, Appointments to positions in the budget are normally subject to institutional and state civil service regulations.

The committee recommended that in Section 41.210, Eligibility for Sabbatical Leave, the last sentence be eliminated, as indicated below:

... The application to sabbatical leave qualification time of war service leave other than direct military service will be considered by the Board on its merits for each individual case that may arise.

Mr. Corey inquired whether all provisions in the Administrative Code on all subjects had been transferred to the Administrative Rules. Chancellor Lueallen replied that there have been some items in the Administrative Code which were not included in the proposed draft of the Administrative Rules.
Note: At the close of the docket item on Administrative Rules, there follows a statement showing the Administrative Code items which have not been carried into the Administrative Rules document.

Regarding Section 42.010, Academic Freedom, there was a brief discussion and it was commented that the section may need re-study and possible amendment in the future. It was recommended by the committee that the statement as shown in the draft be recommended to the Board. It was brought out during the discussion that the statement was approved by the Board in September 1932.

In connection with Section 42.150, Relationship with State Legislature, Mrs. Johnson inquired regarding a news report she had seen which indicated that the Associated Students at the University of Oregon had entered into an employment contract with an attorney and that part of his duties were to be lobbying before the State Legislature on behalf of the students. She said that according to the Board's rule, the Chancellor is to represent the institutions at the Legislature unless he specifically requests an institution executive officer or other staff member to appear before legislative committees; and there may be legal problems if a student-employed attorney attempts to conduct lobbying activities. President Clark of the University of Oregon stated that the contract which the ASUO entered into with the attorney does not mention that lobbying activities are to be performed by the attorney. He said that apparently the news item referred to by Mrs. Johnson was in error. President Layman suggested that the Chancellor have Attorney Ray Underwood provide the Board with a memorandum before its meeting of December 8, 1970, regarding the ASUO contract with its attorney with respect to any contemplated lobbying.

Part V - Rules Pertaining to Institutional Units and Administrative Services. Mr. Collins reported that the University of Oregon Medical School had requested that Section 50.160, Medical and Surgical Charges, be replaced with a new page referring to policies and procedures which had been approved by the Board on April 23, 1968, after the policies and procedures outlined in the original draft of Section 50.160. The proposed new draft for Section 50.160 is as follows:

50.160 Medical and Surgical Charges

1. Patients in the Medical School Hospitals or Clinics who are found able to pay the cost of all or part of the medical and/or surgical services performed by Medical School faculty members are to be billed for such services by the Medical School. It is understood that bills are to be presented to patients only in those instances where thorough investigation of the patients' financial resources discloses that funds are available for the services and where the faculty member rendering the services approves charging the fee. As a general rule a patient is not to be billed for medical and surgical services until after his obligation to pay the hospital bill is satisfied.

2. It is understood that the amounts of professional fees to be charged are to be in accordance with a fee schedule prepared by the clinical departments concerned and approved by the Dean's Office. All billings are also to be reviewed by the Administrator of the
Hospital, who has authority to waive or modify an individual bill if circumstances warrant.

3. The amounts collected from medical and surgical fees are to be placed in a Medical Education Improvement Fund in the gift and grant group of accounts, to be used for purposes having the objective of strengthening the instructional, research and patient care programs. Specific uses of the fund include salaries for faculty positions and participation in educational programs not adequately financed from other sources, such as the graduate program in basic sciences and continuing education program for practicing physicians.

Dean Terkla of the University of Oregon Dental School has requested that a section comparable to Section 50.160 on charges for oral health services provided by the Dental School staff to patients in the Medical School Hospitals be included in the Administrative Rules. It is recommended that there be added to the Administrative Rules, Section 50.170, Oral Health Service Charges from UODS, as follows:

50.170 Oral Health Service Charges from UODS

1. Invoices for professional oral health services provided patients in the Medical School Hospitals will be submitted to the patient by the Medical School. It is understood that an invoice is to be presented only in those instances where a thorough investigation of the patient's financial resources discloses that funds are available for this purpose and the faculty member rendering the service approves the fee. Also, as a general rule, the patient is not to be billed for oral health services until after his obligation to pay the hospital bill is satisfied.

2. The amounts of professional fees to be charged are to be determined by a fee schedule, prepared by the Dental Clinical Departments concerned, and approved by the Dean's Office of the Dental School. All billing will also be reviewed by the Administrator of the hospital, and the administrator has authority to waive or modify an individual bill if warranted by circumstances.

3. It is proposed that the entire amount collected from oral health service fees be placed in a Dental Education Improvement Fund in the gift and grants group of accounts. This fund will be used for a variety of purposes, all having the general objective of strengthening the instructional, research, and patient care programs. Specific uses of the fund include salaries of faculty positions, educational programs not now adequately financed, and continuing education programs for practicing dentists.

Section 50.210 - ORS Sections Pertaining to Individual Institutions. In the draft considered by the committee it was contemplated that the ORS sections 352.010 through 352.990 would be included in the body of the Administrative Rules under subject headings consistent with the format of the document. After discussion it was decided that it would be more suitable to place the ORS sections pertaining to the individual institutions in the Appendix. The Committee so recommended. With this change the contents of the Appendix would be as follows:
APPENDIX

A. ORS 351.770 – 351.840, Western Regional Higher Education Compact
B. ORS 351.265 – 351.303, State Educational Coordinating Council
C. ORS 348.505 – 348.620, State Scholarship Commission
D. ORS 352.010 – 352.990, Institutions of Higher Education
E. Oregon High School-College Relations Council, Constitution
F. By-Laws of Oregon State Board of Higher Education (which have been adapted and incorporated into the Administrative Rules)
G. State System Guidelines and Policies in Curricular Allocations

Note: It is suggested that the items in the Appendix be indicated by capital letters instead of numbers as shown in the preliminary draft to avoid confusion with the numbered parts of the Administrative Rules.

It was suggested by Mr. Joss that Section 51.010, Library Centralization, be omitted from the Administrative Rules because of its general nature and lack of any precise statement of policy or procedure. The committee recommended that the section be deleted. The section contained in the draft was as follows:

51.010 Library Centralization

The Board, in its original directive for centralization of library resources and services adopted in 1931, set forth "an ideal for a great common supply of books and other printed materials." This ideal serves as the guide for the libraries.

Regarding the remaining sections related to the State System library coordination, President Layman called attention to the fact that the Dean of Library Services is the only one remaining of the old designation of interinstitutional dean and director and he inquired whether the present title should be continued. The Chancellor said that the Dean of the Libraries who coordinates the operation of all of the libraries in the State System reports to Vice Chancellor Romney. The Chancellor said he felt that the coordinating office for the State System libraries was useful and that the sections directed to library coordination should probably be retained. It was recommended by the committee that the sections on library coordination be included in the Administrative Rules.

Part VI – Finance and Business Affairs. The Chancellor stated that Vice Chancellor Holmer wishes to re-study Part VI on Finance and Business Affairs as shown in the draft and will probably be proposing some modifications in the future.

Because of recent changes in the assignment of disbursing activities at the state level, it was suggested that Section 60.150 be changed to read as follows:
60.150 Authorization to Sign Claims, Payroll, and Checks

The Vice Chancellor for Administration or at his direction the Controller is authorized to:

1. Appoint a person or persons to sign claims on behalf of the Board for payment by the Secretary of State Executive Department.

2. Appoint a person or persons to sign payrolls for payment by the Secretary of State Executive Department, to provide the necessary surety statutory bonds required by the Secretary of State Executive Department, and upon termination of appointments to cancel the bonds.

3. Appoint a person or persons to sign checks on bank accounts with the State Treasurer or commercial banks.

In Section 60.170 it was suggested that the section be changed to read as follows in order to call attention to the assignment of certain responsibilities to the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning:

60.170 Contracts

1. Contracts and legal documents customarily prepared by or for the institutions are subject to the recommendation of the institutional executive or his designated representative. The contracts and legal documents are then to be referred to the Vice Chancellor for Administration or his designated appointee for official approval and execution on behalf of the Board except contracts and agreements concerning matters for which responsibility is assigned to the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning (see AR 70.210). In the absence of the Vice Chancellor for Administration or his appointee, the Secretary of the Board or his appointee is authorized to approve and execute contracts and legal documents on behalf of the Board.

The Committee recommended approval of the change referred to above.

2. Contracts involving general policy questions shall be reviewed with the Board or a report made to the Board.

For Sections 62.230, 62.240 and 62.250 it was reported to the committee that subsequent Board action on July 23, 1968, supersedes the rules shown in the three sections referred to above. The policies and procedures approved by the Board on July 23, 1968, are included in the Administrative Rules in Section 70.135. It was recommended to the committee that the paragraphs under the three section headings be deleted and that in the place of the paragraphs there be included under each of the three topic headings a reference to AR 70.135. The committee recommended that the change be made as outlined above.

Regarding Section 64.000 on intellectual property, patents and inventions, President Layman indicated that changes in policies and procedures are probably needed in this area since there have been no changes for
a considerable length of time. Mr. Holmer said that problems are also arising in connection with copyrights. He said that his office has been working on the development of material, and that there will be a report to the Board at its December 8 meeting on the status of patent administration in the State System.

The Chancellor called attention to Section 65.010, Duties of the Vice Chancellor for Administration. He said that this is a new section which describes briefly the duties and responsibilities of the Vice Chancellor for Administration.

Part VII - Physical Plant, Equipment, and Traffic Control. Attention was called to the fact that in Section 70.040, Purchases of Real Property, this section reflects a change from previous practice in transferring the responsibility for purchase of real property from the Vice Chancellor for Administration to the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.

The Chancellor called attention to Section 70.210 which lists the duties and responsibilities of the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning. He reminded the Board members that in this document they had also reviewed statements of the duties and responsibilities for the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Administration.

Items in Administrative Code Not Included in the Administrative Rules. Chancellor Lieuallen indicated to the committee that a list of the omitted sections, together with explanations, would be presented to the Board at its meeting on December 8, 1970. (The listing appears as Supplement B to these minutes.)

Recommendation. The Chancellor recommended approval of the Administrative Rules document by the committee. The committee voted to recommend that the Board approve the Administrative Rules as shown in the draft subject to the changes suggested by the committee and shown in the preceding paragraphs.

The Chancellor recommended an appropriation from the Board's Unappropriated Fund in the amount of $5,000 to cover the costs of printing approximately 1,000 copies of the Administrative Rules for distribution to the institutions, the Board's offices, state officials and others. The estimated cost includes the printing, assembling, tabbing and the placing of the Rules in an inexpensive loose leaf binder so that replacement pages can be readily inserted. Any part of the $5,000 amount not used will be returned to the Board's Unappropriated Fund.

President Layman indicated that presentations in connection with the hearing on the proposed Administrative Rules were in order. Dr. Michael Papadopoulos was recognized for the purpose of presenting the following statement:
I believe that it is in the best interest of all those involved in the field of higher education that the making of administrative rules be more fully shared between the various parties concerned. Too often it seems that rules are adopted without proper concern for their effect on scholarship and on faculty morale.

At some future date, it may seem desirable to amend or to repeal certain of the administrative rules adopted on the basis of this hearing, which is being held in accordance with the provisions of the Oregon "Administrative Procedures Act," ORS Chapter 183. Some of the rules govern procedures to be used by the State Board in running its own meetings, others subject faculty members and students to the possible imposition of penalties.

As a person with a proper interest in the administration of higher education in the State of Oregon, I request the State Board of Higher Education to adopt further administrative rules for the following purposes:

(1) in order to comply with the provisions of ORS 183.390,

(2) in order to comply with the part of ORS 183.410 which, on the subject of petitions to be made for the issuance of a declaratory ruling by a State Agency states that "Each agency shall prescribe by rule the form for such petitions and the procedure for this submission, consideration and disposition."

Mr. Mosser moved that the wording of Section 42.410(8) of the proposed Administrative Rules be amended from "Use, possession or distribution of illegal drugs on institutionally owned or controlled property" to read "Illegal use, possession, or distribution of drugs on institutionally owned or controlled property." He indicated that both the Medical and Dental Schools had included this recommendation in their reports on the Administrative Rules and pointed out that the drugs themselves are not illegal but their use and possession may be.

The Board approved Mr. Mosser's motion.

Upon motion by Mr. Corey, the Board voted to incorporate in the proposed Administrative Rules the following:

1. The amendments and changes made by the Ad Hoc Committee on Review of Administrative Rules as indicated in the report of the session of that committee held on November 15, 1970; and
2. The amendment pertaining to the authorization for allocation of funds for plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay considered by the Building Committee on November 16, 1970, and adopted by the Board earlier in the December 8, 1970, Board meeting.

Mr. Corey then made the following motion:

To repeal the Administrative Code and Bylaws of the Board of Higher Education now in force and effect, including all prior amendments thereto, and to adopt, in lieu thereof, the Administrative Rules as set forth in the draft thereof submitted to the Board at this meeting and as heretofore revised at this Board meeting. The repeal of the Administrative Code and Bylaws and the adoption of the Administrative Rules shall be effective upon compliance with the filing and publication requirements of the Oregon Administrative Procedure Act; and

To appropriate from the Board's Unappropriated Fund an amount not in excess of $5,000 to cover the costs of printing approximately 1,000 copies of the Administrative Rules for distribution to the institutions, the Board's offices, state officials and others.

The Board approved the motion as presented and the President of the Board declared the Administrative Rules adopted.

President Layman indicated that he was reappointing the members of the standing committees to each of those committees and that the reappointments were made for the current academic year, effective September 8, 1970.

Mr. Layman said that a schedule of the tentative dates and places for Board and Committee meetings for 1971 had been distributed and that if there were no objections this schedule would be confirmed for the 1971 meetings. The approved schedule appears below:

Committee Meetings—all scheduled for Portland State University, on the following dates: January 4-5; February 15-16; April 5-6; May 17-18; July 6-7; October 4-5; November 22-23; January 4-5, 1972.

Board Meeting Dates and Places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>Lane Community College, Eugene (Joint meeting with Board of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 25</td>
<td>Portland State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26</td>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8</td>
<td>Eastern Oregon College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>