2. $14,324 - "To provide services of a consultant who will assist in the design and implementation of a system for federal program management, planning and evaluation," July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Mr. K. A. Ahlberg, Project Director.

Oregon Traffic Safety Commission
Grant of $31,740 from the Oregon Traffic Safety Commission, Salem, "to produce a packaged training program designed to provide city, county, and state agencies, as well as private agency personnel with a practical understanding of traffic safety engineering," July 1, 1972, through January 31, 1974, under the direction of Mr. William Beck, Specialist in Engineering.

Teaching Research Division
Subgrant of $800 through the Oregon State Department of Education, Salem, "to conduct an independent accomplishment Audit of the Oregon School for the Deaf's Title I Project," May 1 through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. John Quanbeck, Assistant Research Professor.

Oregon Mathematics Education Council
Grants totaling $97,278 from the Oregon Mathematics Education Council, Salem, for the following purposes:

1. $85,639 - "To conduct the needs assessment portion of a National Science Foundation grant entitled 'Oregon System for Mathematics Education Project' which has been awarded to the Oregon Mathematics Education Council, a committee of the Educational Coordinating Council," April 15, 1972, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Gerald Gage, Research Professor.

2. $11,639 - "To cover salary and related costs of a half-time Evaluation Component Director for the above project," April 15, 1972, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Mr. John Quanbeck, Assistant Research Professor.

Oregon Mental Health Division
Grant of $865 from the Oregon Mental Health Division, Department of Human Resources, Salem, "to develop a manual for using the PARS (Personal Adjustment and Role Skills) scale," July 12 through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Gaylord Thorne, Associate Research Professor.

Springfield School District No. 19
Grant of $740 from the Springfield School District No. 19, Springfield, "to conduct an educational accomplishment audit of the School District's ESEA, Title I Summer Project (State Project #72204)," July 4 through October 28, 1972, under the direction of Mr. John Quanbeck, Assistant Research Professor.

U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
Grant of $4,489 from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bethel Agency, Bethel, Alaska, "to conduct an evaluation of the Community Child Development Program at Akiachak, Alaska," March 15 through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. F. Leon Paulson, Associate Research Professor.
It was recommended that Dr. Stanley Williamson, Head of the Department of Science Education, be appointed as Acting Dean of the School of Education, effective July 1, 1972, to serve during academic year 1972-73, or until his successor may be appointed and report for duty, with a change in annual salary from $21,000 to $22,500 for 9-months' service. Dr. Williamson has been carrying out the duties of the Dean's Office during July and August of 1972.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

At 2:25 P.M., President Layman adjourned the meeting until October 25, 1972, on which date the Board will reconvene at 10:30 A.M., in Room 327, Michael J. Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University.
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PARKING AND VEHICULAR TRAFFIC REGULATIONS
EASTERN OREGON COLLEGE

Year 1972-73

Philosophy

Student, faculty, and staff parking and traffic policies are developed and recommended for the President's approval by the Administrative Committee, composed of the Associated Student Body Business Manager and Second Vice President, seven faculty and one staff member.

The basic philosophy guiding the thinking of the Administrative Committee, which develops campus parking and vehicular traffic regulations, is that campus streets are no different than public streets. All city, county, and state laws pertaining to the operation of vehicles are applicable and are enforced within approved campus boundaries. These boundaries are L Avenue and C Avenue-Gekeler Lane at the north and south respectively, and 12th Street and 6th Street at the east and west respectively.

Another factor which guides the Administrative Committee is that ample gratis parking for automobiles, motorcycles, motorbikes and bicycles is available to all students, faculty, and staff within two blocks of every instructional building and each residence hall. Because there is ample gratis parking for automobiles, motorcycles, motorbikes, and bicycles, reserved parking permits are made available first to full-time faculty and staff and associated student body officers who must maintain regular work day schedules. Faculty and staff, in particular, are urged by the Administrative Committee to purchase automobile parking permits so that they can park their automobiles in reserved parking areas close to their work stations. This action will leave open for gratis student parking the major portion of the campus streets.

The above philosophy and the regulations which follow will remain in effect until parking becomes a major problem and parking structures or paved parking lots must be constructed or repaved in order to meet the needs of personnel associated with the college. At that time, the Board of Higher Education's mandatory self-liquidating, self-supporting policy pertaining to financing the cost of building and maintaining parking structures and facilities will be reviewed and other priority systems for issuing reserved parking permits will be considered.

General Regulations for Parking

Grāteis parking is permitted on all streets and lots within the campus boundaries except on (1) lots or street areas posted with Reserved signs, (2) streets where curbs are painted yellow, (3) the brick-paver mall (formerly 8th Street) between I Avenue and K Avenue, (4) 1 Avenue between 7th Street and 8th Street, (5) the paved mall (formerly J Avenue) between 7th Street and 8th street, and (6) the west side of 7th Street between H and I Avenues.
Specific Vehicle Violations

1. Parking a non-registered, non-permit displaying automobile, motorcycle, motorbike, or bicycle in a reserved parking lot.

2. Parking an automobile, motorcycle, motorbike, or bicycle on streets next to curbs painted yellow or posted Reserved parking.

3. Falsification of vehicle registration information.

4. Straddling lines between parking spaces regardless of whether the painted lines are located on streets or in parking lots.

5. Blocking traffic anywhere within the approved campus boundaries.

6. Failure to register bicycles.

7. Parking a bicycle anywhere on campus except in a bicycle rack adjacent to an instructional building or a student residence hall.

8. Driving automobiles or riding bicycles, motorcycles, and motorbikes anywhere within approved campus boundaries except on the streets and in approved parking areas.

Action Against Violators

If a college citation is placed on a vehicle, the registered owner is directed by means of instructions on the citation to pay a fine at the Business Office in the Administration Building. Appeals, if any, must be directed in person to the Business Manager. His decision is final.

The student's right to receive his registration packet and to enroll during a registration period will be denied if any fines owing under the regulations remain unpaid at the time of registration. In addition, transcripts will be held up until any outstanding fine is paid.

Three violations by a student will result in the student being referred to the Dean of Students' office for appropriate action.

Flagrant violations by faculty and staff will be turned over to the Dean of Administration for appropriate action.

Occasionally faculty, staff, and students will report misconduct in the use of vehicles within approved campus boundaries to the Dean of Administration or Dean of Students. Usually, the misconduct includes but is not limited to riding of bicycles, motorcycles, or motorbikes on other than streets used by public vehicles; speeding; reckless driving; driving the wrong way on a one-way street; running stop signs; and excessive noise. All are violations of state, county, city, and campus vehicular regulations. Usually, complaints for these violations are filed with the La Grande City Police Department.

Continued or flagrant violations are investigated by the Dean of Students. He will determine whether the alleged violator is a student. If he is a student, the Dean of Students will request that the student report to the Dean's office.
In accordance with the Eastern Oregon College Student Conduct Code, the alleged violator is then given one of two choices: (1) a hearing before the Dean of Students, followed by a decision including, if necessary, a penalty, or (2) a hearing before the Judiciary Committee (consisting of three faculty and three students) including, if necessary, a penalty. In rare instances, the Dean of Students may refer cases directly to the Judiciary Committee. The student may appeal the decision of the Dean of Students or the Judiciary Committee to the President of the College. Reports involving faculty or staff will be turned over to the Dean of Administration for appropriate action.

If a citation for any violation is issued by a city, county, or state police officer, the person cited should post bail or appear at the time and place stated on the citation. The college exercises no authority or responsibility over these actions. However, the college authorities will cooperate with law enforcement officers in apprehending suspected violators. In no instance will a student, faculty member, or staff member be notified to appear before the Dean of Students, the Judiciary Committee, or the Dean of Administration if he was cited by a city, county, or state law enforcement officer for the same violation.

Fees and Fines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserved Parking Fees</th>
<th>Fine for Each Violation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automobile</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 for 3 terms</td>
<td>$5 (Reduced to $3 if paid within 2 working days after citation is issued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4 for 2 terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2 for Spring term only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.50 for second car for same reserved space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motorcycle or Motorbike</strong></td>
<td>$3 (Reduced to $2 if paid within 2 working days after citation is issued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3 for 3 terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 for single term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle</strong></td>
<td>$2 (Reduced to $1 if paid within 2 working days after citation is issued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All bicycles used within the approved campus boundaries must be registered in the Business Office. Non-registered and/or illegally parked bicycles will be impounded by Physical Plant. Bicycles should also be licensed by the City of La Grande. Impounded bicycles will be released after the violator pays the fine.

If a student withdraws or a faculty or staff member leaves prior to the end of Spring Term, he will be refunded $1 only on the automobile parking permit for each full unexpired term. No refunds will be issued on unexpired motorcycle or motorbike reserved parking permits.

Reservation Parking

Students. Associated student body officers may request reserved parking through the Director of Institutional Research. Such reserved parking is available during Fall, Winter, and Spring terms.

Thirty (30) reserved parking spaces for automobiles are assigned to men residents of Hunt Hall by the Hunt Hall Student Council. These parking spaces are located northwest of Hunt Hall.
Residents of Hunt Hall who wish reserved parking for their motorcycles and motorbikes on the island northwest of Hunt Hall may request permits through the Director of Institutional Research.

Twenty (20) reserved parking spaces for automobiles are assigned to women residents of Dorion Hall by the Dorion Hall Student Council. These parking spaces are located on the west side of 7th Street between H Avenue and I Avenue.

All students who ride bicycles on the campus must register their bicycles in the Business Office. The registration permits them to park their bicycles in any of the reserved parking bicycle racks located adjacent to each instructional building and residence hall.

Ackerman Lab School students must register their bicycles in the Principal's office.

Faculty and Staff. Reserved parking is available during Fall, Winter, and Spring terms. Requests for reserved parking of automobiles, motorcycles, and motorbikes are placed with the Director of Institutional Research.

All faculty and staff who ride bicycles on the campus must register their bicycles in the Business Office. The registration permits them to park their bicycles in any of the bicycle racks located adjacent to each instructional building and residence hall.

Assignments

Reserved parking assignments for automobiles, motorbikes, and motorcycles are made at the time the reserved parking permit is purchased in the Business Office.

Responsibility for Observing Campus Parking and Vehicular Traffic Regulations

The responsibility for locating a legal parking space or the assigned reserved parking lot or area rests with the driver or rider of the vehicle. Should lack of space ever become a problem, it is not a valid excuse for violating a campus parking regulation.

Citations are issued to the registered owner of the vehicle. If the registered owner loans his vehicle to another party, it is the responsibility of the registered owner to instruct the person to whom he loans the vehicle regarding campus parking and vehicular traffic regulations.

In the event the driver or rider of a vehicle receiving the citation issued by college campus personnel fails to pay the fine, it is the responsibility of the registered owner to pay the fine.

Authority of Oregon State Police, Union County Sheriffs, La Grande City Police, and College Traffic Regulation Enforcement Personnel

State police officers, Union County Sheriffs, and La Grande City Police officers are authorized to issue citations for violations occurring anywhere within approved campus boundaries.

Citations are also issued by college physical plant personnel, students employed by the college to issue citations, Hunt Hall and Dorion Hall student officers,
the Director of Residence Halls, and Business Office personnel, depending on the location of the violation. College personnel concentrate on illegal parking in reserved parking areas.

Eastern Oregon College does not have campus police; therefore, enforcement of state, county, city, and campus parking and vehicular traffic regulations is dependent upon the cooperation of the above personnel. Strict enforcement is necessary to minimize congestion, maintain safety, enhance security, and maximize the use of existing parking facilities.

Authority to Establish Vehicular Regulations

Authority to establish regulations governing the use of vehicles within approved campus boundaries is derived from Oregon statutes and action of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education pursuant to such statutes.

Use of Income from Fines

Income from fines paid in the Business Office is used to defray the cost of printing parking permits and to maintain, pave, and construct state-owned parking facilities.

Security

Everyone is urged to lock his automobile, motorbike, or motorcycle. Bicycles should be locked to the bicycle rack. The college does not assume any responsibility for loss due to theft or damage to vehicles while parked within the campus boundaries.

The above regulations have been approved by the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Administration and Board of Higher Education and filed with the Secretary of State.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Revised August 1972
OREGON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE
REGULATIONS GOVERNING TRAFFIC CONTROL
Year 1972-73 (no change from 1971-72)

1. RESPONSIBILITY IN TRAFFIC CONTROL

a. Oregon Revised Statute 352.360 authorizes the State Board of Higher Education to "...enact such regulations as it shall deem convenient or necessary to provide for the policing, control and regulation of traffic and parking of vehicles on the property of any institution under the jurisdiction of the Board. Such regulations may provide for the registration of vehicles, the designation of parking areas, and the assessment and collection of reasonable fees and charges for parking."

b. Strict enforcement of these regulations is necessary to minimize congestion and maintain safety on campus roads and in parking areas. The Oregon Technical Institute Executive Office has placed the administration of these regulations with the Campus Traffic Commission working in co-ordination with the Campus Police.

c. The Board, "for the purpose of enforcing its regulations governing traffic control, may appoint peace officers who shall have the same authority as other peace officers as defined in O.R.S. 133.170."

d. The regulations listed hereinafter which provide for the policing, control, and regulating of traffic and parking of vehicles on campus are enforceable whenever a vehicle is on campus. All personnel (faculty, staff, and students) of Oregon Technical Institute are required to be knowledgeable of and abide by these regulations.

e. Administrative and disciplinary sanctions may be imposed upon students, faculty and staff for violation of the regulations, including but not limited to, a reasonable monetary penalty which may be deducted from student deposits, and
faculty or staff salaries or other funds in the possession of the institution as provided in sub-section 2 of O.R.S. 352.360. The regulations may also be enforced by the impoundment of vehicles, and a reasonable fee may be enacted for the cost of the impoundment and storage, if any, prior to the release of the vehicles to their owners, as provided in sub-section 4 of O.R.S. 352.360.

f. The regulations governing traffic control may, by authority of the Traffic Commission and with approval of the State Board of Higher Education, be changed or altered (temporarily or permanently) whenever it is deemed to be beneficial to the public interests. In the event of any emergency or special event, parking and traffic regulations may be waived by the Traffic Commission or administrator in charge.

II VEHICLE REGISTRATION

a. A vehicle is any motor conveyance requiring a state or city license to operate on public highways.

b. Any vehicle operated on campus must be properly registered with the Traffic Co-ordinator, Physical Plant Office. Vehicles must be registered at the time of academic-registration. PROOF OF OWNERSHIP MUST BE PRESENTED AT TIME OF REGISTRATION. (Title or state vehicle registration certificate.) After academic-registration vehicles must be registered when brought on the campus the first time.

c. Registration permits must be permanently affixed to the rear bumper (left-third) on the registered vehicle. Courtesy parking permits for visitors must be obtained at the information desk in Snell Hall and displayed as indicated on that permit. Temporary parking permits, issued to students and faculty, must be obtained at the Traffic Co-ordinator’s Office, Snell Hall 203, and will be displayed as indicated. Any variation of the above instructions must be approved by the Traffic Co-ordinator’s office.
playing student permits must park in student areas - (Orange).

ea. Student permits will be issued to part-time* students for a fee of $2.50 per term.

b. Division of Continuing Education permits will be issued to students who are attending only DCE classes for a fee of $1.50 per term. DCE students may apply for a DCE parking permit for the school term by submitting a completed Vehicle Registration Card and the $1.50 fee to the Cashier's Office.

c. Summer Term permits will be issued to staff and students who were not registered full-time during the proceeding year. A fee of $3.00 is charged for these permits and will be valid for Summer Term only.

d. Two-wheeled, Power and Scooter permits will be issued for a fee of $7.00 per annum. Such vehicles will be parked according to instructions in section 5.

e. Bicycle permits will be issued for a fee of $3.00 per annum. Such vehicles will be parked according to instructions in section 5.

f. Special permits may be issued at the Physical Plant Office under the following circumstances: (1) permanently handicapped students may be issued a special permit upon application to and approval by the Traffic Commission, after paying the appropriate student permit fee. (2) Students temporarily handicapped may be issued a temporary handicapped permit upon application to and approval by the Traffic Co-ordinator, provided a regular student parking fee has been paid. (3) Students, staff, and faculty who wish to bring a vehicle on campus on a temporary basis up to two weeks in duration, will be issued a temporary permit for a fee of $1.00. (4) Vehicles displaying temporary permits must park in the area designated by that permit.

k. Refunds for students withdrawing from school will be consistent with

* Part-time students are those registered for eleven credit hours or less per term.
State Board policy for fee and tuition refunds. A non-returning student will receive a refund for those terms not attended during the school year. If a student disposes of his registered vehicle and does not replace it with another, however, a refund of fees paid in advance for succeeding terms only, will be made.

2. Second vehicle or replacement permits may be obtained for a fee of $.50 provided proof of ownership is established. Second vehicle permits will not be issued for two-wheeled vehicles except as replacement permits. Purchasers of second vehicle permits may have only one vehicle on campus at a time, unless full parking fees have been paid for both vehicles.

m. Visitors displaying Courtesy Parking permits may park in areas designated by that permit, provided all posted signs are observed.

IV DRIVING ON CAMPUS

a. Any operator of a motor vehicle, while driving on campus, must comply with the traffic laws and ordinances of the State of Oregon and the City of Klamath Falls, and with the regulations governing motor vehicles on campus.

b. Designations for campus roads: (1) main roads -- entrance-exit roads and roads connecting one campus area with another, (2) service roads -- roads to buildings and to service parking zones, (3) access roads -- roads connecting parking areas with main roads, (4) parking aisles -- roads within the parking areas which connect parking spaces with access roads, and (5) circle drive -- road at entrance to Snell Hall.

c. Maximum speeds for operating vehicles on campus: (1) main roads -- 25 miles per hour unless otherwise designated, (2) service and access roads -- 15 miles per hour, and (3) parking aisles and circle drive -- 10 miles per hour. Speed limits must be observed and complied with on all campus roads.
d. The "basic rule" and rules for safe driving are constantly in effect. Moving violations shall automatically be referred to the Traffic Commission.

e. Vehicles leaving service roads, parking aisles, and circle drive must yield to vehicles operated on main roads; and vehicles operated on any road must yield to pedestrian traffic.

f. Driving any vehicle on sidewalks, lawns, landscape areas, or on any area not designated or designed for driving is prohibited.

g. Cases involving destruction of State property resulting from the use of a motor vehicle shall be automatically referred to the Business Manager, Snell Hall 201 for collection of damages, in addition to customary fine.

V PARKING ON CAMPUS

a. A "parked vehicle" refers to any vehicle which is stopped with or without a driver in attendance and irrespective of the time such vehicle is stopped. The driver (owner) of a vehicle must assume the risk of injury to other vehicles which are parked when the proximate cause of the injury involves negligent parking on the part of the driver or to mechanical failure on the part of the driver's parked vehicle.

b. Areas designated for parking are indicated on the campus traffic map or are listed herein as "(1) parking 1 -- area west of circle drive, (2) parking 2 -- area east of circle drive, (2a) east and adjacent to parking lot no. 2, (3) parking 3 -- area west of and adjacent to Physical Education Building, (3a) north of parking lot no. 3 and adjacent to Physical Education Field, (4) parking 4 -- area northeast of and adjacent to Cornett Hall, and (5) parking 5 -- area south of Physical Plant."

c. Zones designated for loading-unloading purposes and/or for limited parking are indicated on the campus traffic map or listed herein as "(1) service
parking -- east of cafeteria, northeast of and adjacent to Physical Education Building, west of Classroom Building, and on all service roads and (2) limited parking -- west of and adjacent to Residence Hall and on circle drive. Circle drive will be open for parking between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., on weekends and on school holidays, except for the space marked "Police."

d. Vehicles shall be parked on campus ONLY in areas designated for parking. Parking of vehicles on any road, driveway, fire lane, entranceway to building, pedestrian lane, and landscaped area is prohibited. Encroachment upon adjacent spaces and parking aisles is prohibited.

e. Assigned parking is authorized as indicated on the campus traffic map and is marked by appropriate colors and signs or is listed herein as "(1) blue -- faculty, staff, and visitors, (2) orange -- resident and commuter students, (3) white -- as marked, (parallel parking only), (4) yellow -- limited and service.

f. Parking assignments may, by authority of the Traffic Commission be temporarily changed in the event of special campus activities.

g. When need has been established, a reserved parking space may be authorized by the Traffic Commission within a parking area; no other vehicle may be parked in this space.

h. Handicapped persons may be authorized special parking permits which will allow parking in spaces designated "handicap parking"; no other vehicle may be parked in these spaces.

i. Head-in parking is required with the front wheels adjacent to the curb where angle or right-angle parking spaces are provided; parallel parking is required where paralleled spaces are provided and is permissible in service zones for purposes of loading and unloading.
j. Parking is allowed for service vehicles only in any service zone.

k. Special zones are designated for parking two-wheeled vehicles; no other vehicles may be parked in these zones.

l. Open parking is permissible between 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. and on weekends and school holidays EXCEPT for parking in reserved spaces, services areas, fire lanes, and limited parking zones.

m. Parking of any vehicle in any building is prohibited, except Cornett Hall during repairs.

n. Repair of vehicle in any parking area or zone is prohibited, except in minor repair area.

VI APPLICATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE LAWS OF THE STATE OF OREGON

All motor vehicle laws of the State of Oregon including specifically, but not by way of limitation, Chapters 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, and 622, together with amendments hereafter adopted are applicable to the campus of Oregon Technical Institute to the same extent as if said campus and its roads were public highways, and all provisions of said motor vehicle laws are invoked and enforceable except insofar as they are incompatible or inconsistent with these regulations.

VII PENALTIES FOR OFFENSES

a. Vehicle not registered - Fine of $2.00

b. Permit not properly displayed - Fine of $2.00

c. Falsification of information - Fine of $5.00

d. Parking offenses - Fine of $2.00

e. Moving violations including such offenses as reckless driving, driving while intoxicated, speeding, driving the wrong way, running stop signs, excessive noise, and other offenses not otherwise specified herein which are a violation of the motor vehicle laws of the State of Oregon are punishable upon convic-
tion, in accordance with said motor laws. Violators will normally be cited to the District Court.

f. FAILURE TO ANSWER A CITATION AS DIRECTED OR RESPOND TO A LETTER from the Traffic Commission within the time specified thereon may be punishable by a fine of up to $2.00. A fine of $5.00 will be levied for each additional letter.

g. Excessive citations may result in cancellation of parking permit by the Traffic Commission. In addition, the violator may be referred to the Office of Student Personnel Services for disciplinary action.

h. Bail will be required in all appeal cases referred to the Traffic Commission. The amount of bail shall not exceed the prescribed fine for the violation.

i. A student who fails to tender payment to the cashier for any traffic citation received or fails to post bail and requests a hearing before the Traffic Commission on or before the date specified on the traffic citation will, after written notice, have the fine deducted from his general deposit.

j. A faculty or staff member who fails to tender payment to the cashier for any traffic citation received or fails to post bail and requests a hearing before the Traffic Commission on or before the date specified on the traffic citation will, after written notice, have the fine deducted from his payroll check.

VIII ENFORCEMENT OF PENALTIES

A student, faculty, or staff member who is cited for violation of a parking regulation shall, within the time provided on the citation:

1. Pay the amount prescribed on a citation as a penalty to the cashier on the OTI campus, or;

2. Request a hearing before the Traffic Commission and post the amount prescribed on the citation as bail. The appeal shall be in writing and indicate reasons of defense to the violation. The Traffic Commission shall review the matter and render judgment and its finding shall be conclusive. The submission of the matter to the Traffic Commission shall be a waiver of any rights to pre-
sent the matter to the District Court.

The Traffic Commission hearings shall have the full authority to:

A. Dismiss the violation.
B. Find the individual not guilty of the charges on the traffic citation.
C. Find the individual guilty of the violation, or of some lesser violation, and impose a fine as the Traffic Commission shall consider appropriate.
D. Enter a finding of guilty, and without imposing any fine, issue a reprimand or warning, or impose a fine and suspend its payment during a probationary period.
E. In addition, make recommendations to OTI authorities as a restriction or suspension of driving privileges, withdrawal of academic registration or parking privileges, dismissal, or other disciplinary actions. Such actions, however, shall be recommendatory only.

3. Request a hearing before the District Court in Klamath Falls and post the amount prescribed on the citation as bail. The written request shall be submitted to the Traffic Co-ordinator's Office, whereupon his case will be set on the docket of the District Court of Klamath Falls, in accordance with the rules and procedures pertaining to said court. The requirements for the posting of bail, the assessment of court costs, and the conduct of hearings and other matters in such cases will be in accordance with the laws and rules applicable in said court. Failure to respond to the three (3) solutions as stated above will be punishable as stated in paragraph 7h and 7i.

IX AUTHORITY OF CAMPUS POLICE OFFICERS

All members of the campus police have been appointed as special agents of the Oregon State Police and are vested with full authority as peace officers
in accordance with the laws of the State of Oregon. All notices of violations of any of the regulations herein will be signed by the campus policemen as peace officers. Any resistance to, interference with, or physical assault upon a campus police officer, will be handled in the same manner and to the same extent as a similar offense against other police officers.

These regulations are subject to revision.
INTRODUCTION

DRIVER RESPONSIBILITY

All persons operating vehicles on campus are responsible for knowing and adhering to the regulations herein. A thorough understanding of these regulations is important because violations will result in needless expense and inconvenience to violators.

The regulations are enforceable at all times including vacation periods by authorized Security Officers.

AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MOTOR VEHICLE REGULATIONS

Authority to establish regulations governing the use of motor vehicles on the Southern Oregon College Campus for visitors, faculty, staff, and students is derived from Oregon Revised Statute 352.360 and action of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education pursuant to such statute. The regulations as herein published have been approved by the Office of the Chancellor and filed with the Secretary of State in accordance with the provisions of ORS 183.310 to 183.500. Strict enforcement of these regulations is necessary to minimize congestions, maintain safety on Campus streets, enhance security, and maximize the use of existing parking facilities.

APPLICATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE LAWS OF THE STATE OF OREGON AND THE CITY OF ASHLAND

All motor vehicle laws of the State of Oregon and City of Ashland, including specifically, but not by way of limitation, ORS Chapters 481, 482, 484, 485, and 486, together with amendments hereafter adopted, are applicable and enforceable on the Campus of Southern Oregon College to the same extent as if this campus and its streets were public highways.

Revised June 2, 1972
1. TRAFFIC COMMITTEE

a. The Traffic Committee is established to advise and make recommendations to the President in creating or modifying traffic parking policies and to assist in the orderly, effective, and economical regulation of vehicle use on the Campus. Final authority will rest with the President.

b. The Traffic Committee will include: Three faculty members recommended by the Faculty Senate; three student members recommended by the Student Senate; and one civil service staff member elected by all full-time members of the civil service staff. All members are subject to final confirmation by the President.

c. Term of Office. Each member of the Traffic Committee will be appointed for the period of two years. Appointments to fill vacancies will be for the unexpired term of the particular vacancy being filled. Terms of office will be staggered so as to provide continuity.

d. The Director of Security and Safety, being responsible for the enforcement of these regulations, will be an ex-official (non-voting) member of the Traffic Committee. In this capacity, he will serve as an advisor concerning traffic problems on the campus. Additionally, the Director will make recommendations on needed improvements or changes in this program.

2. DRIVING AND PARKING REGULATIONS ON CAMPUS

The Dean of Administration in consultation with the Traffic Committee will designate parking areas on the campus.

a. Anyone operating a vehicle on campus will observe speed limits, barricades, bicycle lanes, crosswalks, and stop signs and will drive in a safe and prudent manner. The speed limit on campus is 15 MPH. Driving or parking vehicles on sidewalks, lawns, and other areas not designated for driving or parking is prohibited.

b. Campus traffic boundaries and parking areas are indicated on the campus traffic map.

c. Vehicles shall be parked within indicated parking areas.

d. Vehicles shall not be parked in loading zones at any time for any purpose other than loading and unloading.

e. Bicycle racks are provided on the campus for parking; they will be used. Pedestrians have the right-of-way over bicycles on campus walks.
3. VEHICLE REGISTRATION AND PARKING PERMITS

a. Vehicles requiring a state license are classified as motor vehicles and include automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, and motor scooters, all of which are hereafter referred to as vehicles.

b. Vehicles parked on the campus at any time must be registered and display the appropriate parking permit. Vehicle registration is available during normal registration or at the Business Office.

c. Parking permits will be attached only to the vehicle for which they are issued and to the designated area of the vehicle as specified by the Security and Safety Department. If a vehicle is disposed of, permits should be removed and returned to the Business Office to obtain another permit or a refund (see paragraph 4.m.).

d. Bicycles to be used or parked on the campus will be registered with the City of Ashland and licensed in accordance with ordinances thereof.

4. PARKING PERMITS AND PARKING AREAS

a. Parking permits are valid for the full school year which begins with the fall quarter and continues through the summer session. Parking permits may be purchased during the winter, spring, or summer terms at a proportionately reduced rate.

b. Vehicles will park in specified areas as designated by parking permit color and campus parking map.

c. Regulations may change from time to time. In the event of conflict between traffic signs or markings and printed regulations, the signs or markings will be followed.

d. FACULTY/STAFF parking permits will be sold to classified employees and to faculty. Vehicles displaying faculty/staff permits are authorized to park in designated faculty/staff areas. Because of limited space for faculty/staff parking, vehicles displaying these permits may park in other parking lots on the campus when faculty/staff lots are full.

e. STUDENT COMMUTER parking permits will be sold to students who live off campus and wish to bring vehicles on the campus. Vehicles displaying student commuter permits will park in student commuter parking lots.

f. RESIDENCE HALL parking permits will be sold to students living in campus residence halls. Vehicles displaying a Residence Hall permit will be parked in residence hall areas only.

g. MOTORCYCLE AND SCOOTER parking permits will be sold for two wheel vehicles only. These vehicles will be parked only in areas designated for two wheel vehicles.
h. For a second vehicle (OWNED BY THE DRIVER), more than one parking permit may be issued with appropriate controls. If a substitute vehicle, not owned by the driver, has to be brought on campus, the individual will acquire from the Security and Safety Department a substitute vehicle permit.

i. If the registered vehicle is sold or the permit is destroyed, a replacement permit may be purchased by showing proof of new vehicle ownership and remnants of the original permit showing the number.

j. SPECIAL permits may be approved by the Security and Safety Department, such as:

(1) Permanently and temporarily disabled students may be issued a special permit, to be used in conjunction with regular current parking permit.

(2) Special "Service" permits will be issued to Service Agencies doing business at the SOC Campus.

(3) Other permits as prescribed by the Traffic Committee.

k. The parking areas for SOC will be "open" from 6 PM to 6 AM and all day Saturday and Sunday unless otherwise marked, as long as vehicles are parked legally.

l. VISITORS permits are available at the Security and Safety Department, Business Office, Department Offices, Division Offices, or Campus Activities Office. Visitors may park in any of the parking areas, provided all posted signs are observed. Visitors passes are ordinarily issued for "one day" only. Special exceptions may be made by the Security and Safety Department. Buses will park in Lot #1 by the Physical Education Building and will be expected to have a VISITORS permit. If a ticket is received while obtaining a Visitors permit, return both the ticket and permit to the Security and Safety Office.

m. A refund for a parking permit will be made only for whole terms (fall, winter, and spring) remaining, and upon return of the sticker or fragments thereof showing the registration number. Refunds for a term will not be made after the published date for late school registration for that term. There will be no refunds for summer-term.

n. Special parking spaces are authorized for the President, Dean of Faculty, and Dean of Administration.

o. A limited number of parking spaces are available for Reserved Parking for a one year period. Applications will be made to the Traffic Committee for approval. Applications are available at the Security and Safety Department.
p. For those persons who would use the campus parking facilities only intermittently and for short periods of time, a weekly parking permit may be purchased at the Business Office.

5. PENALTIES FOR OFFENSES

a. Bringing unregistered vehicle on campus: Fine $10.00
b. Registered vehicle on campus without proper permit: Fine $5.00
c. Falsification of vehicle registration information: Fine $10.00
d. Parking Offenses: Fine $5.00
e. Overtime Parking: Fine $2.00
f. Improper driving, including such offenses as reckless driving, driving while intoxicated, speeding, driving the wrong way, running stop signs, excessive noise, and other offenses not otherwise specified herein which are a violation of the motor vehicle laws of the State of Oregon are punishable upon conviction in appropriate courts of law.
g. Excessive citations - five or more in a school year - will result in cancellation of parking permit by the Security and Safety Department. A refund may be made in this instance as per Section 4.m.
h. A vehicle may be towed off the campus and impounded and the owner subject to towing and storage fees in addition to penalties under the following circumstances:
   1. A vehicle causing imminent danger to people or College property.
   2. A vehicle having a parking permit and receiving five (5) or more citations within a school year.
   3. A vehicle not having a parking permit and receiving three (3) citations within a school year.
   4. A vehicle left parked or standing in an area not normally used for vehicular traffic. This includes parking on a sidewalk, or the grass.

6. ENFORCEMENT OF PENALTIES

a. All penalties prescribed in paragraph 5, other than for violations enforced in appropriate courts of law as provided in paragraph 5.f., will be administratively enforced by Southern Oregon College. Violators will receive a traffic citation or notice of the offense with which he is being charged, together with the scheduled fine for said violations in accordance with the penalties set forth in said paragraph 5.
b. After receipt of a traffic citation, the individual must, within 7 calendar days of the date on the traffic citation, either,
(1) pay the appropriate fine, or (2) file a request for a hearing before the Traffic Appeals Board.

c. Any person wishing to take his case before the TAB must prepare a "Petition for Appeal of Traffic Violation" for a hearing indicating why the citation should not be enforced. Petition forms are available at the Security and Safety Department. This petition must be refiled at the Security and Safety Department within seven (7) calendar days of the date of citation.

At this time, the appellant will have the right to request substitution of any one member of the TAB and select the replacement from that section's alternate group.

d. A student who fails to pay the College for any traffic citation received, or to request a hearing before the Traffic Appeals Board within 7 days of the date on the traffic citation will have the fine deducted from his general deposit.

e. The student's right to receive his registration packet and to enroll during the registration period will also be denied if any penalties owing under these regulations remain unpaid at the time of registration.

f. A faculty or staff member who fails to pay the College for any such traffic citation received, or to request a hearing before the Traffic Appeals Board within 7 days of the date on the traffic citation will, after written notice, have the fine deducted from his payroll check.

7. TRAFFIC APPEALS BOARD -- FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS

Statement of Purpose

The Traffic Appeals Board, hereinafter referred to as TAB, is established to provide an expedient method of handling appeals for citations issued by Southern Oregon College Security Officers. They provide only for matters concerning traffic and parking violations on the Southern Oregon College campus which fall under Southern Oregon College's jurisdiction.

a. The TAB will consist of two faculty members nominated by the Faculty Senate, one Civil Service staff member elected by the full time members of the Civil Service staff, and three students nominated by the Student Senate. All members are subject to confirmation by the President.

Each of the above groups - Faculty Senate, OSEA, and Student Senate - will provide a minimum of one, but no more than three, alternate members to the TAB. Alternate members can only be used in the absence of appointed members. It will be the responsibility of the absent member to notify
an alternate to fulfill his obligation.

b. Term of Office. Each member of the TAB will be appointed for a period of three years. Terms of office will be staggered.

c. The decision of the TAB may be appealed in writing through the Traffic Committee to the President. Forms for making such an appeal are available at the Security and Safety Department. This appeal must be filed with the Security and Safety Department within seven (7) calendar days following the decision of the TAB. The Security and Safety Department will also have an opportunity to submit a written statement concerning the issuance of the citation.

d. Citations resulting from violations other than parking may result in the passing of the case out of SOC jurisdiction into that of appropriate Civil authorities at the discretion of the Traffic Appeals Board. The TAB serves an arbitration function.

e. The party appealing the citation may have legal counsel to present his case to the TAB, but the appellant must be present or the set fine will be imposed.

f. For the purpose of rendering a judgement, four members or their alternates will constitute a quorum.

g. In considering appeals, the TAB shall have full authority to:

(1) Dismiss the violation.
(2) Find the individual not guilty of the charges in the citation.
(3) Find the individual guilty of the violation and either impose the fine stipulated in these Regulations, or impose a lesser fine.
(4) Enter a finding of guilty, and, without imposing any fine, issue a reprimand or warning, or impose a fine, but suspend its payment during a fixed probationary period.

8. AUTHORITY OF CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS

All members of the Security and Safety Department are designated as Security Officers and are vested with full authority as peace officers in accordance with laws of the State of Oregon (1). Notice of a violation of any of the provisions herein will be signed by a campus Security Officer. Security Officers will be appropriately designated and will carry identification and/or wear distinctive dress.

(1) ORS 352.360 and 133.170
a. The jurisdiction of Southern Oregon College Security Officers will be limited to the physical boundaries of the Southern Oregon College Campus for the purposes of assisting in the enforcement of the traffic, parking, and vehicular registration policies as established herein for Southern Oregon College.

b. Employment procedures for Southern Oregon College Security Officers will be administered by the Security Director.

c. Southern Oregon College Security Officers will be expected to attend conferences and educational programs for peace officers as the duties of their position require.

d. The normal performance of duties should be carried out without the bearing or use of firearms.
FEE SCHEDULE
June 2, 1972

FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENT COMMUTER - For first registered vehicle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall term through summer</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter term through summer</td>
<td>$16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring term through summer</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer term only</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS - For first registered vehicle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall term through summer</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter term through summer</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring term through summer</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer term only</td>
<td>$7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTORCYCLE AND SCOOTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall term through summer</td>
<td>$7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter term through summer</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring term through summer</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer term only</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECOND VEHICLE OR REPLACEMENT PERMIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESERVED PARKING (NON-REFUNDABLE)

$25.00 over and above price for regular parking permit

WEEKLY PARKING PERMITS

$1 per week
REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE USE OF MOTOR VEHICLES

AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MOTOR VEHICLES REGULATIONS

Authority to establish regulations governing the use of Motor Vehicles on the Oregon State University (OSU) Campus for visitors, faculty, staff, and students is derived from Oregon Statutes and action of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education pursuant to such statutes. The rules and regulations published herein have been approved by the Office of the Chancellor and are filed with the Secretary of State in accordance with the provisions of ORS 183.010 to 183.040. Strict enforcement of these regulations is necessary to maintain safety on campus streets, reduce congestion, improve security, and effectively utilize parking facilities.

APPLICATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE LAWS OF THE STATE OF OREGON AND CITY OF CORVALLIS

All motor vehicle laws and ordinances of the State of Oregon and City of Corvallis specifically including, but not limited to, ORS Chapters 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, and 486 together with adopted amendments are applicable to the campus of OSU to the same extent as if this campus and its streets are public highways. All provisions of the above motor vehicle laws are applicable and enforceable except as they conflict or are inconsistent with these regulations.

AUTHORITY OF CAMPUS SECURITY OFFICERS

All members of the campus security force are designated as peace officers and have full authority in accordance with the laws of the State of Oregon.
1. DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of these regulations:

a. The word "parked" means any vehicle which is stopped and/or waiting, regardless of the period of time the vehicle is stopped or whether a driver is present, except for vehicles immobilized by traffic control, congestion, or accident.

b. The word "motor vehicle" or "vehicle" means any type of motor-powered conveyance including, but not limited to, automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, and scooters.

c. The central campus is defined as that area legally reached via the Information Centers.

2. VEHICLE PERMITS

a. All faculty, staff, and students who have motor vehicles in their possession or control for use on the OSU campus and parking areas must display a current vehicle permit. Use of university streets, lanes, or parking areas without a properly displayed current OSU permit can result in a citation and a $10 fine. (Visitors are covered in paragraph 4-k.)

b. Faculty, staff, and students wishing to operate or park vehicles on campus at any time, except as provided in paragraphs 4-g and 6-g, must obtain appropriate permits.

c. Eligible persons who obtain permits must attach these permits only to the vehicle for which they are designated. The vehicle must be owned by or in the possession of the permit purchaser.

d. Purchased permits for automobiles must be permanently affixed to the left side of the front and rear bumpers. Permits for motorcycles and scooters must be affixed on the left side of the vehicle in a readily visible place. All expired permits must be removed or covered. If a vehicle is disposed of, permits must be removed.

e. Student permits normally shall be purchased during academic registration. Faculty, staff, and students unable to obtain permits during academic registration may obtain permits from the Office of the Traffic Committee, Room B 006, Administrative Services Building, phone 754-2583.
3. DRIVER RESPONSIBILITY
   a. All persons operating motor vehicles on campus are responsible for knowing and adhering to the regulations stated herein. The regulations are enforced at all times.
   b. The responsibility for locating a legal parking space rests with the operator of the motor vehicle. Lack of space is not a valid excuse for violating any OSU parking regulation.
   c. In the event of conflict between signs or markings and printed regulations, the signs or markings shall be followed.
   d. OSU is not responsible for any vehicle or its contents parked on OSU property or environs. Individuals assume all risk of accident and property loss, for injury to persons, and for property damage.
   e. The status of the vehicle driver limits the area where the vehicle may park during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays.
   f. The vehicle registrant is responsible for traffic violations on campus involving his (her) vehicle.

4. PERMITS AND PARKING AREAS
   a. STAFF PERMITS may be purchased by OSU academic personnel with the rank of research associate or higher; by 1.00 full time equivalent (FTE) instructors and research assistants, by OSU employees who have worked full time in the Oregon State System of Higher Education for a continuous period of four or more calendar years prior to the date of purchase, and by employees whose state and/or federal salary is equivalent to or exceeds $800 per month. (1) The fee for a Staff Permit is $30 per academic year. The permit will expire on September 30, 1973. (2) Emeritus and retired personnel may be issued a Staff Permit without charge upon application at the Traffic Committee Office. (3) Vehicles displaying Staff Permits may park in any university parking area from 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. of the following day provided posted signs are observed. (4) Students are not permitted to drive vehicles with Staff Permits within the central campus during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays, except as provided in paragraph 4-g.
b. LIMITED STAFF PERMITS may be purchased by any OSU faculty and employees including those qualified for a Staff Permit and by graduate students employed at least .6 FTE. (1) The fee for a Limited Staff Permit is $20 per academic year. The permit will expire on September 30, 1973. (2) Vehicles displaying Limited Staff Permits may park in all designated areas except those reserved for Staff Permits from 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. of the following day provided all posted signs are observed. (3) Staff areas may be utilized from 5:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. of the following day and from 6:00 a.m. Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays until 2:00 a.m. of the following day. (4) Students are not permitted to drive vehicles with Limited Staff Permits within the central campus during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays, except as provided in paragraph 4-g.

c. STUDENT PERMITS may be purchased by students who do not qualify for residence hall permits and who wish to bring vehicles to the campus. (1) The fee for a Student Permit is $18 per academic year. The permit will expire on September 30, 1973. (2) Vehicles displaying Student Permits may park in student areas and residence hall areas from 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. of the following day. (3) Staff and Limited Staff areas may be used from 5:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. of the following day on weekdays, and from 6:00 a.m. Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays until 2:00 a.m. of the following day. (4) Students are not permitted to drive vehicles with Student permits within the central campus during the hours 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays, except as provided in paragraph 4-g.

d. RESIDENCE HALL PERMITS may be purchased by students living in campus housing and who wish to bring vehicles on the campus. (1) The fee for a Residence Hall Permit is $18 per academic year. The permit will expire on September 30, 1973. (2) Vehicles displaying Residence Hall Permits may park in Residence Hall areas at any time and in student areas from 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. the following day. (3) Staff and Limited Staff areas may be utilized from 5:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. of the following day on weekdays and from 6:00 a.m. on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays until
2:00 a.m. of the following day. (4) Students are not permitted to drive vehicles with Residence Hall Permits within the central campus during the hours 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays, except as provided in paragraph 4-g.

e. MOTORCYCLE AND SCOOTER PERMITS may be purchased for a fee of $8 per academic year. The permit will expire on September 30, 1973. Motorcycles and scooters will be parked and driven on campus according to instructions in paragraph 10.

f. DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION PERMITS will be issued to students who are attending only DCE evening classes for a fee of $3 per term for campus parking areas entered via Information Centers between 5:00 p.m. and 2:00 a.m. of the following day. DCE students may apply for a DCE Permit for the school term by submitting a completed Motor Vehicle Registration Card and a $3 fee to the OSU cashier, Administrative Services Building.

g. SPECIAL PERMITS may be issued at the Office of the Campus Traffic Committee under the following circumstances: (1) Students, Staff, and Faculty who do not have a permit and who wish to bring a vehicle on the campus on a temporary basis up to one week in duration and have a valid reason therefore will be issued a temporary permit of the appropriate class for a fee of $1 per week. (2) Persons who have a permit normally invalid on the central campus and who have an unusual need for a vehicle on the central campus for a limited period may obtain a temporary permit for their vehicle. (3) Permanently disabled persons may be issued a special "C" permit upon application, after a permit has been purchased. (4) The purchase of a special parking permit is required of persons not directly associated with the University, but who make frequent business calls on campus and who desire to park a motor vehicle in any designated campus parking space. The fee for this special permit will be not less than the annual rate established for a Staff Permit, except that the permit may be purchased for a lesser period at fractional rates. (5) Staff and students
with permits who are required to be on campus between the hours of 2:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. may apply for a set of "N" (night parking) stickers at no added cost. (6) Special courtesy permits for vehicles which do not bear permits may be obtained by faculty or staff members for special events. No more than four such permits per month will be issued to any individual. (7) Employees who work on campus during the night time hours may apply for a special Limited Staff "N" Permit at one-half the usual Limited Staff Permit fee. These permits will only be valid on the campus between 6:00 p.m. and 7:30 a.m. (8) Conference or special meeting permits must be arranged for at least two weeks in advance by a responsible official through the campus traffic administrator.

h. SUMMER TERM PERMITS may be purchased by the following personnel for the fees indicated: (1) Student or Residence Hall- $4; (2) Limited Staff- $5; (3) Staff- $7; (4) Motorcycle and Scooters- $2. These permits expire on September 30, 1973.

i. SUBSTITUTE (Second) VEHICLE PERMITS may be purchased for a fee of $2, provided proof of vehicle ownership is presented to the Office of the Traffic Committee. Only one set of substitute permits will be issued for each original permit. Purchasers of substitute permits may have only one vehicle on campus at a time, except when the second vehicle parks in the coin-operated fee lot. Abuse of the substitute permit may result in revocation of permit privileges for the remainder of the academic year.

j. REPLACEMENT VEHICLE PERMITS may be purchased for a fee of $2. Replacement permits may be obtained for original or substitute permits that have been destroyed, or if the vehicle has been sold. Evidence of the old permit must be presented, or a signed certificate of permit destruction submitted to the Office of the Traffic Committee.

k. VISITORS VEHICLES are required to display Courtesy Parking Permits, obtained at the campus Information Centers. Visiting vehicles may park, provided all posted signs are observed, in the designated visitor parking areas from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and thereafter in any parking areas until 2:00 a.m. If Information Centers are not open,
visitors may park on campus without a Courtesy Parking Permit. (Also see parking privileges that are specified in paragraph 6-g.) Visitors staying overnight in a residence hall may obtain parking instructions from the residence hall desk clerk, or from Campus Security by dialing 754-1473.

1. COIN-OPERATED FEE PARKING is provided for visitors' vehicles, and for faculty and staff displaying Staff or Limited Staff Permits, in the parking lot located across from the OSU Book Store. The parking fee is $.25 per entry from 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays. During other times the gate will be raised and parking in this lot will be available to all vehicles displaying visitors or any current OSU permit.

5. REFUNDS

a. Students or staff members who leave the university, dispose of their vehicle without replacing the permit, or are dissatisfied with the permit are entitled to refunds which will be made only for whole terms (Fall, Winter, Spring). Upon return of the permit or fragments thereof showing the registration numbers, refund will be made. Refunds for a term will not be made if the permit is returned after the published date for late school registration for that term. Refunds will not be made if a vehicle has been cited more than five times during the academic year for traffic or parking violations.

6. DRIVING AND PARKING REGULATIONS ON CAMPUS

a. Anyone operating a vehicle on campus shall observe speed limits, barricades, bicycle lanes, crosswalks, stop signs, and all other traffic signs and regulations, and shall drive in a safe and prudent manner. The speed limit on campus is 15 m.p.h. except where otherwise posted. Driving or parking vehicles on sidewalks, lawns, lanes, and other areas not designated for driving or parking is prohibited.
b. Campus traffic boundaries and parking areas are indicated on the accompanying campus traffic map.

c. Only vehicles with Staff or Limited Staff Permits and visitors' vehicles will be authorized entrance at Information Centers during the hours 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays, except as provided in paragraph 4-g.

d. Students are not permitted to drive vehicles with Staff or Limited Staff Permits within the central campus during the hours 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays, except as provided in paragraph 4-g.

e. Vehicles shall park headed into the curb, or parallel, within indicated boundaries and only in areas designated for parking.

f. Vehicles shall not park in loading zones at any time for any purpose other than loading and unloading, and for such purpose maximum time is 10 minutes.

g. Vehicles without permits may park in certain university-owned lots and areas during certain hours as follows: (1) Parking from 5:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. of the following day on weekdays, and from 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. the following day on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays is permitted in those peripheral parking areas on campus that can be entered without driving via the Information Centers or against a "DO NOT ENTER" or "ONE WAY" traffic sign.

h. Vehicles other than those displaying Residence Hall Permits and those with "N" permits (par. 4-g) are prohibited from parking on campus from 2:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. daily. Vehicles with Residence Hall Permits must park during those hours in the residence hall areas designated on the map in this publication.

i. All vehicles parked on university property are required to observe posted traffic and parking signs.
j. Vehicles which have broken down on university property and which cannot be removed immediately by the owner or registrant must be reported at once to the campus security office. Mechanical repairs to disabled private vehicles on university property, except for instructional purposes in a proper laboratory, are prohibited.

k. Abandoned vehicles left on university property more than 72 hours will be removed at the owner's expense. Unlicensed vehicles or vehicles without a valid OSU permit parked on university lots will be considered to be abandoned and subject to removal.

7. TRAFFIC COMMITTEE AND TRAFFIC COURTS
   a. The Traffic Committee is responsible to the University President for the administration and modification of traffic regulations. Requests for hearings and suggestions for enforcement, modification, or amplification of traffic regulations should be sent to the Traffic Committee.
   b. Any appropriate matter presented to the Traffic Committee will be considered by the committee or referred to the proper Traffic Court to determine what action, if any, is required. Such action will normally be in the form of a recommendation to the President's Office, through the Dean of Administration, Dean of Students, or Dean of Faculty.
   c. Hearings on student violations (except DCE) will be considered by the Student Traffic Court; hearings on violations by others will be considered by the Staff Traffic Court.

8. PENALTIES FOR OFFENSES
   a. Failure to display a permit on vehicle parked within campus boundaries in violation of these regulations: Fine to $10.
   b. Falsification of information, or altering, defacing, or transferring a permit to another motor vehicle for which a permit was not issued: Fine to $10 and/or revocation of the permit.
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9. ENFORCEMENT AND APPEALS

a. All penalties prescribed in paragraph 8, other than violations referred to appropriate courts of law as provided in paragraph 8-e, will be administratively enforced by OSU. For all administratively enforced violations, a traffic citation or notice of offense, together with the scheduled fine, will be given the violator or attached to the violator's vehicle.

b. Fines for cited violations shall be paid to the university at the OSU cashier's office, on or before the date indicated on the citation.

c. A person charged with a violation may, at his option, have the matter presented to and heard before the Staff Traffic Court or Student Traffic Court, whichever is appropriate. For visitors the Staff Traffic Court is the appropriate body. In such cases, the appropriate court shall render judgment and its findings shall be conclusive subject to appeal to the Office of the University President. A person desiring a hearing before the Staff or Student Traffic Court should appear at the Office of the Traffic Committee within the time specified on the citation.
Alternatively, if the person cannot be physically present, he may write to the Traffic Committee Office and request instructions for a hearing. Upon payment to the OSU cashier of bail in the amount on the citation and the preparation of a request for hearing indicating why the fine should not be imposed, the case will be scheduled for review.

d. A student who fails to post bail for a violation on or before the date specified in the citation will, after written notice, have the amount deducted from his general deposit and forfeits right of appeal.

e. The student's registration packet and enrollment during the registration period will also be withheld if any penalties under these regulations remain unpaid at the time of registration.

f. A faculty or staff member who fails to post bail for any citation on or before the date specified in the citation will, after written notice, have the amount deducted from his payroll check and forfeits right of appeal.

10. MOTORCYCLE AND SCOOTER OPERATION

a. Parking areas for motorcycles and scooters are specifically allocated and marked as follows: SW Corner of Campus Way and 15th Street; NW gate of Bell Field on 26th Street; Limited Staff lot North of Infirmary; South of Callahan Hall on Adams Street; SW Corner of Sackett parking lot; NE Corner of Snell lot. Additional areas may be designated from time to time.

b. Motorcycles and scooters with permits may also park in any student parking area providing they do not occupy an automobile parking space or hinder the maneuverability of parked automobiles.

c. Motorcycles and scooters are prohibited from parking in any yellow painted areas, crosswalks, loading zones, time limit zones, bicycle parking areas, or in the interior of campus buildings, and are not permitted on sidewalks, lanes, paths, or other pedestrian areas.

d. Motorcycles and scooters are prohibited from the central campus during the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays.

NOTE: 9-c

Upon payment to the OSU cashier of bail in the amount on the citation and the preparation of a request for hearing indicating why the fine should not be imposed,
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ARTICLE I  
Authority to Establish Regulations

Authority to establish regulations governing the use of motor vehicles on the University of Oregon campus for visitors, faculty and staff, and students is derived from Oregon Revised Statutes 352.360 and 352.990, as amended, and by actions of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education pursuant to such statutes. The rules and regulations have been approved by the Office of the State Board of Higher Education and were subsequently filed with the Secretary of State in accordance with the provisions of Oregon Revised Statutes Chapter 183. Strict enforcement of regulations governing the use of motor vehicles on campus is imperative in order to remove as much congestion as possible, to keep a margin of safety and to utilize the existing parking facilities at maximum.

All motor vehicle laws of the State of Oregon including specifically, but not by way of limitation, Chapters 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, and 486 together with amendments hereafter adopted, are applicable to the campus of the University of Oregon to the same extent as if this campus and its streets were public highways, and all provisions of said motor vehicle laws are applicable and enforceable except insofar as they are incompatible with these regulations.

It is your responsibility to know what the parking regulations are on the University of Oregon campus.

ARTICLE II  
General Parking Regulations

1. In the event that any vehicle to which a permit is affixed is temporarily incapacitated or otherwise cannot be used by the registrant, a temporary permit may be obtained only from the Office of Campus Security, which will restore his parking privileges. For this purpose, the office located at Alpha-Straub will be open from 8:00 A.M. until 5:00 P.M., Monday through Friday. Temporary parking is available for persons while obtaining such permits.

2. Faculty/Staff and Students registering second automobiles should not park both vehicles on campus at the same time. A $5.00 penalty will be assessed for each violation.

3. Parking permits are not transferrable between vehicles or between individuals. Parking permits must be displayed only on vehicle for which assigned.

4. All members of the University community will be held responsible for reading and knowing these regulations and for all University parking violations involving such vehicles, regardless of who is operating the vehicle. These regulations should be made known to any person who is operating the vehicle on the University of Oregon campus.
5. Permits shall be mounted on the left hand side of the rear bumper so as to be readily visible. Instructions on how to install the permit are printed on the reverse side of the permit. In the case of motorcycles, insofar as practicable, permits should be mounted on the left rear of the vehicle so as to be readily visible. Permits may not be affixed by tape or any other temporary method.

6. A person eligible to obtain a parking permit may attach such a permit only to a vehicle owned or in his possession.

7. The responsibility for locating a legal parking space rests with the operator of the motor vehicle. Lack of space will not be considered a valid reason for violating any University Parking regulations. Parking lot restrictions are in effect from 7:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. (Monday through Friday). At other times lots are open on a first come, first serve basis except for those spaces reserved or lots with special restrictions. The status of all lots and spaces, plus any special restrictions, is indicated by signs located by spaces or at the entrance to parking areas.

8. For the purpose of these regulations, the word "parked" is defined to mean any vehicle which is stopped on the University of Oregon campus whether or not a driver is in attendance and irrespective of the period of time such vehicle is stopped.

9. No vehicle shall be parked on the campus except in those areas set aside and designated as parking or on city streets within the campus boundaries at curb side.

10. No parking is allowed at any time in yellow zones or areas, fire lanes, driveways, sidewalks, service vehicle spaces, loading dock or areas, or on landscaped areas.

11. All individuals will observe posted speed limits, posted and reserved areas and spaces. The operation of a motor vehicle on University property in excess of 15 miles per hour unless otherwise posted will be considered evidence of irresponsible or careless driving. Within the campus boundaries and at crosswalks, the pedestrian is considered to have the right-of-way.

12. Head-in parking is required in all angle or right angle spaces on all lots. All vehicles parked on University streets, where permits are required will be parked in such manner that the right side of the vehicle will be on the curbed side.

13. Persons who's motor vehicles have broken down on University property must notify immediately the Office of Campus Security during working hours, or the Campus Operator at other times. Mechanical repairs to vehicles on University property are prohibited. Abandoned or junked motor vehicles remaining on University property more than 72 hours will be removed at the owner's expense. Unlicensed vehicles parked on University lots will be considered as abandoned and subject to tow.
14. The University of Oregon cannot assume responsibility for any motor vehicle or its contents parked on University property or its environs. Individuals assume all risk of accident and expressly agree that the University shall not be liable for any reason for injury to persons, for loss, or for property damage.

ARTICLE III
Motor Scooters and Motorcycles

1. Motor scooters and motorcycles are, by State law, motor vehicles and are subject to all traffic rules and regulations controlling motor vehicles. Operation on sidewalks, paths, or in pedestrian areas is not permitted.

2. Individuals who use University owned motor scooter or motorcycle parking spaces must purchase the appropriate permit.

3. Appropriate location for displaying a parking permit will be on the left rear of the vehicle so as to be readily visible.

4. Motor scooters and motorcycles must park in only those spaces designated for their use and may not park in any automobile spaces.

5. Motor scooters and motorcycles may not park in or on courts at dormitories or along side of buildings. Fire regulations prohibit the parking or storage of any internal combustion engined vehicle, including motor scooters and motorcycles, inside any University owned building.

ARTICLE IV
Enforcement

1. Campus parking regulations are in effect 24 hours a day, seven (7) days a week, and are enforced by University Peace Officers and City Police Officers. Tickets issued by the University are payable at the University of Oregon Business Office within 10 days of the ticket date.

2. In lieu of payment to the Business Office, there is the following alternative: Faculty, staff, visitors, and students, may petition within 10 days of the ticket date to the University Petitions Officer. In the case of a denied petition, an additional 10 days will be allowed before final action is taken. Those petitioners denied may appeal the decisions within five days to the University Traffic Appeals Board.

ARTICLE V
Penalties for Offenses

Monetary penalties, as specified below may be deducted from student deposits, and faculty or staff salaries or other funds in the possession of the institution as provided by Oregon Revised Statutes 352.360 (2) as amended.

In cases involving repeat violations or where warranted by the immediate circumstances, vehicles may be booted, towed and impounded at the discretion of the officer, and thus subject to towing and storage fees in addition to penalties.
SCHEDULE OF MAXIMUM PENALTIES

1. Failure to display parking permit $ 4.00
2. Speeding on University property 10.00
3. Improper driving on University property (on or off driveways) 10.00
4. Parking by a fire hydrant or in posted fire lane 10.00
5. Blocking driveways, entrances or alleys 5.00
6. Counterfeiting, altering, defacing or transferring a parking permit to another vehicle for which the parking permit was not issued, or giving false information in an application or hearing or misuse of any permit 10.00
7. Parking in a posted or reserved space 10.00
8. Parking on lawns, sidewalks, campus landscaped area, or any area outside clearly delineated parking spaces where such parking causes actual or potential damage to natural or landscaped features 10.00
9. Improper parking, including parking in a manner as to take the space of two (2) automobiles, overtime in a limited loading zone, service drives or entrances, restricted areas or failure to place the permit properly in accordance with the regulations 2.00
10. Faculty/Staff and Students parking two (2) cars on campus simultaneously, or not having the permit visible 5.00
11. Booted .......... Payment of all outstanding traffic penalties

LOADING ZONES

Persons having heavy or bulky packages or materials to load or unload may use 10-minute loading zones located throughout the campus. No permits are required to use loading zones or meters.
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How to Obtain Parking Permits

1. All Persons--Faculty, staff, students, full or part time, visitors or commercial representatives, who park in University-owned parking lots must obtain and display a permanent or temporary parking permit. Vehicles cited for failure to display such permits are subject to a $4.00 penalty assessed by the University. The University parking lots are continuously patrolled, day and night; all lots with the exception of the Kincaid Street, PLC (lot 16) are open for non-permit parking from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Monday through Friday, and all day Saturday and Sunday. Reserved spaces are enforced 24 hours a day unless otherwise posted. Parking permits are obtained as follows:

a. Students

1) At the beginning of each term, during academic registration and prior to payment of fees, parking permits may be purchased when the student registers and pays his fees.

2) At other times, students should apply to the Office of Campus Security, located at Alpha-Straub. Office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (Monday through Friday).

b. Faculty/Staff--Register through their departmental secretary or representative.

c. Visitors--There is no charge for temporary parking permits.

1) One day permits may be obtained from the department being visited, from the information desk in Johnson Hall, from the University of Oregon Cashier located in the Business Office in Emerald Hall, or in the Office of Campus Security, located at Alpha-Straub. Metered and street parking in the above areas may be used while a permit is being obtained, thus preventing the possibility of inappropriate citation. A one day permit may be obtained in advance of the visit, provided a definite date is specified.

2) Under special circumstances, a visitor may be issued a temporary parking permit good for more than one day. Such permits are obtainable only from the Office of Campus Security, located at Alpha-Straub.

3) Due to the heavy demand for parking on the University owned lots, visitors are urged to utilize street and metered parking, which is conveniently located with respect to almost all University facilities.
4) Temporary parking permits allow visitors to park only in unrestricted spaces on University owned lots. Such permits do not authorize visitors to park in reserved or otherwise specifically designated spaces, loading and unloading zones, fire lanes, landscaped areas, etc.

d. Commercial and business representatives with regular business on the campus may purchase a permit entitling them to park in designated areas appropriate to their business. Application for such permits should be made at the Office of Campus Security located in Alpha-Straub.

e. No permit may be issued without applicant furnishing the correct license number.

Fees, Eligibility and Parking Privileges

1. Faculty/Staff (A)
The fee for the school year (12 months) is $30.00; $11.25 for the second automobile registered; and $7.00 for any portion of the summer session only. Second automobile is $2.00 for any portion of the summer session only. Faculty/Staff parking privileges are available only to faculty with a minimum rank of instructor, to teaching assistants only if certified by department as having complete responsibility for teaching one or more classes, and to 40 hour per week employees. Deans of colleges and department heads must certify that graduate students extended parking privileges are assigned responsibility for the conduct of regularly scheduled classes. Faculty/Staff automobile data cards must be signed by an authorized departmental representative before permits may be issued. Faculty/Staff permits authorize parking on any University lot, street or area designated faculty, staff or student as available. The purchase of this permit does not guarantee a parking space. (See Paragraph 8 for reduced fee lot.)

2. Student (S)
The fee for the school year (12 months) is $15.00; $11.25 for a second automobile registered; $6.00 for any portion of the summer session only; $2.00 for second automobile for any portion of the summer session only. This permit authorizes parking on any University owned parking lot marked Student as available. The purchase of this permit does not guarantee a parking space. (See Paragraph 8 for reduced fee lot.)

3. Motorcycles (M)
The fee for the school year (12 months) is $7.50 for faculty, staff and students and $3.00 for any portion of summer session only. This permit authorizes parking in designated motorcycle parking areas. The purchase of this permit does not guarantee a parking space.

4. Reserved Parking Space (assigned only on the basis of need for official University business)
The fee for the school year is as listed in the schedule on Page 3 for each reserved space requested, approved and assigned. The purchase of this permit guarantees a space.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Reserved space fee</th>
<th>Parking Permit fee</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall (12 months)</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter (9 months)</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring (6 months)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer (3 months)</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reserve parking space requests must have the endorsement of the department head and must be approved by the University Petitions Officer, 461 Omega-Straub.

NOTE: If a current parking permit has been purchased prior to the application for a reserved parking space, only the reserved parking space fee applies.

5. Spaces Assigned to Disabled Individuals
   Physically handicapped persons may apply for reserved parking spaces to the Office of Campus Security and must provide medical verification of the disability, including the length of time the space will be required. Assignment guarantees a parking space. Reserved disabled parking spaces are available to the physically handicapped at no additional cost beyond the cost of the appropriate permit.

6. Commercial Representatives (C)
   The following fee for the school year will be charged for each parking permit requested and issued: $15.00 for 12 months. Sale of this permit is restricted to off-campus, commercial and business representatives only.

7. Construction Employees-Reserved
   Reserved space fee will apply for each space used or as specified by construction contract.

8. Lots 34F (Special—Reduced Fee)
   Lot 34F—The lot is bordered on the south by 17th Street, on the west by Columbia Street, on the north by lot 34E, and on the east by the housing warehouse. Entrance is from 17th Street at Columbia.
   a. Faculty/Staff (A)—34F
      The fee for the school year (12 months) is $15.00; $10.00 for the second automobile registered; and $7.50 for any portion of the summer session, $2.00 for a second car for the summer only.
   b. Student (S)—34F
      The fee for the school year (12 months) is $7.50; $5.00 for the second automobile registered; and $3.00 for any portion of the summer session, $2.00 for the second car for the summer only.
Refunds and Replacements of Parking Permits

1. At the beginning of the academic year, all permits are issued on a 12 month basis. Permit fees are proportionately refundable up to the end of winter quarter upon official withdrawal, graduation, resignation of employment, or in the event of loss of eligibility. Proportioned refunds will not be made for a period of less than one quarter. Registrants should scrape off or otherwise remove permits and bring them to the Office of Campus Security in the event that a refund is requested. Refunds will be allowed as follows: Refund requested prior to or at the end of...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>Winter Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff (A)</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (S)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles (M)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Representatives</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Any individual who has purchased a parking permit and who is dissatisfied with it will receive a full refund upon written request and physical evidence of the permit to the Office of Campus Security, located at Alpha-Straub, for refund within ten days of the purchase date.

3. Registrants making a request for replacement parking permits for newly acquired vehicles or to replace damaged permits, should scrape off or otherwise remove permits and bring them to the Office of Campus Security. Replacement will not be made if registrant is unable to produce evidence of the old permit. Registrant is responsible for all tickets unless the permit or pieces of the permit have been turned in to the Office of Campus Security. A fee of $1.50 is charged for replacement permits.

University Traffic Court

Establishment of Faculty, Staff, Student and Visitor Traffic Court:

1. Pursuant to the provisions of ORS 352.360 a Faculty, Staff, Student and Visitor Traffic Court governing the use of motor vehicles is hereby established. This court will be conducted by a Petitions Officer appointed by the President. Rules of procedure and other matters relating to the administration and functioning of the court shall be developed by the Vice President for Administration.

2. The Traffic Court shall be the agency to hear all petitions involving traffic citations (other than those enforced as state traffic violations in appropriate Courts of Law) and all other matters referred to the Faculty, Staff, Student and Visitor Traffic Court in accordance with said
regulations. Specifically, the jurisdiction of this court shall relate to petition by members of the faculty, members of the staff, and students, including those students enrolled in the classes of the Division of Continuing Education. The Petitions Traffic Court will also hear petitions by all other parties, as, for example, wives and families of staff and faculty who do not fall within the category of students and members of the public who visit or bring cars upon the University campus.

3. Other matters presented to the Traffic Court as provided in the University of Oregon Regulations governing the use of motor vehicles shall be considered by the Traffic Court and recommendations in relation thereto shall also be presented to the University authorities. Such actions, however, shall be recommendatory only.

4. All actions by the Traffic Court on petitions from citations, including findings of guilty or not guilty, and the imposition of penalties, shall be final, except that the President of the University, acting through the appropriate University executive, may review any case he considers appropriate within 60 days after the rendering of the Traffic Court's decision and may set aside or modify the findings of the Court. Any such order of modification or setting aside a finding shall be done only after the matter has been reviewed with the Traffic Court.

5. Nothing herein contained in any way limits the authority of the University Administration to take disciplinary action (as opposed to the imposition of a penalty, as provided in Paragraph 4) against any individual as a result of a traffic violation or the infraction of any traffic regulation of the University.

6. In considering petitions by individuals for traffic violations, the Traffic Court has the authority to investigate the circumstances involved in each petition and to call upon the members of the Office of Campus Security, and of the Office of the Cashier, during the course of its investigation and hearing.

Traffic Petitions Officer and Traffic Appeals Board

1. Traffic Petitions Officer
   a. All petitions shall be presented in writing at the Office of Campus Security, Alpha-Straub Hall.
   b. The Petitions Officer will be available at designated times to meet with petitioners should they desire to present their case in person. Appointments may be scheduled at the Office of Campus Security at the time the petition is filed.
   c. In reaching a disposition, the Petitions Officer shall consider all factors that the petitioner wishes to present.
d. In considering petitions of University Traffic Citations, the Traffic Petitions Officer will have the authority to:

1) Dismiss the violation.

2) Find the individual not guilty of charges in the traffic citation.

3) Find the individual guilty of the violation, or of some lesser violation, and impose a penalty as the Petitions Officer shall consider appropriate.

4) Enter a finding of guilty, and without imposing any penalty, issue a reprimand or warning or impose a penalty but suspend its payment.

5) Make recommendations to appropriate University officials as to the restriction or suspension of driving privileges, withdrawal of registration or parking privileges, dismissal, or other disciplinary action.

6) Seek the advice of the University Traffic Appeals Board.

e. Should a petition be denied by the Petitions Officer, an appeal may be made in writing (within five days) to the University Traffic Appeals Court. The appeal must show that the decision of the Petitions Officer was unreasonable or arbitrary or was not supported by substantial evidence.

f. In the case of repeated offenders, the Petitions Officer on reaching a finding of guilty shall consider the traffic penalty record for the present academic year prior to imposing any penalty.

g. Quarterly summary reports of all actions by the Petitions Officer shall be filed with the Parking Committee.

2. University Traffic Appeals Board

a. The University Traffic Appeals Board shall consist of two faculty members, two classified staff members and two students. A quorum shall be three members of the Board. The chairman shall be selected at the first board meeting each term. A majority vote of the members present is needed to overrule the decision of the Petitions Officer. In cases where the decision is not to affirm the Petitions Officer's decisions, the University Traffic Appeals Board may:

1) Dismiss the violation.

2) Find the individual not guilty of charges in the traffic citation.

3) Find the individual guilty of the violation, or of some lesser violation, and impose a penalty as the Court shall consider appropriate.
4) Enter a finding of guilty, and without imposing any penalty, issue a reprimand or warning or impose a penalty but suspend its payment.

5) Make recommendations to appropriate University officials as to the restriction or suspension of driving privileges, withdrawal of registration or parking privileges, dismissal, or other disciplinary action.

6) Refer the case back to the Petitions Officer for further consideration consistent with its direction.

b. The Petitions Officer will provide quarterly summary reports to the Parking Committee of all Board actions.

3. The Petitions Officer will report any recommendations for changes in Parking Regulations prior to May 1, of each year.
RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE POLICING, CONTROL AND REGULATION OF
TRAFFIC AND PARKING OF VEHICLES IN THE PARKING STRUCTURE AND PARKING
LOTS AT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Year 1972-73

Section 1. Declaration of Purpose

In order to facilitate the operation of parking structures at Portland State University, hereinafter referred to as Parking Structure, and Parking Lots, the following rules and regulations are hereby established and enforceable under authority provided by Chapter 569, Oregon Laws 1959, (ORS 183.010-040), (ORS 352.360) and (ORS 352.990).

All motor vehicle laws of the State of Oregon including specifically but not by way of limitations, ORS Chapters 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, and 486, together with amendments hereafter adopted, are applicable to the campus of Portland State University to the same extent as if this campus and its streets were public highways, and all provisions of said motor vehicle laws are applicable and enforceable except insofar as they are incompatible and inconsistent with these regulations.

Portland State University, through the President and other administrative officers designated by him, is hereby authorized to place these rules and regulations into effect and to provide for the enforcement thereof through the appointment of peace officers or through arrangement with the Police Department of the City of Portland as provided in Chapter 569, Oregon Laws 1959.

Section 2. Use Restrictions

The Parking Structure and Parking Lots are for the use of faculty, staff, students and guests of the State System of Higher Education; parking by other persons is (not permitted) subject to availability of parking spaces.
and the policies as established by the Administration of Portland State University. All persons - faculty, staff, students, visitors and commercial representatives - who park in University owned permit parking lots and structures must obtain and display a permanent or temporary parking permit or service permit. Vehicles cited for failure to display such permits are subject to penalty as assessed by the University.

Section 3. Fees and Permits

A. Permits: Depending on the type of permit purchased, permits (placed in the left rear window of the vehicle) displayed in a manner as prescribed by the University authorize vehicles to use designated parking areas. Permits are not transferable except as provided in Section 4. The following types of permits are available at the Business Office to faculty, staff, students, and guests of the State System of Higher Education:

1. Day and Evening Permits allow the vehicle to be parked at any time during the day or evening in any space (not reserved or metered) designated as a permit parking area, excepting spaces marked as reserved or otherwise restricted.

2. Day and Evening Reserved Permits allow the vehicle to be parked any time during the day or evening in designated reserve areas.

3. Car Pool Permits allow only one vehicle of the pool in the (college) university permit parking facilities at one time. Vehicles may be parked at any time in any space designated as a permit parking area, excepting spaces marked as reserved or otherwise restricted.

4. Evening Permits allow a vehicle to be parked from 2:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. in any space (not reserved or metered) designated as a permit parking area, excepting spaces marked as reserved or otherwise restricted.
5. Tuesday/Thursday Permits allow the vehicle to be parked any time during the day or evening Tuesday and Thursday in any space (not reserved or metered) designated as a permit parking area, excepting spaces marked as reserved or otherwise restricted.

6. Motorcycle Permits allow motorcycles and power scooters to be parked at anytime but only in areas designated as "Cycle Parking."

7. Alumni Permits allow a vehicle to be parked from 2:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. in any space designated as a permit parking area, excepting spaces marked as reserved or otherwise restricted.

8. Metered Parking is available (in the parking structure) for guests of the University in designated metered areas. No permit is required in these areas.

9. Temporary Permits may be issued in emergencies and special situations in lieu of regular or reserved permits.

10. Special Event Parking Permits may be sold to (persons) visitors attending on-campus events such as athletic, cultural, educational or social contests, concerts, meetings and workshops.

11. Park and Pay Lots are available at established rates as posted. No permit is required in these lots.

12. Special Use Permits are for use by departments or organizations who wish to reserve the use of a parking lot or section of the parking structure for special use. Special Use Permits are available only when space is not needed to accommodate permit users and with expressed permission of the Vice President for Business and Finance or his designee.

B. Fees: The fees to be collected for parking permits described in Section 3 are as follows:

1. Day and Evening. $30.00 per term or $10.00 per month by payroll deduction from faculty and staff.
2. Day and Evening Reserved. $36.00 per term or $12.00 per month by payroll deduction from faculty and staff. Reserve permits are $30.00 per term and $10.00 per month by payroll deduction from disabled faculty and staff.

3. Car Pool. $36.00 per term or $12.00 per month by payroll deduction from faculty and staff.

4. Evening Permits. $2.50 per term.

5. Tuesday/Thursday Permits. $7.50 per term.

6. Motorcycle Permits. $6.00 per term.

7. Alumni Permits. $6.00 per year.

8. Metered Parking. 20¢ per hour or 5¢ for 10 minutes in the Box Office metered spaces.

9. Temporary Permits. 50¢ per day from 7:00 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. 25¢ per day from 5:30 p.m. until 7:00 a.m.

10. Special Event Permits. 50¢ per day 7:00 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. 25¢ per day from 5:30 p.m. until 7:00 a.m.

11. Park and Pay. 50¢ per day from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. 25¢ from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

12. Special Use Permits. $25.00 per event per day plus any necessary charges assessed for cleaning, repairs or maintenance.

(Motorcycles, scooters and bicycles may be parked in designated areas within the structure without payment of the parking fee.)

Fees for temporary, special event, and special use permits may be waived by the Vice President for Business and Finance or his designee. Bicycles may be parked without charge in areas where bicycle racks have been placed.
Section 4. **Replacement Permits**

A replacement permit may be obtained for a substitute vehicle when the original vehicle is sold or when the permit is lost or stolen. A charge of $2.00 per permit will be made for the replacement permit.

Section 5. **Parking Regulations**

No driver of a vehicle shall stop or park such vehicle at a time or in a place not authorized by a permit duly issued under these regulations, or in any manner exceed the authorization to park granted by such permit.

A. **Automobile Parking**: Automobiles are to be parked headed into the designated stalls.

B. **Other Vehicle Parking**: Motorcycles, scooters, and bicycles are restricted to those areas (not) designated for (automobile parking) cycles or bicycles.

Section 6. **Vehicular Traffic Within the Structure**

A. **Speed Limit**: The speed limit within the Parking Structure shall be 10 miles per hour. In the street areas the speed limit is 15 miles per hour. The Basic Rule of Oregon applies to use of all vehicles in any University facility.

B. **Traffic Within the Parking Structure**

Traffic within the Parking Structure or lots is limited to movement from an entrance to a parking space and from a parking space to an exit. (the entrance and exit to or from the parking space in the direction indicated). All vehicles will follow the indicated direction of traffic flow.
Section 7. **Impounding of Vehicles**

A. **Impounding of Vehicles:** Vehicles found to be in violation of parking and/or fee payment regulations may, in addition to other penalties provided herein, be impounded in place or towed away.

B. **Release of Vehicle:** Release of vehicle will be made upon payment of fine as set forth in Section 8 below, or by satisfactory arrangement for payment with the Business Office of Portland State University.

C. **Notice to Owner:** If within three days after a vehicle shall have been impounded, no one appears to claim and establish ownership, or right to possession thereof, Portland State University shall search the motor vehicle registration records and the vehicle for the name and address of the person entitled to possession of such vehicle and send notice to such person by mail if the name and address have been found. Such notice shall show the whereabouts of the vehicle and the amount of charges against the same and ask if he wishes to call for the possession and pay the accrued and accruing charges.

Section 8. **Pedestrian Traffic**

A. **Right of Way:** Pedestrian traffic shall have right of way over vehicular traffic any place in the Parking Structure, Parking Lots or in any of the University controlled street areas.

B. **Loitering:** Loitering in the Parking Structure or any of the University controlled parking lots or street areas is prohibited.

Section 9. **Violation and Penalties:** Fines are payable at the Business Office.

A. **Fines:** Fines for violation of regulations set forth in Sections 1 through 9 above are as follows:
Overtime Parking  $2.00
No Permit  2.00
Backing into Space  2.00
Straddling (Designated) Parking Space(s) lines  2.00
 Restricted or Reserved Area  2.00
Blocking Traffic  2.00
(Parking in wrong area)  (2.00)
Meter/Coin Box Violation  2.00
Impoundment  5.00

B. Enforcement of Penalties: All disputed violations will be reviewed by the (Director of) Vice President for Business (Affairs) and Finance or his designee.

C. Nonpayment of Fines:
1. A student who fails to tender payment to the University for any traffic violation received, or fails to request a hearing with the (Director of) Vice President for Business (Affairs) and Finance or his designee on or before the date specified in the traffic citation will, after written notice have the fine deducted from his general deposit.
2. Students without a general deposit or whose general deposit has been exhausted may have their transcripts withheld or may have their registrations cancelled or may be denied graduation if any fines or fees under these regulations are owing and unpaid. (The student's right to receive his registration packet and to enroll during the registration period may be denied if any penalties owing under the regulations remain unpaid at the time of registration, or a transcript may be withheld.)
3. A faculty or staff member who fails to tender payment to the University for any traffic citation received, or fails to request a hearing with the (Director of) Vice President for Business (Affairs) and Finance or his designee on or before the date specified in the traffic citation will, after written notice, have the fine deducted from his paycheck.

D. (An excessive number of citations), Six or more violations resulting in citations in a (school) fiscal year, may be cause for (result in) forfeiture of a parking permit (by the Director of Business Affairs or his designee). Failure to forfeit a parking permit or to comply with instructions against driving a vehicle within the boundaries of the University campus (can) may result in the violator's vehicle being impounded.

Section 10. Abandoned Vehicles

Abandoned or junked motor vehicles remaining on University property more than 72 hours will be removed at the owner's expense. Unlicensed vehicles parked on University property will be considered as abandoned and subject to removal.
RULES AND REGULATIONS COVERING TRAFFIC AND PARKING ON CAMPUS OF UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL AND DENTAL SCHOOL

Year 1972-73

Section 1. Declaration of Purpose

In order to relieve the critical parking situation on the campus of the University of Oregon Medical School and University of Oregon Dental School (hereinafter referred to as the campus), and to control and regulate vehicular traffic on the campus, the following rules and regulations are hereby established under authority provided by ORS 352.360 and 352.990.

The University of Oregon Medical School, through the Dean and other administrative officers designated by him, is hereby authorized to place these rules and regulations into effect and to provide for the enforcement thereof through the appointment of peace officers as provided in ORS 352.360.

Section 2. Parking Upon Campus

No motor vehicle shall be parked upon the campus except in those areas designated upon the map which is on file in the Board's Office, and by reference incorporated herein; provided, however, that the manner and extent of parking shall be only in accordance with the provisions of this statement of rules and regulations.

Section 3. Designation of Parking Space for Use of Employees and Students of the Medical School and Dental School

Specific parking areas on the campus may be designated for the use of employees and students and appropriate signs shall be installed clearly indicating the restricted use of such areas and the exact time during which parking in these areas is thus restricted. Only those individuals with specific authorization in the form of a card or decal may park in these areas. Such individuals may be assessed a charge of not more than $9.00 per month for this privilege.

Section 4. Designation of Parking Space for Use of Patients and Other Visitors to Campus

Specific parking areas may be designated for the use of patients and other visitors to the campus. Meters or coin-operated automatic parking control systems may be purchased and installed in these areas.

Section 5. Time Limits and Fees

Parking Fees to be charged by UOMS and UODS are as follows:

(1) Covered Parking $9.00/month
(2) Uncovered Parking
   (a) Large car spaces $8.00/month
   (b) Small car spaces, Lots 33 and 31 $7.00/month
(3) Cycles $1.50/month

A parking meter fee shall be paid by all persons parking a motor vehicle within any metered space on the campus in the amount indicated by a sign or legend installed on the meter. Such sign or legend shall indicate that the fee payable shall be five (5c) cents for each twenty minutes. Each meter will provide for a maximum parking time of five (5) hours. The time limits and the fees specified herein are to be in effect during the following periods:
From 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Mondays through Fridays; exceptions, all official state holidays.

The display of a sign showing illegal parking on any parking meter while the motor vehicle is parked in the space controlled by the parking meter shall be prima facie evidence that said motor vehicle has been parked overtime.

In areas where coin-operated automatic parking control systems may be used, the fee to be charged shall be 50 cents for each entry.

Section 6. Parking Regulations

No driver of a vehicle shall stop or park such vehicle contrary to the following parking regulations except when necessary to avoid conflict with other traffic or in compliance with the directions of a peace officer.

A. Manner of Parking

A motor vehicle parked on the campus shall be parked within the lines or marks and in the manner prescribed by signs, lines or other means placed on the curbs, roads or parking areas by the Medical School.

B. Place of Parking

No driver of a vehicle shall stop or park such vehicle in any of the following places on the campus:

1. In a crosswalk
2. In a loading zone, except for that purpose
3. At any place where official traffic signs have been erected prohibiting stopping or parking
4. At any place where said vehicle shall be double parked
5. At any place where the vehicle would occupy more than one parking space
6. At any place where the vehicle would obstruct a roadway
7. In front of a fire hydrant.

Section 7. Towing of Vehicles

(a) When may be towed: Any vehicle found on any road or parking area on said campus parked unlawfully or in such a manner as to be a traffic hazard under conditions then existing may be towed to a storage area designated by the Medical School. For any vehicle towed to the designated storage area a charge shall be placed against the same and the owner for towing and storage. The charge of towing shall be the actual cost thereof, and the charge for storage shall be at the rate of $1.00 per day.

(b) Release of vehicles: When any vehicle shall have been towed to the designated storage area the owner or person entitled to possession thereof may obtain possession and paying the charges for towing and storage, and upon accepting service of the citation, if one shall have been issued charging violation of these rules and regulations, and signing a proper form acknowledging delivery of said vehicle.

(c) Notice to owner: If within three days after a vehicle shall have been placed in the designated storage area no one appears to claim and establish ownership or right to possession thereof, the Medical School shall search the motor vehicle registration records and the vehicle for the name and address of the owner or person
entitled to the possession of such vehicle and send notice to such person by mail if the name and address be discovered. Such notice shall show the whereabouts of the vehicle and the amount of charges against the same and ask if he wishes to call for the vehicle, establish ownership or right to possession and pay the accrued and accruing charges.

Section 8. Speed and Operation of Motor Vehicles

The maximum speed at which motor vehicles may be driven on the campus shall be 20 miles per hour, provided that emergency vehicles, such as fire, ambulance, utility service and policy shall be exempt from this regulation when an actual emergency exists. However, no person shall drive a vehicle upon a street or roadway of the campus at a speed greater than is reasonable or prudent, having due regard to the traffic, surface, and width of the street or roadway and the hazards and any other conditions then existing.

Section 9. Crosswalks

All motor vehicles, on approaching a crosswalk, as indicated by painted lines on the roadway from one curb to the opposite, shall come to a complete stop before crossing if the crosswalk is occupied by a pedestrian.

Section 10. Obedience to Traffic Signs and Signals

It shall be unlawful for the driver of any vehicle to disobey the instructions of any official traffic sign or signal placed in accordance with the provisions of these rules and regulations, unless otherwise directed by a police officer.

Section 11. Obedience to Police Officer

It shall be unlawful for any person to refuse or fail to comply with any lawful order, signal or direction of any traffic officer displaying his badge and invested by law with authority to direct, control or regulate traffic or parking on the campus.

Section 12. Violations and Penalties

Violation of any rule or regulation herein promulgated by the Board shall upon conviction thereof in any court having jurisdiction, be punishable by a fine not to exceed $10.00
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I. INTRODUCTION

"Ten years ago, computing in higher education was in its second phase—an era of second generation equipment, massive federal support, and handsome incentives from the computer industry through outright gifts of equipment, educational discounts, and the award of fellowships, grants and project support.

"Today, however, the era of special privileges is over, with government tax laws making it illegal for colleges to apply the full undiscounted cost of its 'gifts' computer as a reimbursable item against government contracts and antitrust pressures discouraging industry discounts (which once ranged upwards to 60%) to colleges for equipment.

"In addition, government support through its various agencies has either been terminated or slowed to a trickle.

"In response to this financial squeeze, which occurs paradoxically at a time when computing power has never been greater, colleges are being forced to look at some new alternatives."

"College and University Business," May 1972

With the delivery of the ALWAC computer at Oregon State University in 1959, computing in Oregon higher education formally commenced. From then until now, computer operating service accounts have grown to nearly $7 million dollars for the biennium, 1971-1973. (This does not include the cost of purchased equipment.) An estimated value of purchased data processing equipment is $3,250,000.
In the biennium 1969-1971, the computing dollar for the Department represented about 46% personnel and 54% equipment and supplies. In 1971-72 equipment was 42% and personnel 58%. As of 1972-73, the estimated costs showed 40% equipment and 60% personnel.

The equipment or hardware share is decreasing and the personnel share is beginning to increase with respect to the total computing dollar. The cost decrease in hardware is attributed to the technology used today for mass produced electronic equipment, while the increase in personnel is attributed to the inflation of wages and salaries as well as the greater emphasis today on software applications and systems.

During these 13 years (1959-1972):

- An Interinstitutional Committee on Computer Activities (ICCA) was formed in 1963 by the Chancellor. The purpose of this committee was to study and coordinate an orderly growth of computing in higher education in Oregon.

- In a major report published in 1967, the ICCA made the following recommendations relating to institutional management systems:

  "An integrated data processing system be created by the Board's Office to handle selected data."

  "Each institution initiate an internal analysis of its management system..." to

  (1) Establish a data processing system.

  (2) One which is compatible with the Board's Office system.

  Limit equipment acquisition for management systems.

  Add additional staff for each institution and the Board's Office.

  The Chancellor appoint a committee to insure orderly and economic development-statewide coordination of both instruction, research and institutional management."
In addition to the ICCA, a number of studies have been performed by outside consultants on a variety of computing applications in the Department from 1965 to 1970.

Two of these early studies were made by Ernst & Ernst (Financial Systems), and Cresap, McCormak & Paget (Portland State University - integrated data management system). Other studies and their respective recommendations have been:

**Warren King and Associates - 1970**

**Purpose:** Legislative study. Analysis of management of public higher education.

**Recommendations:**

a. Design a common institutional data base to serve as the nucleus of a management information system for each college and university as well as the Board's Office.

b. Develop uniform administrative systems and procedures to serve the common needs of public higher education.

c. Establish an institutional services center funded and operated by the proposed Board of Regents (Board's Office).

d. Prepare a long-range plan providing detailed implementation procedures for meeting and computing the data processing needs of public higher education.

**Governor's Data Systems Advisory Committee Report - 1970**

**Purpose:** Review all systems development and data processing in the State of Oregon.

**Recommendations:**

a. Greater management participation in systems and data processing planning and control.

b. Centralization of data by function.

c. Standardization of hardware and software wherever possible.
Haskins and Sells – 1971

Purpose: Review of the Financial Management System (FMS) progress, status and plans.

Recommendations:

a. Develop a master plan for systems development in reference to total Department of Higher Education projects.

b. Establish data processing training programs.

c. Hire and train a file design and management specialists.

d. Revise the present payroll system.

e. Conduct feasibility studies prior to installing any more terminals.

These studies all had the common thread of recommending more explicit comprehensive planning for computing in the Department of Higher Education. In addition, a general consolidation of computing activities was suggested for the administrative areas of the Department.
II. A NEW PLANNING FOCUS

To help coordinate planning for computing in the Department of Higher Education and to provide a planning focus within the Department, the position of Data Systems Coordinator was established in November of 1970.

The Coordinator was expected to undertake three chief activities directed toward the improvement of the Department of Higher Education use of automatic data processing equipment:

1. To recommend policies, plans, and programs relating to data processing systems development and implementation.
2. To recommend policies and plans for acquisition and use of automatic data processing equipment.
3. To review computer systems operations, making recommendations for modification.

The position was filled on March 1, 1971.

The approach taken after the establishment of this position was one of cooperative planning. The concept was to use, as possible, the personnel resources of the Department in achieving a plan for data processing. A series of task forces, committees and executive level groups were formed and coordinated in an effort to identify and detail the various alternatives available. These alternatives were expected to identify the most effective and productive ways of utilizing the computing resources of the Department of Higher Education.

The Administrative Systems Task Force

To gain a perspective of computer applications in administration (existing and planned), a cooperative investigation and planning study
was initiated in May 1971 by an interinstitutional task force for administrative systems.

The mission of the Administrative Systems Task Force was:

- To identify and categorize administrative areas of the Department.
- To determine priorities for administrative systems development.
- To develop a conceptual framework for administrative systems implementation.
- To make a chronological administrative systems implementation plan.

The approach taken to meet the objectives was direct:

- A review of materials published and written on administrative systems and other aspects of higher education data processing in Oregon, including consulting and committee reports.
- Identification of current expenditures for development and maintenance of administrative data processing in the Department.
- Interviews with administrative staffs and institution executives, including the Board's Office, to identify:
  - Functions and objectives of each administrative area.
  - Its information and data needs, present and prospective.
  - Problems of information availability.
  - Analytical techniques employed.
  - Future operational goals of the administrative area.

The principal findings of the Administrative Systems Task Force were:

- A lack of coordinated planning for administrative systems development in the Department of Higher Education.

- Potential for redundancy of expenditures. For example, expenditures for development and maintenance of student systems (1969-1971):

  University of Oregon   $224,558
  Oregon State University 330,192
Limited attention to compatibility of data definitions.

Lack of standards for documentation and computer language.

In some cases, evidence of poor utilization of existing computer equipment for administrative data processing.

A 1969-1971 estimated data processing expenditure for development and maintenance of administrative systems totalled over $3.2 million:

- Student Systems: $850,600
- Financial Systems: $1,766,800
- Personnel Systems: $294,750
- Physical Plant: $51,850
- Research (Institution Data): $69,800
- Miscellaneous: $190,173

$3,223,973

The recommendations of the Administrative Systems Task Force were to:

- Establish a departmentwide organization to coordinate administrative systems development.
Develop and share statewide systems for common administrative needs.

Standardize administrative data elements using NCHEMS standards and definitions as a foundation.

Designate project leaders for each functional systems area on each campus.

Enforce state Executive Department computer program language standards.

Adhere, in general, to the following priority in the development/refinement of administrative systems priorities:

1. Student systems.
2. Financial systems.
3. Personnel systems.
4. Facility/physical plant systems.
5. Hospital systems.

Where feasible, buy administrative data-processing systems rather than develop them within the Department.

Involve executives and high level administrators in administrative data processing planning.

The Technical Advisory Group

While the Administrative Systems Task Force was meeting, a number of discussions between Control Data Corporation and Oregon State University resulted in consideration of the possibility of the Oregon Department of Higher Education acquiring a CDC CYBER 73 computer system. The CYBER 73 was offered in lieu of the CDC 3500 computer called for in an existing contract on which delivery has not been made. The cost of the larger CYBER 73 would be the same as the cost of the CDC 3500.
To consider the feasibility of this acquisition a technical data processing evaluation group was established and Gerald Schmitz, Director, Data Systems Division, Executive Department, was asked to serve as chairman.

The technical team at its first meeting concluded that the computer would provide a computing capability greater than OSU's current requirements and thus would be unnecessary unless means were found of making its capacity available to other institutions. Discussions followed concerning the acceptability of a computer network concept to the institutions represented at the meeting. The five institutions represented agreed that the establishment of a network to serve standard computing needs of all campuses would serve to alleviate the uneven distribution of computing resources within the Department of Higher Education.

The team agreed on the feasibility of a computing network for the Department of Higher Education and that the CDC CYBER 73 was a suitable tool for inclusion in the network.

The group became the Technical Advisory Group for the Computer Policy Council that first met on March 8, 1971.

The Computer Policy Council

Pursuant to the recommendation of the Administrative Systems Task Force, the explicit involvement of institution executives in data processing planning was initiated in February. The institution executives devoted
three days to a consideration of the effectiveness with which the computing resources of the Department of Higher Education were being used.

One of the results of the conference was the establishment of an interinstitutional committee which has further considered (with the assistance of the Technical Advisory Group) the feasibility of a computer network serving all of the institutions. The computer network would provide the means of making available to every institution equitable access of Departmental computer resources.

On March 8, 1971 the first meeting of the Computer Policy Council was held.

The following is a general summary of the recommendations of the Computer Policy Council for 1973-1975:

- Implement the network concept for computing activities for the Department of Higher Education.
- Utilize, as possible, the existing computing resources of the Department to meet these purposes.
- Implement common software systems to meet common needs and requirements.
  (This recommendation applied equally to instructional, research, and administrative systems.)
- Buy rather than build software systems, when suitable software expertise is available.
It is difficult to describe with confidence a computer network for the Department of Higher Education for the next four to ten years. Although the logic that urges such a conclusion is strong, there are good reasons for diffidence.

1. The options are numerous (and endlessly arguable) with respect to organization, hardware configuration, system development priority, and other aspects of computer service operations.

2. There is no directly parallel model either to emulate or deviate from.

3. The varieties of institution needs and experience are enormous and the differences must be accommodated.

4. The presentation of a "staff plan"—prior to the designation of a network director—may appear to prejudice the flexibility the director should have in setting the basic patterns for network operation.

Despite these concerns, the logic of the processes of government requires that choices be made—however tentatively—if the financial resources that would be required are to be identified and allocated. It is further assumed that the purpose of this plan is to define the objectives and to estimate the resources required to attain it. The assumptions concerning equipment configurations are made with the clear understanding that implementation should be subject to further study and evaluation by the Computer Policy Council and the staff it employs.

Policy Goals

The goals of a computer network for the Department of Higher Education are generally agreed:

1. To provide equitable access for students and staff at all institutions of the Department of Higher Education to the computing resources of the Department.
2. To maintain and enhance the quality of computing resources and services presently available to students and staff at any institution of the Department.

3. To maximize the efficiency of use of computing resources, whether of hardware or in software development.

4. To strengthen the use of computers for instruction and research.

Organization

It is proposed that computer network services be provided under the policy guidance of a Computer Policy Council. It is expected that there will be both a central staff (designated by the Council directly or under contract) and, in most instances, institutional staffs to coordinate institutional uses of computer services.

Computer Policy Council

The Computer Policy Council, established pursuant to action of the Board of Higher Education at its meeting on July 24, 1972, consists of the Chancellor or his representative and a representative of each institution (appointed on recommendation of the institution executive).

The Council is charged with policy-making in its broadest terms, including supervision of network operations and recommendations relating to employment of operating personnel. It is understood, of course, that the actions of the Council are subject to the usual processes of budgetary review and to review by the Chancellor and the Board in matters involving significant disagreement within the Council.
It is expected that the Computer Policy Council will be assisted in its activities by four task groups:

- **The Administrative Systems Users Group** will review student systems, financial systems, library systems, clinical records systems, and other administrative-type applications of interest to participating institutions; recommend the extent to which development and implementation of such systems can be shared; and recommend to the Board the order of priority for development and implementation by network systems analysts and programmers, or outside systems and software companies.

- **The Academic Users Group** will hold open meetings for instruction and research users at regular intervals, respond to user requests or problems and seek out users' views.

- **The Budget Task Group** will review network requirements, recommend resource allocations and help develop an annual data processing budget for the Department.

- **The Technical Evaluation Group** will evaluate and make recommendations on hardware for the network and review hardware requirements for the institutions.

**Institution Staffs**

It is understood that each institution and the Chancellor's Office require one or more full-time staff members to perform certain necessary services related to operation of a computer network:

a. Scheduling and operation of terminal equipment.

b. Planning for and encouragement of use of computer services.

c. Development of unique software systems.

d. In special cases, operation of computer facilities.

**Central Staff**

The central processing units of the computer network should be operated by a staff responsible to the Computer Policy Council.

For the foreseeable future, it is proposed that the Council contract
for the operation of the central network facility by Oregon State University. There are several reasons for this recommendation:

a. The experience of Oregon State University in operating its CDC 3300 regional network.

b. The proximity of the Controller's operating staff (which must be a part of the central facility).

c. The expected saving of time, compared with that required to assemble a new staff.

d. The avoidance of duplication of staff that would otherwise occur in Corvallis.

The central staff will necessarily perform a series of crucial functions, whether by contract with Oregon State University or otherwise. Figures 1 and 2 on the following pages suggest the varieties of activities that will be essential to operation of an effective network.
Figure 1 - Administrative Staff - Central Network Facility
The Hardware Plan

In developing a plan and a budget for 1973-1977 computer services, a number of assumptions have been made. They may be summarized as follows:

1. The Department will establish a central network facility at Corvallis. The facility will include:
   - The OSU-owned CDC 3300
   - A (larger) successor to the Controller-leased IBM 360/40
   - A leased computer of the CYBER 73 (CDC) magnitude.

2. The Department will retain the PDP-10 at the University of Oregon.

3. The Department will dispose of:
   - The UO-leased IBM 360/20 (by June 30, 1973)
   - The UO-owned IBM 360/50 (by December 31, 1974)
   - The PSU-leased Honeywell 200 (by October 31, 1974)
   - The UCMS-leased NCR 200 (by June 30, 1975)

4. RJE terminals will be installed initially on a quarterly schedule:
   - April 1, 1974: Portland State University, University of Oregon
   - July 1, 1974: Southern Oregon College, Eastern Oregon College
   - October 1, 1974: University of Oregon Medical School, Oregon Technical Institute
   - January 1, 1975: University of Oregon Dental School, Oregon College of Education

5. A communications preprocessor is to be installed January 1, 1975.

These hardware decisions are subject to refinement and modification in the light of competitive bidding. The implementation of these
decisions will permit both time-sharing operation (serving instruction and research users) remote-batch processing, and batch processing.

The Software Plan

The objectives of software planning are to provide access to the needed variety of programming languages, packaged tools, and coordinated systems development.

1. **Languages.** Subject to Computer Policy Council decisions, a wide range of computer languages will be available—normally in the National Standard (ANSI) version.

2. **Packaged tools.** The software for certain standard applications will be accumulated in a network library. These include tools for linear programming, various forms of statistical analysis, computer assisted instruction, modelling, simulation, etc.

3. **Coordinated administrative systems development.** Because of institutional similarities, many systems applications should be developed for all institutions in a coordinated way. This applies to student systems, financial systems, personnel, facilities, library and medical systems. The primary instance for 1973-1975 is in the need for coordinated implementation of a purchased student information system.

Pursuing the recommendations of the Administrative Systems Task Force (1971) that data elements should be standardized where feasible and administrative systems software should be purchased
 rather than developed, a nationwide search was undertaken to find a vendor experienced and successful in implementing student information systems. Systems and Computer Technology, Inc., (SCT) was chosen. Its success in implementing over 40 student systems, as well as working in the areas of university financial and fund development systems, was persuasive.

During 1971-1973, SCT has developed student information systems specifications for the Department at three pilot institutions—Portland State University, the University of Oregon and Southern Oregon College. Also, an implementation project (admission system) at the University of Oregon has been undertaken. As a result of these efforts, SCT's ability to develop an integrated Department-wide system which retains appropriate institutional differences in the operational areas of student information systems seems assured.

After reviewing the SCT proposal and investigating the utilization of our own Department resources for Systemwide SIS development, the Department of Higher Education proposes to contract with SCT for its services. These services would include:

For a fixed price,

Student information systems for participating institutions in the areas of:

Admissions
Student Information Systems Retrieval/Receiving
Student Data Base
Grade Reporting
Financial Aid
Course Request Processing
Course Schedule Maintenance
Student Scheduling
Add/Drop
Student Billing
Alumni/Development Fund Raising

Six institutions would participate:

PSU
UO
OCE
SOC
OTI
EOC
(UOMS/UOIDS, OSU free license fee after six institution installations)

For implementation of all of the systems in the participating institutions (three years), SCT agrees to furnish for a fixed price:

1. Specification assistance and service.
2. Software (for a license fee).
3. Installation (includes debugging, testing, etc.).
4. Training (computer and student area clerical staffs).
5. Initial operation of each module or system (school term installed).
6. Complete detailed documentation (computer systems and SIS procedures).
7. Oregon resident SCT staff during implementation.

Total price: Approximately $400,000, of which approximately $285,000 should be requested for 1973-1975.

The result of the contract would produce a standardization of all data elements in the above-mentioned student system areas and provide compatibility among all of our institutions for student information reporting requirements, both state and federal. All systems will be fully compatible with the WICHE/NCHEMS data definition activities.
The target machine for this statewide systems project would be the IBM resource of the central network facility. This would allow direct communication (RJE) by all institutions to their respective student systems for operation and file maintenance functions.

Another application now planned deals with a central library ordering and accounting system. The basis for such a system now exists and is operational for both OSU and OCE. The Library On-Line Information and Text Access (LOLITA) system can, when extended to all institutions, provide improved accounting services while creating a valuable central file of purchases which will greatly improve institutional options as to acquisition or sharing of library materials.

This system will share the same communication lines as will be used for other network computer applications. While implementation of LOLITA is not dependent on the network, sharing of facilities and communication lines should appreciably improve the cost effectiveness of the LOLITA system.

A third area for development is to improve the quality, accuracy, availability and utility of clinical records, income and supplies accounting, and student registration and scheduling at the University of Oregon Dental School.

To do this a common data base must be established for all departments and divisions within the Dental School so that teaching,
research and administrative needs may more adequately and effectively be met.

To develop a data processing and retrieval system which provides the flexibility to accommodate the Dental School's present and future needs as they relate to curriculum, student-patient progress monitoring, research efforts and administrative information demands, a buy rather than develop concept will be employed.

As a means of solving some of the data processing problems which are unique to the Dental School, a program improvement is requested to permit entering into a contract with an established outside firm through which we can obtain:

(a) Previously tried and tested computer programs designed specifically to meet the unique needs of dental schools; and

(b) The professional help and guidance necessary for the implementation of these programs on the network computing facilities of the Department.

Other areas of administrative systems development are under investigation at the present time. These studies are consistent with our system development priorities, and will be considered for action, after their respective formal presentations are made.
I have grave reservations concerning some of the provisions in the computer network. I beg your indulgence while I state the reasons. But first let me reiterate my full concurrence with the basic purpose—to strive for efficiency in the use of the State's resources—and my belief that a network may provide the best means to achieve efficiency in computer operation. It is important that maximum accessibility be provided to those institutions that lack adequate computer capacity. It is equally important that present users be protected, not only for the educational value of their research, but also for their qualifications to receive the non-state funds which are calculated in the proposal as part of the revenue to support operations. The basic plan of supplanting smaller units with large units may prove to be sound given adequate data to support the sequence of moves and magnitude of the equipment. But I have these reservations.

1. The proposal is not for a network of available facilities, or of facilities that are to be retained, nor even a network that is to manage and distribute available and assigned computer capacity.

2. No cost and operational analyses are available to demonstrate the need to rent and operate two new major computers as the plan proposes. There is no cost analysis of alternative and perhaps less expensive ways of producing the needed computer capacity.

3. Even with the possibility that the proposal will over-commit the State System to costly equipment, there is no adequate analysis to show that the proposal will protect and retain users at the University of Oregon who now support the computer operation annually with over a half million dollars of non-state funds.

Let me proceed to the consideration of each of these reservations.

1. The proposal is not for a network of available facilities, or of facilities that are to be retained, nor even a network that is to manage and distribute available and assigned computer capacity.

The proposal moves partially in the direction of a network. It recommends that the State System, in effect, purchase from Oregon State University computer capacity for distribution to other institutions in the System. It does not state, categorically, but apparently assumes that Oregon State's present and future capacity needs will be reasonably protected, and that it will be treated equitably as a consumer as well as a manager. The principle, in my opinion, is good. It does not go far enough. It ought also to encompass the University of Oregon's major computers (an IBM 360-50 and a PDP-10) in the capacity pool. I shall in a moment argue that it would be uneconomical and unwise to trade in the IBM 360-50 at the time indicated. The proposal that the PDP-10 be set aside for the exclusive use of the
University of Oregon is contrary to the best interests of both the network and the University. A policy that sets up one machine for special privilege to one institution without making it available to the network effectively marks that facility for elimination at an early date, or sets up protective devices and barriers that discourage transfer work to the network and encourages destructive competition for funds.

A network might take the form of pooling and distributing the resources now available, augmenting the resources as necessary, eliminating inefficient or obsolescent facilities. Such a network might be likened to a power pool in which there may be two or three or several producers of power. Each producer might at given times, have a shortage or an excess of power. By pooling resources, excess power in one unit can be utilized to reduce shortages in other units. In computing facilities the analogue to power is capacity. The State System now has more capacity than it utilizes. But some of the institutions are "have-nots" whose needs greatly exceed the capacity of their small computers. Under a network, the excess capacity should be made available to those who need it. Those needs which have not yet been analyzed, may prove to be so great, that additional capacity will be required. A satisfactory network would supply the additional capacity needed by the institutions now lacking adequate facilities without endangering the capacity needs of those institutions now well-served, and it would effect these changes at a minimum cost.

2. No cost and operational analyses are available to demonstrate the need to rent and operate two new major computers as the plan proposes. There is no cost analysis of alternative and possibly less expensive ways of producing the needed computer capacity.

I do not possess the technical ability to estimate the capacity requirements of the State System or to assess the need for new facilities. But I do have confidence in stating the premise that we ought not spend more money than is necessary for the rental of new equipment. The proposal recommends that the Board rent and install two new major computers at Oregon State—an IBM 360-65 and a Cyber 73. To make the transaction possible it is proposed that the Board trade in several computers, most of them leased but including the IBM 360-50 now owned by the University of Oregon. Two of my advisers who are knowledgeable in this field and who have made a careful study of our capacity requirements, tell me that we probably do not need two new computers to meet those requirements in the period of time encompassed by the proposal. If they are correct, the Board is being asked to make an unnecessary expenditure at a time when we are critically short of funds. Moreover, they tell me that the trade in of the owned IBM 360-50 and maintenance of the proposed delivery schedules for network facilities would cost $11,650 more in 1973-75 than would be necessary if the 360-50 were retained and that the unnecessary costs would be more than $400,000 for the 1975-79 period. I have appended to my statement a report detailing these added costs made by Dr. George Scruble, director of the Computing Center at the University of Oregon.
The proposal points out that the conflicting and partisan claims of the several institutions have made it difficult if not impossible to reconcile the claims in a manner that would be satisfactory to all of the contending parties. I acknowledge that fact. But I object to an arbitrary resolution that is not based upon analysis. Several months ago the University suggested that an outside, impartial agent be employed to study our needs and make recommendations for the development of a network. The National Science Foundation is much interested in and has given a grant of $150,000 to a neighboring multi-campus university for that very purpose--planning for the development of a computer network among the several institutions comprising the University system. We ought at least to apply for a similar grant.

3. The University of Oregon has two computer budgets, now in the process of being consolidated into one. The Business Office rents an IBM 360-20 with annual operational costs of $140,000. It handles accounts and student records and services. The Computing Center has an IBM 360-50 and a PDP-10 which are used primarily for instruction and research, although a considerable amount of administrative computing is also done on the IBM 360-50. Its annual budget of $600,000 is derived from two sources: approximately $100,000 are contributed by departments from State funds, chiefly for instructional purposes. Approximately $500,000 are derived from federal or private research grants and contracts. Because the Computing Center has title to these computers it can operate at a modest expense to the users. If the rates to users are increased, as seems likely under the proposal, either additional State funds must be made available as a subsidy or programs must be reduced. It is possible, even though not desirable, to reduce instructional programs. But if, because of additional costs, services to research programs are reduced, one or two results will follow: either research scholars will not be able to compete successfully for scarce research grants or, faced with that prospect, they will move to other institutions where they can compete. In either event, funds which are now calculated to support the proposed budget will be lost to the State System.

The National Science Foundation gave the IBM 360-50 and the PDP-10 to the University of Oregon as part of the Science Improvement grant. Their total value is in excess of over $2,000,000. The National Science Foundation and other agencies which fund the research grants subsidize the operation of the Center by, roughly, one-half million dollars per year. These gifts to the University are a direct reflection of the quality of the faculty members who receive them. The gifts and grants are made on recommendation of panels of leading scientists and social scientists in this country, and in direct competition with proposals from other universities. The University has developed strong departments in the disciplines that use the computer facilities. The American Council on Education's study of leading graduate facilities places eight instructional areas of the University of Oregon in the top rank of American universities. We can ill afford to adopt a policy that, deficient in many particulars, may also foreshadow the loss of able members of our faculty.
I do not intend for one moment to suggest that because the University receives a subsidy from the Federal Government it is in some degree free from control by the Board. Not at all. The University is a creature of the State of Oregon, chartered by the State, and subject to governance by the Board, an agency of the State.

There is no question of the Board's right and power, indeed its duty, to govern the institution, including setting the policy for the operation of the computer program, as it believes wise. Our concern is much narrower, much more specific: we think that the proposal itself is not wise; we think it is an improvident use of public funds, an imprudent disregard of the resources we have in our faculty. We do not believe it the practice of the Board to transfer capital assets from one institution to another, particularly assets that have been awarded on the basis of merit and that are derived from non-state funds. Given these perceptions, I hope that you will be able to understand why anguished members of our faculty, who have sought and obtained the facilities and the supporting grants in the good faith that those facilities would continue to be available to them, regard the proposal as unethical.

I do not impugn the motives of any one. Those who prepared the proposal are undeniably men of good will and intent. The unwise proposal that the University be set apart in a specially favored position by having the PDP-10 assigned to it exclusively, was an effort to recognize and protect the community of scientists who had made possible the acquisition of the Center building and the computer facilities. But the inadequate analysis did not take into account the fact that many of the research projects are programmed for the IBM 360-50 and conversion to the PDP-10 would require not only a very considerable expenditure of funds, but an enormous investment of time and energy that these men can ill afford to divert from their instruction and research.

The fact is that Mr. Holmer's office has worked under an impossible pressure of time, schedule, and conflicting interests—not only between institutions, but within them. With his limited staff, adequate analysis has not been possible. Following the many meetings of inter-institutional committee which, necessarily have been devoted to an attempt to reconcile often irreconcilable differences, the series of proposals has reached the several institutions at the last moment before Board meetings. In consequence, the institutions have not had time to make adequate analyses or to develop data that might have been substituted for the rhetoric of conflict.

In other areas of planning, e.g., capital construction and curriculum, the Board's office has a regularized set of analyses and procedures. The need must be thoroughly established and projected into the future with careful documentation; alternative methods of incorporating existing programs or facilities are clearly set forth and examined in terms of educational and cost effectiveness: the final cost implications are clearly understood. Procedurally, in the planning of a building there is involvement by the user groups, the internal architectural planning specialists,
the outside consultants and architects, and the Board's office.

I do not by analogy suggest that planning for the computer network requires several years. I suggest, rather, that we utilize the three major computers we now have in our possession and that we acquire the IBM 360-65 as recommended. We could then create the network with less expense than is suggested in the proposal, and we could do so without taking irrevocable, destructive, and expensive steps. And we could buy time to conduct the study that should be conducted before we venture into more expensive and uncertain enterprises.

I have at the inter-institutional level objected to the proposed network at several stages of development. In consequence, one proposal prepared for Board action was withdrawn and some modification of earlier plans are reflected in the present proposal, notably the assignment to the University of the exclusive use of the PDP-10, a questionable arrangement. I am appreciative of the good will and personal consideration of members of the Chancellor's staff. But good will, however much to be cherished, is no substitute for analysis. In addition, the fact remains that the Board has not had a full and open discussion of this issue. If I may be permitted to say so, it is uncharacteristic of the Board to act without such discussion, limited not to a single meeting of the Board as the present schedule prescribes, but conducted first by the appropriate committee after a careful examination of relevant documents. The memoranda that I attach to my remarks, and the statements my colleagues make today will, I trust, aid you in understanding the issues. But even then the hard data on which you ought to make your decision will not be available to you. It has not been developed. I urge you first to postpone action on the major proposal until you have the data and second, to move forward, which is possible, to create at once a network on a more limited basis that will provide needed services without incurring unneeded costs or without destroying present programs or endangering present sources of financial support.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Roy Lieuallen, Computer Policy Council, Technical Advisory Group, Robert Clark, Ray Hawk, and Doug Olson

FROM: George Struble

DATE: September 19, 1972

The Computer Policy Council realizes the deficiencies in the planning to date of a computer network. The concept of a network is agreed to by the entire council, but many features of the necessary basis for firm planning of the network have not yet been supplied. The Council at its September 12th meeting showed that it recognizes the value of retaining the IBM 360/50 at the University of Oregon. However, it was reluctant to recommend the retention if retention would add $250,000 to the network budget request by eliminating the projected trade-in on the computer.

The addition of $250,000 to the network budget request is not necessary, however. We can strengthen the proposed network plan while keeping the budget request at approximately the level proposed at the September 12th meeting. The main features of the strengthening of the plan would be:

1. Retain the IBM 360/50.
2. Postpone acquisition of the CYBER 73 for 6 months.
3. Postpone acquisition of the job preprocessor by 3 months.

The following describe the effects of these changes.

There are several immediately identifiable fiscal effects of the changes. There should be other fiscal effects as well which will take more explanation to delineate firmly.

1. We have no projections of how the workload currently on the IBM 360/50 can be done on a 360/65 or equivalent. Since the 360/50 often runs a full three shifts, it is reasonable to suppose that this work will occupy the equivalent of at least a full shift on a 360/65. The effects on operator expense at the University of Oregon will be practically nil as approximately the same operator staff would be necessary for the required sophisticated
2. The RJE station necessary at the UO Computing Center if the 360/50 is released must have the capabilities to read and write 7 and 9-channel magnetic tapes, control a pen-and-ink plotter, punch cards, and read cards and print lines at a rather high rate of speed. Such a terminal, if one exists that can perform satisfactorily, is estimated to cost $4,000 per month. Since that is scheduled for delivery April 1974, the cost savings of its deletion would be $60,000 in the 1973-75 biennium if the 360/50 were retained instead.

3. A 50 KB communications line would be necessary to support the RJE station mentioned above. Such a line is quoted by the telephone company at $1500 per month between Eugene and Corvallis. Elimination of that line would therefore save $22,500 in the 1973-75 biennium.

4. If the IBM 360/50 is released its workload will immediately place heavy demands on the network facilities. At some time in the future, expanded demands from all institutions will force an upgrade of the network facilities. If the IBM 360/50 is retained the date for acquisition of a major upgrade can be postponed. The date when such an upgrade would be needed is extremely difficult to determine, especially since we do not even have analyses that show that the workload necessary in the 1973-75 biennium can be accommodated on the network facilities. Even under a rather trusting assumption of network performance, it is reasonable to suppose that a major upgrade would be needed about July 1976 and cost an additional $70,000 per year.

5. By no means does the University of Oregon wish to secede from cooperation in or use of the network facilities. The network facilities will rather be improved by the continued existence of the 360/50. Among other things, the 360/50 can act as a powerful RJE station into the network. This can be accomplished with installation of a 270X communication controller on the 360/50 at a cost of approximately $1,000 per month. Assuming installation in October 1974, this would cost $9,000 in the 1973-75 biennium and $12,000 per year thereafter.

6. Maintenance of the 360/50 costs approximately $26,000 per year. To extend that maintenance through the 1973-75 biennium would add $13,000 to the proposed network budget.

7. Most of the IBM 360/50 is owned, but the 2314 disk unit and one tape drive are being purchased under a 5-year
contract. Retention of the 360/50 will entail about $22,500 additional payments in July 1975 - March 1976, after which the contract will be fulfilled.

8. The card punch on the 360/50 is rented. Continuation will entail an additional $4,800 in 1973-75 and $9,600 per year thereafter.

9. Clearly if the 360/50 is retained indefinitely, the projected $250,000 trade-in will not be available.

10. The CYBER 73 rental is currently in the proposed network budget at $211,860 per year, assuming that an additional 841 disk unit will be acquired for the 3300 in any case and later transferred to the CYBER 73. Retention of the 360/50 will permit postponement of delivery of the CYBER 73 since more capacity on the 360/65 will be available to institutions other than the U of O. Postponement of delivery of the CYBER 73 by 6 months, to January 1975, would introduce a savings of $105,930 in the proposed network budget.

11. Postponement of the CYBER 73 also causes postponement of installation of the job preprocessor. If that were delayed 3 months, to April 1975, the cost saving would be $15,000.

12. Postponement of delivery of the CYBER 73 and job preprocessor and removal of the necessity of converting the 360/50 workload to the major network computer reduce the pressures on network staff immensely. This should make possible some savings on network staff, at least in the postponement of the filling of some positions. Since no analysis of the job function of network personnel is available it is not possible to be precise as to positions which could be affected or for what period of time. A conservative estimate is $45,000 in the 1973-75 biennium.
A summary of the fiscal impacts is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Computer operators</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. UO RJE station</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 50 KB comm. line</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Network upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 270X Comm. link</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 360/50 Maintenance</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Installment contract</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Card punch</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Trade-in loss</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CYBER 73 postpone</td>
<td>105,930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Job preproc. postpone</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Staff savings</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET SAVINGS**

|                | 276,800 | 288,430 | 117,700 | 282,000 | 95,200 | 352,000 |

In addition to cost savings in the 1973-75 biennium and even greater savings in subsequent years from retention of the IBM 360/50 there are a number of advantages to retention that will make the network more valuable and hence strengthen the network proposal.

1. **We reduce the risk of overcommitment of network facilities.**
   The network proposal, as it stands, commits network facilities to take over existing work of several computers, large and small, in addition to increased workload, both academic and administrative, as yet undefined. There is a grave risk that the proposed facilities cannot handle this workload effectively. We have no analysis to show that this is a reasonable risk to take. There is a parallel risk of overcommitment of staff to convert and implement and organize too much too quickly. Again there is no analysis of job functions, workload, and proposed schedules that show the proposed staff will be adequate. Retention of the 360/50 dramatically reduces the pressure on network machinery and staff and therefore reduces the risk of overcommitment even more dramatically.

2. **University of Oregon computing facilities have been supported very substantially by grant funds from the National Science Foundation and other agencies.** The OSSHE computing network should attempt to preserve this funding, as it directly reduces the demands on state of Oregon funds.
A significant upset in the performance of computing and in the procedures used by the science faculty will necessarily degrade the ability to receive further grants. National Science Foundation officials admit that grant funding at the University of Oregon, especially that available for computing, would decrease were the 360/50 to be traded in. No dollar estimate of this impact can easily be made, but there is no question of the direction of the effect.

3. Retention of the 360/50 and connection to the network computer allows load-sharing that can enhance significantly the performance of the network. First, the 360/50 can undertake a portion of the 360/65 workload if the 360/65 is down for an extended period. Second, while both machines are operating, load-sharing can be accomplished, as is now done on similar facilities at the Triangle Universities Computing Center, to smooth the workloads of both machines and therefore improve responsiveness of service.
MEMORANDUM

TO: President Robert D. Clark

FROM: Wayne Wiitanen, Assistant Professor of Biology

SUBJECT: Proposed OSSHE computer network.

I would like to present a brief analysis of the proposed computer network plan for the OSSHE, but first I will make clear why I feel compelled to comment on it. I have been actively engaged in working with computers or in the computer industry since 1954, when as an undergraduate at MIT, I worked as a professional programmer to support myself while attending school. Before taking graduate work, I worked for over a decade in the computer industry in a variety of responsible jobs: chief systems programmer, job and proposal analyst, management consultant, principal in a management consulting firm, and as a private consultant. I have had ample opportunity to evaluate, and indeed design, computer networks. An example is a combined process control system (for an automated film-making plant) and management data system — a system analogous to the proposed OSSHE computer network but far more sophisticated in its requirements. Another is a simulation analysis of a computer network that consisted of IBM 7094s in Boston, New York and Washington D.C. — a network that was failing for reasons not obvious to management. The result of all this is that I have had considerable experience in evaluating and designing computer "networks", and based on my industrial experience, I would like to pass my observations along to you.

There are two premises that I think apply: first, the Legislature requires that every state department operate with financial responsibility. This premise becomes relevant in connection with the prudence of the current proposed network plan. The second premise is that excellent computing services should be provided to all the institutions within the State System of Higher Education without favoritism. By excellent computing services, I mean high quality (service, turnaround time, communication, etc.), sufficient quantity (with respect to time, memory capacity, and peripheral equipment), and low cost. Certainly the existing quality of service at any institution should not be lowered to satisfy a network concept.

The proposed computer network plan suffers from what I believe to be four fatal flaws. The first is the haste with which the study has been undertaken and brought to a conclusion. (I use the word conclusion because I do not feel that any application of reasoned arguments will be able to stop the State Board's adoption of the current plan.) It is good practice when preparing a
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Subject: Proposed OSSHE computer network.

Proposal to commit one or two persons to the project, on a full time basis, for at least six months prior to the first draft, and then to call in other experts to cooperate in putting the proposal into final shape. It appears that the amount of staff work on as large a project as this has not come up to even minimal planning standards. I believe that the plan shows the result of this haste.

The second flaw is that there has been no data gathering and analysis program. In fact no one has analyzed the work loads imposed on existing computers by the Controller's Office, University Administrations, academic work, research work, or by any of the other outside users at any site. It is patently impossible to arrive at any kind of a reasonable estimate of the demands to be placed on a projected computer network without first analyzing the current machine loadings and making at least first-order approximations to usage growth. Hand in hand with data collection and analysis goes the cost effectiveness of various plans and analysis of staffing tables. No groundwork of either kind has been done. Since budget planning is based on machine requirements and staffing tables, it is irresponsible not to have performed the necessary analyses.

The third flaw is that the proposed system has not been simulated. By obtaining data from the Controller's Office concerning the characteristics of the computing load there and its seasonal variations, and the work load at the U of O (since the proposed major network machine is an IBM 360/65 and IBM 360s are already in use at these two locations) one can obtain reasonable estimates of daily computing requirements. Couple this with a projected growth of academic and research computing (based on the U of O growth rate and pro-rated for other schools) it becomes possible to write a computer program which will simulate any projected network in a realistic way. One can include such things as different storage capacities, rates of transmission to and from RJE's, scheduling algorithms, facilities seizure, job priorities, transmission rates of various telephone lines, line failures, computer malfunctions, and a host of other real considerations. Most commercial firms involved in making a major network proposal will include simulation as part of the plan in order to avoid making gross errors of judgment. Large systems are quite counterintuitive and require special methods for their analysis. A simulation was not even thought of during the "planning" for the proposed network.

The fourth flaw is that the budget estimates are based on verbal statements by salesmen (or perhaps even by corporate officers) based on no analysis of the buyer's requirements. This is a particularly vicious situation: the buyer doesn't have an accurate assessment of his requirements and makes a crystalball estimate. The vendor, realizing this, makes only verbal statements of what he will do if awarded the contract, something to which he is in no way bound. The buyer then predicates a budget on what he was told by the vendor,
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It is common business practice, even for the estimable IBM, for salesmen to make any kind of verbal quote just to get a foot in the door. My experience suggests that one (or perhaps all) of the following things will happen: the firm quote on the system will be twice or three times that which the salesman gave, or the vendor will be unable to deliver the goods at any price, or the goods will be delivered only at the vendor's convenience. A budget based on inadequate data and on verbal statements from a vendor is an egregious practice.

Two associated factors, often not appreciated for the problem that they are, are that costs on large systems generally over-run estimates significantly, and that conversion from one operating system (DOS on the Comptroller's IBM 360/40) to another (OS on the IBM 360/65) takes longer than expected (witness the transition problem encountered recently by Lane County). These two problems present difficulties in making budget estimates and in arranging a suitable conversion schedule. The current plan does not treat either factor satisfactorily.

I venture to predict that the computer network is doomed to failure because of a lack of sound planning, and that is financial irresponsibility. I think that the budget is imprudent, and rather than providing excellent computing services to the state institutions under the proposed network, totally inadequate computing will be offered at too great a cost, leading to dangerous repercussions in subsequent Legislatures.

It is appalling that a committee (selected largely from the administrative sector) worked to produce a plan and never once had open meetings for help and criticism from the academic community, much less to take evidence and advice from individuals who have had experience with networking (I do not refer to myself but to others who have had experience with elaborate systems such as ARPANET). This closed-door committee work is an affront to the academic community since the plan will effect each institution and since the democratic processes that normally take place in the academic community have been ignored.

In order to assure excellent service to all the institutions within the System it is clear that all users must be handled under identical guidelines. The Controller's Office has stated that they cannot use RJE's because of the special nature of their work. This special nature implies a different handling by the network contractor (OSU). In plain terms it will be a preferential treatment of the Controller's Office. It would seem to follow that if the network contractor (OSU) has to treat the Controller's Office specially, then it will have no difficulty in treating its own users preferentially. I believe that this practice will reduce the computing services offered to all other institutions to a lowest common denominator. The final result of this will be less and less use of the system by institutions having RJE stations until the "network" consists of an IBM 360/65 and a Cyber 73 for the exclusive use of OSU and the Controller's Office, thus reducing computing everywhere else to naught. The effect of this reduction will not be visible externally, but graduate programs and research will have to be redirected.
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Another factor, perhaps the most disturbing, is the precedent being set by allowing a board of individuals to decide the final disposition of equipment purchased for a specific purpose with Federal grant funds. The obvious extension of such a prerogative is the authority to shift any computing (and perhaps later any research) equipment around the State System at will, and to dispose of it as the Board sees fit. The following sequence comes to mind: poor service on the network creates a high demand for PDP-10 time. The increased cash flow into the PDP-10 is financially embarrassing to the network (as they are counting on support from research grants). The policy board "nationalizes" the PDP-10 and moves it to Corvallis. It appears that self-determination with respect to computing equipment is being abridged, and planning is done by administrative fiat. This is an extremely dangerous precedent.

Based on my strong, and I believe supportable, belief that the current network plan is imprudent, I strongly urge you to exhaust all possible means to stop the current network and insist that funds be made available for a competent study of an OSSHE computer network.

WAW:ds
MEMORANDUM

TO: President Clark
    Vice President Hawk
    Dean Novick

FROM: Fred Beisse, Head, User Services, Computing Center
      Bob Heilman, Systems Development Programmer, Computing Center
      Gordon Ashby, Head, Systems Programming, Computing Center

DATE: August 8, 1972

SUBJECT: Alternatives to locating an IBM 360/65 at Corvallis

We have learned that the OSSHE is considering using the monies currently spent on the IBM 360/40 at the Controller's office to lease an IBM 360/65. The 360/65 would be housed at the Controller's office and, in addition to providing computing for the Controller, would be used via remote job entry (RJE) to provide computing for various OSSHE institutions that are in need of such a service. An alternative to this proposal is to move the University of Oregon's IBM 360/50 to the Controller's office and to house the leased 360/65 at the U of O. The U of O would undertake the task of providing the RJE system for the various colleges under this proposal.

There are a number of advantages to this latter alternative, over the original proposal. Briefly, no major unplowed fields need to be tilled. All major administrative and technical units involved in the proposed move would be working in areas where they have familiarity and where they have demonstrated success. Conversion to the new computers and new operating systems would be made easier and the facilities could be available for RJE much more quickly. Finally, the upgrade could be accomplished for less monies: existing staff expertise can be called upon and expensive administrative costs can be avoided or delayed.

What follows is an outline of the major advantages of this proposed move:

1. The Controller's office can immediately run their DOS operating system and their programs on the IBM 360/50 with increased capacity and with no disturbing interruptions or prolonged overlap of the 360/50 and 360/40. This increased capacity can give the breathing room needed for...
the conversion to OS. The controllers staff can learn OS and make needed modifications to systems and programs without critical consequences since it is possible to run both systems on an IBM 360/50. In contrast, if the IBM 360/65 were housed at the Controller's office for use by cooperating institutions, their staff must learn OS, convert from a 40 to a 65, convert from DOS to OS, modify subsystems and programs for OS, implement RJE, and learn to support academic users at remote locations all at once. The outlined task is enormous and expensive, and one would expect that the 65 would not be generally usable by the OSSHE for an extended time.

2. The IBM 360/65 at the U of O could be in operation and running OS almost immediately. Within 2 to 4 weeks after system checkout, RJE stations could bring remote computing facilities to the campuses that need them. The U of O systems programming staff knows and has several years of experience working with OS and HASP, the software needed to support OSSHE computing on a 360/65. The techniques, hardware, software, and communications paths needed for the shared system are known to personnel on the U of O systems staff.

3. The U of O has experience providing computing services to the administrative, instructional, and research user. Our record for user satisfaction is good and our record for cost-effective service is excellent. We are better qualified to provide this service than is the Controller's office because the needs of the academic computing community are well known to us. The U of O has an existing staff of service-oriented programmers, trained in helping users with OS. With some augmentation this staff can serve the combined use of a 65 by the U of O and other institutions. In contrast, the Controller's office staff is not knowledgeable about either OS or the needs of the classroom and research user. Substantial retraining and restaffing concurrent with conversion would be necessary and general use of the system could not be expected rapidly.

4. The SCT administrative systems package has its roots at the U of O. If the IBM 360/65 is at Oregon this development can continue and be available to the participating schools via remote job entry. The U of O has a need for access to a system that runs SCT. Therefore, if the IBM 360/50 remains here, SCT must be installed on both machines, or its availability be restricted.

5. Eventual consolidation of the 65 and 50 may or may not be advisable. The commitment to consolidate should not be made until the U of O and the Controller's office are successfully using the same version of OS, it is determined that the capacities of the components of the 65 are sufficient for the combined work loads, the consequences of giving data processing applications pre-emptive priority are determined, and finally, until the software and hardware exist to effect adequate consolidation. While we cannot speak to remote use of a 360 by the Controller, adequate remote use by the U of O would require high speed remote job entry and job setup and breakdown of files over a high-speed data link. U of O users have a need to routinely send with their jobs large data files collected here and to recover files for use with programs running on
the PDP-10 or local small computers. Nine months to two years notice to the telephone company is required to install the communications equipment after the nature of the communications link is determined. Modifications to OS would be needed to support setup and breakdown. Hardware and software would be required at the U of O to send and collect the files.

6. Salaries and administrative overhead could be significantly reduced if the 65 were housed at the U of O. Since the Controller's office would not be a user of the 65, the required administrative structure could be simpler and user institutions could interact directly with the current administrative structure at the U of O computing center. Without knowing the exact details of the job load of the other OSSHE institutions (that information should be available to or from the Computer Policy Council) it is very difficult to exactly specify the additional staff needed. A very rough estimate would be 2 FTE for the systems staff, 2-3 FTE for the User Services staff, 2-3 FTE for operations, and 2 FTE for Administration and coordination. Additionally, costs for documentation and dissemination, travel and education would need to be established and budgeted. These increases should be much less than required to house the 65 with the Controller. The increases would also be far less than was budgeted in some of the preliminary budget estimates for the network administrative unit alone. Note that some of the staff positions required to offer the RJE services could be filled by students at the University of Oregon who take classes where they become familiar with OS and HASP. Training costs should be reduced by taking advantage of this resource. Additionally, some people can be on work study.

In summary, housing the IBM 360/65 at the U of O has several advantages. The system could be available to the OSSHE institutions quickly and economically. The Controller's office could work on conversion at a reasonable pace instead of attempting to do so simultaneously with learning OS and HASP, trying to become familiar with academic computing, and implementing a remote job entry facility. The systems, user services, operations and administrative staff at the U of O need only expand their existing knowledge and job definitions to meet the RJE requirements. A new, expensive administrative unit need not be added. Finally, the SCT subsystem can be installed, maintained, and used on a single computer.
Presentation by Dr. Burton Moyer, Dean of Liberal Arts, University of Oregon, at Board Meeting on September 26, 1972

Education and Research in relation to the Computer Network Proposal (September 24, 1972)

The basic factors that give impetus to the proposal for a network to serve the computing needs of the OSSHE institutions are free of dispute. It is unlikely that anyone with understanding of the needs would decline to support some concept of combining our present and future computing resources into a coordinated and interconnected system that would make available the capacity required by all of our institutions while also accommodating administrative and managerial computing in an efficient and systematic operation.

Widespread agreement on this idea of an inter-connected system and shared capacity does not, however, lead to an obvious conclusion about the design of a network and its operational pattern. Various university groups that have undertaken or considered such a move have found it wise and necessary to undertake thorough studies producing dependable assessments of service loads, quality of service, costs, required staffs, and effects upon the educational and research programs of the universities participating. And these factors require comparative assessment among the various patterns of connection and operation that appear worthy of serious consideration. The National Science Foundation has assisted with the costs of several studies of these matters, one of the more recent cases being its partial support for a $150,000 study extending over approximately one year by the University of California system. Summaries of the present state of understanding exist in such documents as:

"Networks for Higher Education", Proceedings of the EDUCOM Spring Conference, April 13, 1972. (Available from EDUCOM, P.O. Box 364, Princeton, N.J., 08540)

"Remote Computing in Higher Education: Prospects for the Future", by Richard V. deGrasse, University of Vermont, December 1971. (This is the report of a study funded by the NSF.)

The purpose of the present allusion to these documents is simply to emphasize the recognized complexity of the subject and to mention that they give added weight to the apprehensions urgently expressed by our local experts, most of whom insist that the present Oregon proposal is not based upon sufficient study of what will happen to educational and research programs and to quality of services and costs in the event that this proposal were adopted. Some of these apprehensions are presented specifically and with numerical evidence by Professor George Struble
in his recent memorandum to President Clark on the subject; they have been
the substance of much concerned discussion and study by a number of our
experts and active users of the computers.

The document, "Computer Services in the Oregon Department of Higher
Education", released at the September 12, 1972, meeting of the Computer Policy
Council, proposes a network centered in Corvallis; no major computer facilities
would exist elsewhere as parts of the network. The rationale of this document
and of the form of network proposal in which it culminates relates almost solely
to the problems of administrative and managerial computing. In what follows in
the present writing I shall attempt to indicate the very serious consequences
to education and research of establishing a single-centered network that would
deprive any of our major universities of a substantial local computer facility
that is also a node of the network. But let it be stressed that this is in no sense
intended to argue against a network of shared facilities with remoted access
terminals for all of our institutions. The principal point of argument concerns
the single-center network vs. a distributed network. To the latter the U. of O.
IBM 360-50 could make an important contribution.

Some of the categories of university work strongly affected by these decisions
should be noted.

**Computer Science Education**

This area of study has grown rapidly at the U. of O. into a department with
about 100 undergraduate major students and 35 to 40 graduate students in its MA
program. Its service in support of other areas of study is large and growing,
and we expect a total undergraduate enrollment of about 3,200 student credit
hours in this Fall term. For reasons both direct and indirect its continued
vitality depends upon retaining a major computer facility at the U. of O.

1. Good students and good faculty in Computer Science will simply to
where a comprehensive computer installation exists; a remote job entry
terminal is not an adequate substitute.

2. The presence of the computer entails a staff of experts and a local
enterprise in which Computer Science students gain much by association
and by employment.

3. In the study of systems programming advanced students collaborate
with the staff in software development and testing involving periods of
time (usually at night) when the computer is dedicated to systems program
development and testing. This kind of experience is essential in the training of advanced students, and such access to a computer is essential to research in this field. (Such systems programming efforts by staff and students have improved the efficiency of the 360-50 by a factor of perhaps three in recent years.)

(4) Direct exposure to current techniques as practiced on a major facility is essential.

Research Use of Computer

The dependence of research programs in the natural and social sciences upon flexible and innovative use of the computer is the basis for grave concern about the possibility that the major local facility may be lost. Without a considerable elaboration of the job entry-terminals and communication lines beyond what is presently proposed, with correspondingly higher cost, a marked degradation of service is forecast for the U. of O. by comparison with its present situation. Some of the factors of concern are:

(1) Since computing for research regularly involves development of new computer programs, availability of local operators and computer experts is a major concern. De-bugging of programs, efficiency of computation, and consultation about possibilities all benefit by close association with persons and facilities involved.

(2) The guidance of the progress of certain kinds of research problems depends upon quick return from the computer. This rapid "turn around time" that can be arranged when processing is done locally is in jeopardy in the remote job entry situation.

(3) The possibility of interacting with the computer in a rapid time sharing mode is of much importance to some operations where a prompt communication between the researcher and the computer determines the next step to be taken in an experiment or an analysis in progress.

(4) Research uses -- and some educational uses as well -- require a variety of output modes including coordinate plotters, graphic displays, and cathode ray tube displays, as well as the regular printer and teletype outputs. The degree to which these are comprehended within a remote job entry terminal depends upon the information capacity of the lines and the "intelligence" of the terminal. But large costs are inherent in such capacity and "intelligence", and they do not appear to be anticipated within the existing central network proposal. This type of consideration has been
given detailed and numerical analysis by our authorities in such matters.

(5) The possibility of placing scientific apparatus "on line" with a computer so that its operation is controlled by reference to a pre-set program, or by reference to analysis of data currently coming in, is sharply limited without the local computer or, alternatively, high-capacity lines and an elaborated terminal.

(6) Use of the computer in an "interactive mode", in a manner requiring prompt and continuing communication (usually by rapid time sharing) is a feature of great importance in many types of research. A local major computer as a node of the network ensures the ability to provide this kind of service while also achieving the benefit of the large capacity available for the state system of institutions by the network.

To our faculty members, particularly in the natural and social sciences, the retention of our present versatility of computer service and its favorable cost is a matter of prime concern since it affects basically our capacity to maintain currency in research and to qualify for support of continuing and future projects. This capacity and its concomitant activity opens numerous opportunities for our students in educational and research experience and affects essentially and favorably the quality of our academic operations.

The Computer in Individual and Classroom Instruction

Activity in this area, although long anticipated, is not yet extensive. But there appears to have been little if any attention given to accommodating it in the network proposal. Whether or not the information transfer capacity of the proposed RJE terminals and lines can also include the service to developments in this area is not discussed. Some of the types of computer use for instruction are:

(1) Individual instruction at a teletype and/or CRT console.

(2) Classroom demonstrations, in a dynamic mode, of functional dependence of a system upon arbitrary variation of its parameters. This can apply to mathematical sciences and to social sciences and economics.

(3) Demonstration of computer simulation of system behavior under chosen imposed conditions. (Behavior of populations, diffusion, change of state, etc.)

(4) The application of computer treatment of data in instructional laboratories. This would apply particularly to Chemistry, Physics, Biology, and Psychology.
It is a type of experience in contemporary methods in science that we should consider essential for our students.

Dartmouth University and the University of Iowa have pioneered a number of computer-based courses including some in the social sciences. The transfer of these instructional techniques to other universities is impeded by the lack of versatility of equipment and of compatible software. Here at U. of O. a vigorous program of applying the computer in Chemistry laboratories is proceeding and has claimed favorable attention.

Whether instructional use of computers should be tied to network facilities or whether it should be served by local computers dedicated in part to this function is a problem not yet solved in general. But we should certainly include consideration of this application in reaching any plan for a state-wide network.

Computer Application to the Libraries

While this area of computer application holds great benefit in coordinating the accessibility to information in our various libraries, it probably does not impose conditions upon the type of network pattern to be recommended. The rapid-turn-around and the interactive modes of operation so important to many research programs are not usually considered to be equally important here. Nevertheless, the explicit consideration of the libraries in relation to a network should be included in the planning for educational and research services.

In summary, our concerns over the network design, and our apprehensions regarding the existing proposal, relate to the likelihood of a degradation of service quality and/or an increase of costs with respect to the service now available at U. of O. with its resident 360-50 and PDP-10. We can conceive of network designs that would retain or place substantial computing facilities at the three major campuses, interconnected for shared capacity, and serving the statewide system. This would preserve local versatility, provide back-up arrangements when component failure occurs, give maximum accessibility, and sustain the important feature of a resident staff of operators and experts at each major center. According to the calculations of some of our experts, the needs of the State could be thus better served for a price that is competitive with the single-center plan and possibly even less in the near future by virtue of retaining the 360-50 and making it a part of the system.

If the single-center plan is followed, we foresee the need for considerably greater expense than has been anticipated in the existing plan if we are to obtain the necessary speed of information transmission that must underly even the present quality of service available to our faculty and students, not to mention the future developments.
I thank you for this opportunity to present my views on the proposed plan for a State Computing Network. I admit to some hesitancy in coming before you. I have no special expertise in computing. Whatever insight I can contribute is based on the experience I have gained in the creation and maintenance of a science department. I have only agreed to appear here because of the urgency with which my colleagues asked that I serve as a spokesman to present their collective views. I do not think I can overstate the depth of their feeling or the demoralization which will occur if this plan is accepted by you and initiated as presently proposed. It is not that we oppose a state network for computing. We are very much in favor of such a plan when properly-conceived. The proposed plan is to us a tragedy because it would damage our present computer capabilities and would cause the State of Oregon to miss opportunities that could be taken advantage of with no greater, and probably a smaller, investment of state funds.

For you to appreciate our point of view I think it is important that I review briefly the recent history of the science departments at the University of Oregon.

As you know, in the 1930's science at the University of Oregon was reduced to a service function and, even after that legislative fiat was rescinded, it remained in rather low estate until about a dozen years ago. At that time Professor Terrell Hill persuaded a small group of scientists to come to Oregon. The premise, or gamble if you will, with which he persuaded them to come was that if one put together a program of instruction and research in the sciences that demanded adherence to the highest standards of quality at every step
then such a program would attract the large resources science programs need and this support would come primarily from outside of Oregon. This premise proved to be true. First this small core of scientists attracted grants to individual investigators, then grants from foundations for programs, gifts from industry, matching funds for instruction, equipment, and for buildings. Thus, the whole program grew. It has been an amazing success story of which we are very proud, and I hope that you too share in this pride, for you played an important role in the authorizations and commitments you made at each stage of our development.

Of particular significance during this development were three large institutional grants made in support of our science programs. In 1964, the National Science Foundation singled out the U. of Oregon science programs and made a $4,000,000 grant in their support as one of the first institutional grants in its "Center of Excellence Awards". In 1967, the National Institutes of Health provided a grant of over $2,000,000 for support of the life sciences in a similar program. Then, in 1969, the National Science Foundation, in a renewal of its original "Center of Excellence Award" made an additional grant of $2,740,000. I call your attention to the fact that the single largest item in the original N.S.F. grant was about $1,000,000 for an I.B.M.-360-50 computer and coupled with this were additional funds for the building to house the computer. This was rather unusual because these awards generally were designed to promote existing areas of strength, and the computing facilities at the U. of Oregon were virtually non-existent prior to this award. However, we had argued, and N.S.F. had agreed, that to attain excellence in the other sciences, we had to have good computing facilities. Furthermore, I would
emphasize the importance of these grants to both instruction and research. The instructional program in computer science at the U. of Oregon only became viable after the acquisition of this computer. And this applies as well to instructional programs in the natural and social sciences where computation is a vital part of the course work.

Again, in the N.S.F. renewal grant in 1969, the single largest item was the PDP-10 computer. Both we and N.S.F. recognized by then that the varied types of scientific activity we were involved in required additional computer capacity as well as more than one type of instrument, in particular one adapted for time sharing was needed. Please note that the N.S.F., which is as cost-conscious as anybody, did not ask us to sell or trade-in our IBM 360-50 in order to purchase the PDP-10. They agreed completely that we needed both computers.

In terms of this history and the grants that the U. of Oregon has received, it is important to keep in mind how the grant system works. Grants do not just materialize out of thin air, nor are they awarded to everybody or to every institution. To be successful in obtaining grant support one has, first of all, to have a program of high quality and, secondly, the individuals involved have to do a lot of hard work preparing the applications and negotiating with the granting agency. Once awarded the grant is technically made to the State Board of Higher Education but, in practice, the overseeing of these grant funds or equipment donations has been given back to the individual or unit responsible for securing the grant. This has been done on the basis that this would be the best way of honoring the intent of the grantor.
In the light of this background let us consider the proposal before you. The chancellor's staff is proposing to sell the U. of Oregon IBM 360-50 computer, an instrument representing an investment of about $1,000,000, for a small fraction of its cost, and use these funds as part of the payment for a new computer in Corvallis. To us this proposed action is a real shocker. Disregarding for the moment that question of the wisdom of such an action in terms of building a state network I would like to focus on the impact that this action is likely to have on the relationship between the granting agencies and the State of Oregon. If the IBM 360-50 had been purchased with state funds, then one might question the wisdom of the action but it would be a case of the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away.

However, to dispose of a $1,000,000 investment without the express approval of the grantor and over the strenuous objections of the grantee is an action of highly dubious ethical character and of disastrous practical consequences. The federal granting agencies have provided millions in support of the sciences in Oregon in the past and, if we continue to maintain an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding with N.S.F. and N.I.H., it is reasonable to expect that this level of support will continue in the future. In fact, a computer network system is exactly the sort of program N.S.F. is currently promoting and it would be very logical to go to N.S.F. to seek support for developing the Oregon computer network. On the other hand, it is my opinion that disposing of the IBM 360-50 as proposed would probably jeopardize the possibility of any future N.S.F. aid to computing in Oregon and might well poison our relationship with N.S.F. in other areas as well.
Turning to the question of why the scientists at the U. of Oregon object to having their IBM 360-50 sold and replaced by a remote terminal to Corvallis, I would like to state flatly that this is in no way a matter of worrying about our prestige, status, or protection of a special interest. The only point that concerns us is how well we could carry out our mission of instruction and research under the proposed plan as compared to what we do now. Although the intensity of feeling varies from one scientist to another, overall and without exception, whether you discuss the situation in physics, biology, chemistry, geology, or molecular biology, it is the common feeling that we would be badly hurt.

Of the many individual situations that might be discussed, let me take just one - that of the x-ray crystallographic laboratory. This laboratory is headed by Dr. Brian Matthews and contains equipment provided by N.I.H. at a cost well over $200,000. It is a very interesting laboratory and I only wish that you could visit it and talk with Dr. Matthews. He and his students have just completed the determination of structure of the enzyme thermolysin. This was a brilliant achievement of which all Oregonians ought to be proud. Matthews has recently stated in a letter written to President Clark that, if our IBM 360-50 is sold and replaced by a remote terminal, he will not be able to continue the type of enzyme structure determination he has been doing. Inasmuch as the x-ray crystallographic laboratory is interdisciplinary in character and is intimately involved in programs in physics, molecular biology, and chemistry, the consequences of any action harmful to the x-ray laboratory would be felt by all of us.

It may be puzzling to hear conflicting testimony as to the adequacy of the computational facilities under the proposed plan. How-
ever, I put it to you that Dr. Matthews is one of the world's foremost x-ray crystallographers and there is no greater authority on the computational needs for doing x-ray crystallography than Dr. Matthews himself. You should not overrule him without seeking outside independent appraisal from someone of a stature comparable to his. Or, at the very least, you should make the new system operational and prove that it meets Matthew's needs before you take away the IBM 360-50 he is now using.

There is much more that I could say about the hardships which this proposed plan would cause to the science departments at the U. of Oregon. However, in view of our limited time, I would like to turn to the second point I made earlier of missed opportunities. To me the proposed plan is very short-sighted because it treats the Oregon State System of Higher Education as though it existed in a vacuum. I have already detailed how the present computing facilities at the U. of Oregon were developed through grants from N.S.F. The interest of the federal government in fostering computer capabilities and network programs is a continuing one. Yet the plan before you does not take into consideration, nor is it well adapted to take advantage of, federal planning and federal resources.

During the past two years I have been Chairman of the Chemistry Division of the National Research Council. This is the operating arm of the National Academy of Sciences and one of its functions is to provide objective review and independent opinion on federal planning and activities in the science area. From my participation in the meetings of this body I know that the federal government is making large commitments for the development of a national computing network, that it expects there will be operational by 1975 some such type of
network, presumably under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. Related to this there is also under consideration the question of establishing a National Center for Computation in Chemistry. The committee charged with this responsibility has completed its study and is drafting its report. It is vitally important for scientists at all the institutions in the state of Oregon that the state network which ultimately results be designed to integrate smoothly with such a national network and that it provide easy access to the National Center for Computation in Chemistry if, and when, such a center becomes a reality.

What I am saying is that now is the time for Oregon to go to the National Science Foundation and discuss with them the idea of a state network, to discuss how such a state network could best integrate with a national network, to ask advice, and finally to seek grant support for development of the State of Oregon network. N.S.F. grant support for Oregon scientists to work on the problems of developing computer networks would be the best way of assuring that we would develop the best system for our needs. To define our system rigidly now without this sort of interaction with the National Science Foundation would most probably lock us out of opportunities that we could otherwise exploit.
Statement on Computer Network to Board of Higher Education on September 26, 1972, by Portland State University President Gregory Wolfe

"Mr. Holmer distributed a plan and budget at the September 12 meeting of the Computer Policy Council. He informed CPC that he would recommend to the Board that network operations be contracted to OSU. The total budget was reduced by the combining of the OSU and the Controller's Office Data Processing staffs and equipments. However, the PSU portion of the budget remained at the $700,000 level. We pointed out that the implementation schedule and budget in the plan for PSU would ensure complete failure of computing services at PSU no later than October 1973. Also, we pointed out that our budget had been reduced below a recovery position for PSU in the event the network fails or is scrapped. We requested to meet with the Vice Chancellor's staff to establish a workable implementation schedule and budget for PSU. This was done. The PSU budget request is now at $933,701 which is $18,000 above the PSU status quo budget and $223,000 above the PSU network budget proposed earlier by the Vice Chancellor's staff.

"Mr. Hölmer has distributed A Network Proposal, which includes an OSSHE Plan for computing and a 1973-75 network budget, for action at this Board meeting. The plan proposes that OSU operate the central network facility and the budget proposes a 6.6 percent increase over the total system status quo budget.

"Some basic issues concerning OSU operation of the Network: The most critical issue here will be the ability of institutions, other than OSU, to compete favorably for new faculty. A new faculty member is much more likely to be attracted to PSU if he has access to a computing service which "belongs" to all OSSHE institutions planned and operated for equitable service to students, faculty and staff of the System. He is likely to seek employment elsewhere, if not at OSU, if he only has access to services provided by another institution.

The second most critical issue here will be that faculty and students, other than those at OSU, will not receive equal and impartial service. Even worse, if in fact they could receive equitable service, it would not be fully accepted as such -- there will be a psychological barrier. This phenomenon has been experienced in colleges and universities across the nation. Computing which started in mathematics departments, engineering departments, business offices, etc., in the 1950's and 1960's has had to be reorganized and moved to neutral ground (management) for this reason. Why should OSSHE repeat this error on the much more complex level of nine institutions? It was devastating enough when at the department and college level.
The third most critical issue will be the conflict between the staffs which will be put together to form the Network staff. OSU and controller staffs must change from competing to a harmonious unified service oriented unit overnight or all who depend on them for service will suffer the consequence and be the losers. I believe the time to form a unified, service-oriented staff by combining existing staffs under the existing management of one institution will take longer and experience many more difficulties than selecting a Network Director and letting him select his staff from existing personnel under his terms, as he finds such personnel suitable. Institutions wholly dependent on the Network for their service cannot afford delay caused by conflicts and set directions which take too long to die out."
STATEMENT TO THE BOARD AT SEPTEMBER 26, 1972, MEETING -- By Dr. Craig A. Hagwire, Professor of Mathematics and Director of the Computer Center, PSU

1. Portland State University has had definitive plans to serve its computing needs for well over five years. These plans have only been partially implemented or delayed for one reason or another. This University cannot continue in this state of delay without seriously jeopardizing the opportunities of its graduating students to compete favorably for employment -- students who are among the best in the state and who have entered from some high schools with better computing services to support their learning needs than they can now receive at Portland State.

2. The plan developed by Portland State University and the consulting firm of Cresap McCormack and Paget in June 1967 has only been partially implemented because of inadequate and outdated computer hardware.

3. The plan for a Computer Consortium for Portland Area Institutions was completed in April 1970, approved and submitted as part of the institution's 1971-73 biennium budget request. The plan included a request for Program Improvement money which was not granted.

4. The University submitted a plan in the spring of 1971 to acquire a used PDP-10 to replace its present equipment and, to bring its computing services to the entire University up to university quality level. This plan was not acted on pending development of an OSSHE plan for computing services.

5. A draft plan was submitted in January of this year to acquire an intermediate scale computer system on bid basis (again possibly a modern used computer) to upgrade services to university quality. At that time, it was stated that we would make a formal request to proceed with the plan if a mutually acceptable State System of Higher Education plan did not come forth by April of this year for implementation to start in 1973-74. The plan included acquisition of a computer with sufficient power to serve the University's present uses on a one shift basis at the present level of funding and would leave three shifts into which University uses could grow at modest cost increase over a six-year period. The plan would allow services to increase from the present level of service to 10% to 15% of our students to the neighborhood of 80% of the students over the next six years. This plan would achieve some form of parity in computing services to Portland State University students and faculty and staff...
6. The acquisition of replacement computing equipment has not had the acceptance that some form of a network has commanded during the past year or so.

7. A network adequately planned, staffed, equipped and funded, managed by a staff equally responsible to and responsive to the students, faculty and administration of all nine institutions offers a lot more hope and possibility than further delay offers, for those institutions woefully lacking in computing services at this time.

Thank you.