

**THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MEETING AS A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

January 20, 2005

The Regents of the University of California met on the above date at UCSF–Laurel Heights, San Francisco.

Present: Regents Anderson, Blum, Bustamante, Connerly, Dynes, Hopkinson, Johnson, Lozano, Marcus, Montoya, Novack, Ornellas, Parsky, Pattiz, Preuss, Ruiz, Sayles, and Wachter

In attendance: Regents-designate Juline, Rominger, and Rosenthal, Faculty Representatives Blumenthal and Brunk, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Russ, Provost Greenwood, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Foley, Gomes, and Gurtner, Chancellors Birgeneau, Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Córdova, Fox, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Laboratory Directors Anastasio and Chu, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 10:40 a.m. with Chairman Parsky presiding.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Parsky explained that the Board had been convened as a Committee of the Whole in order to permit members of the public an opportunity to comment on University-related matters. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the subjects noted.

Committee on Oversight of the Department of Energy Laboratories, Item 202, Status of Competition and Other Matters at the Department of Energy Laboratories

- A. Ms. Loulena Miles, representing TriValley Cares, stated that the goals of the organization were to improve health and safety, increase openness and accountability, and stop plutonium research at the Los Alamos National Laboratory.
- B. Ms. Tara Dorabji, representing TriValley Cares, observed that, due to its status as a nonprofit organization, the University avoids paying fines for lapses in safety at the laboratories. She reported that TriValley Cares has devised a list of criteria for bidders for the Los Alamos laboratory management contract.
- C. Mr. Josh Kearns, speaking on behalf of Ms. Judith Flanigan and Ms. Chelsea Cologne, stated that, as representatives of the Coalition to Demilitarize the University of California, they believed that the University should not bid on the management contract for Los Alamos because weapons-related research is against the University's mission of public service and violates the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. They viewed mismanagement of the laboratories as having damaged the University's reputation. Also, the bid process will be expensive in terms of human resources, which is troubling in a time when the

University's lowest-paid workers are in need of salary increases.

- D. Ms. Loren Moret believed that UC management was corrupt and had mishandled the nuclear weapons laboratories. She was opposed to the University's involvement with the military.
- E. Mr. Gary Gwilliam, an attorney advocating workers' rights, expressed concern about the treatment of DOE laboratory personnel. He observed that women there had been underpaid for years and that laboratory workers were often the victims of discrimination and unfair labor practices.

Committee on Grounds and Buildings, Certification of the Environmental Impact Report and Approval of the 2020 Long Range Development Plan, Berkeley Campus

- F. Ms. Anne Wagley, a Berkeley resident, observed that only 30 percent of the Berkeley campus' budget is State money, and only a portion of that is spent on education. She believed that rather than expanding, the campus should spend more money on support systems for its students.
- G. Mr. Carl Friberg, representing Berkleyans for a Livable University Environment, reported that numerous Berkeley neighborhood groups supported Mayor Bates' decision to fight against implementation of the Long Range Development Plan. He believed that the LRDP is inconsistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education.
- H. Mr. Roger Van Ouytsel, a Berkeley resident representing the Northside Neighborhood Association, believed that approval of the UC Berkeley Long Range Development Plan would harm neighborhoods and the city as a whole. He suggested that the University open a discussion with city leaders with the goal of adopting a policy to "do no harm."

University-related Issues

- I. Mr. Ronald Cruz, representing Affirmative Action By Any Means Necessary, stated that diversity in education was in society's best interest. He objected to Regent Connerly's position on affirmative action and characterized him as standing for white privilege.
- J. Mr. Carlos Feliciano, representing the University of California Student Association, believed that The Regents should provide more funding for academic preparation programs. He stressed the importance of informing the Legislature that such programs would enhance the state's future.
- K. Mr. Steven Alvarez, representing the University of California Associated Students, stated that continuing to follow a formula of increasing student fees without increasing financial aid proportionately would create a financial burden for low-income students.
- L. Ms. Karen Strach, spoke on behalf of Cough Campaign, which is opposed to limiting the faculty's power to adopt policies that prevent the acceptance of tobacco funding for

research.

- M. Ms. Cindy Czerwin, a UC Berkeley graduate student speaking on behalf of Berkeley students Mr. Chris Finn and Mr. George Willcoxon, asked why it was necessary to increase graduate school fees. She believed there had been a lack of openness and information concerning the Regents' decisions concerning professional schools and that increasing the fees would limit accessibility.
- N. Mr. Murray Morgan, a former UC employee, submitted additional background pertaining to his personnel issue.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary