The Regents of the University of California met on the above date at the UCSF–Mission Bay Community Center, San Francisco campus.

Present: Regents Blum, Coombs, De La Peña, Dynes, Gould, Hopkinson, Island, Johnson, Kozberg, Ledesma, Marcus, Moores, Paraskev, Preuss, Ruiz, Schilling, and Schreiner

In attendance: Regents-designate Allen, Brewer, and Bugay, Faculty Representatives Brown and Oakley, Acting Secretary Shaw, Acting General Counsel Blair, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Executive Vice President Darling, Provost Hume, Vice Presidents Broome and Gomes, Chancellors Birgeneau, Bishop, Córdova, Drake, Fox, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Acting Chancellors Abrams and Blumenthal, Provost Alley representing UC Merced, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 9:05 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 matters on the agenda and on University-related matters. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the subjects noted.


Speaking in opposition:

1. The Honorable Cynthia Matthews, Mayor of Santa Cruz, expressed the City’s concerns about the impacts of the University’s growth on water, housing, and transportation. She believed that those concerns had not been addressed and that approval of the EIR should be delayed. She reported that the City is willing to work with the University in an effort to avoid litigation and resolve outstanding issues.

2. Mr. Don Stevens, representing the Coalition for Limiting University Expansion, expressed disappointment in the lack of response to the concerns of the City and the community of Santa Cruz. He believed the EIR was inadequate in its response to major environmental impacts.

3. Mr. Mark Dettle, Director of Public Works for the City of Santa Cruz, commented that the EIR identifies ten off-campus intersections near the University that will operate at
unacceptable levels during peak hours. The LRDP and EIR set no timelines for projected growth or required mitigation.

4. Mr. Bill Kocher, Water Director for the City of Santa Cruz, believed the University’s commitment to water conservation was insufficient, given the gravity of the water situation in Santa Cruz. He asked what the University would be willing to do in terms of phasing if a desalination plant is not approved.

5. Ms. Shelly Errington, a UCSC faculty member, reported that many faculty are in favor of expansion of graduate programs, facilities, and faculty. She noted, however, that although rapid and inadequately planned growth of the student body may bring short-term rewards, it affects teaching and research adversely. She advocated delaying the LRDP approval.

6. Mr. John Aird, a Santa Cruz resident, commented that key environmental impacts on water quality and supply, air quality, housing, and transportation are identified as significant and unavoidable in the EIR.

7. Mr. Greg Larson, Planning Director for the City of Santa Cruz, believed that housing impacts of UCSC’s past and proposed growth had not been analyzed or mitigated adequately. He noted that the campus had failed in its previously stated on-campus housing goals, with a resulting negative impact on the community.

8. Mr. William Friedland, UC Santa Cruz Professor Emeritus, recalled that the University’s failure to mitigate the impacts of the 1988 LRDP in housing and transportation had caused skepticism about the latest LRDP.

Speaking in support:

9. Mr. Paul Mercelin-Sampson supported increasing the student population to the number originally agreed upon with the City in order to ensure that future generations are accommodated.

10. Mr. Dom Siababa, President of UC Santa Cruz Alumni Association, noted that the plan responds to the need for growth and for the State to meet its responsibility to provide access. He believed that the University had been amply attentive to the unique environment of the Santa Cruz region.

11. Mr. Matt Waxman, a UC Santa Cruz graduate who had been a representative on the LRDP committee, observed that the campus planning process will continue after approval of the LRDP and that students will have opportunities to participate in the implementation process.

12. Mr. Mike Isaacson, a UC Santa Cruz professor, believed that the growth proposed by the LRDP was modest at 2 percent a year and acceptable.
University-Related Matters

13. Mr. Joseph Nikson supported the UC Santa Cruz School of Engineering’s adding schools of business and law to form the elements to enable a technological and economic powerhouse for the Monterey Bay region. Co-located professional schools would fuel development of new businesses that can collaborate with academic institutions.

14. Mr. James Strickland believed that all graduate and professional schools belong on the Santa Cruz campus to take advantage of cross-fertilization between faculty and students who can work on regional business development opportunities. Relocating non-professional undergraduate programs to Mountain View would free up assets in Santa Cruz for professional schools and offer a more manageable campus population within current limited resources.

15. Mr. Brent Laab, representing the UC Student Association, believed that action should be focused on drawing more qualified applicants to the University. He advocated reducing international graduate student fees and working through student-initiated outreach programs to solve problems in K-12 that limit diversity in the UC student body.

16. Ms. Cindy Mosqueda, representing the UC Student Association, believed that the Regents should make it a priority in the budget request that is made to the Governor in November to increase funding for student-initiated outreach programs.

17. Mr. Robert Martin, representing the UC Student Association, encouraged the Regents to fund academic preparation at the 2002 level. He believed the programs provide a crucial link to ensuring that students have the information they need to succeed in the UC system.

18. Ms. Sarah Lang, a student representing Toxic Free UC, expressed concern about the environmental and human health impacts from electronics. The group’s concern extends to the impacts of electronic waste that result from the University’s disposal of large numbers of outdated computers. She urged responsible electronics purchasing and recycling.

19. Mr. Murray Morgan suggested that if members of management worked in low-paid jobs they would become more empathetic with regard to those whom they supervise. He suggested capping management salaries at $180,000.

20. Ms. Michelle Tsai urged the Regents to do everything in their power to stop a laboratory proposed to be built in Tracy that would use extensive animal experimentation and develop new biological weapons.

21. Ms. Leila Beckwith, a UCLA professor emeritus, speaking also on behalf of professors Ilan Benjamin and Tami Rossman-Benjamin, stated that they represented a faculty organization that works to promote peace in the Middle East. She expressed concerns about hostility toward and intimidation of Jewish and/or pro-Israel students on California public campuses, fueled by anti-Zionist rhetoric in curricula and campus events. Her
group advocates administrative and faculty review to ensure that course materials and invited speakers represent the full range of scholarly views about Israel and Zionism. It also requests the development of courses to educate students about contemporary anti-Semitism.

22. Mr. Isaac Traynis, a UC Santa Cruz graduate who is a Russian immigrant, spoke of the one-sided political bias against Israel that is injected into classroom discussions. He reported that any attempts to present differing views were stifled.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m.

Attest:

Acting Secretary