

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

July 20, 2000

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

Present: Regents Atkinson, Bagley, Connerly, Davies, Fong, Hopkinson, O. Johnson, S. Johnson, Khachigian, Kohn, Kozberg, Leach, Lee, Miura, Montoya, Moores, Parsky, and Sayles

In attendance: Regents-designate Morrison and Seymour, Faculty Representatives Coleman and Cowan, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Small, Provost King, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Kennedy, Vice Presidents Broome, Drake, Gomes, Gurtner, Hershman, and Saragoza, Chancellors Berdahl, Cicerone, Dynes, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Vice Chancellor Bainton representing Chancellor Bishop, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 10:55 a.m. with Chairman S. Johnson presiding.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Johnson explained that the Board had been convened as a Committee of the Whole in order to permit comment pertaining to issues on the day's agendas and University-related issues that are not on this month's agenda. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the items noted.

1. ***Permanent Lighting at Memorial Stadium, Berkeley Campus***

- A. Mr. Robert Breuer, UC Berkeley neighbor speaking on behalf of the neighbors of Memorial Stadium, reported that the campus proposes the installation of nine coliseum-style towers rising 135 feet above the stadium floor, each of which will have lights measuring 22 feet by 12 feet. The neighbors object to this proposal, particularly given the fact that the lights will be used only a few hours a year. The use of temporary lights as needed should be continued.
  
- B. Ms. Frederica Drotos, speaking in opposition to the proposed stadium lights, discussed the history and architecture of Memorial Stadium, which was built in 1923 to honor the men who died in World War I. Lighting was carefully considered by John Galen Howard when he designed the structure, with a focus on natural lighting. In addition, the installation of the lights is not supported by the architects retained by the campus to study the history of the stadium.

- C. Mr. Michael Kelly, a Berkeley resident, believed that the elegance and beauty of the Berkeley campus would be damaged by the installation of the light towers, which will be visible from many areas of the campus. The lights will provide Fox Television with a more convenient way to broadcast football games one or two times per year.
- D. Dr. Ellen Gunther, a member of the Panoramic Hills Association, urged the campus not to install the light towers, which would be one of the most imposing structures in Berkeley, destroying the intimate setting of the stadium. She suggested that the campus consider the use of the Oakland Coliseum for its football games.

2. ***Underhill Project, Berkeley Campus***

- A. Mr. Kriss Worthington, Berkeley City Councilmember, noted that the Underhill project had originally been approved by The Regents as a site for student housing. The campus administration has decided to concentrate on parking for the Underhill site. He suggested that the Board request the campus to present more constructive compromises.
- B. Mr. Rick Young, a student at Boalt Hall School of Law, reported that the Berkeley campus plans to build a three-story parking structure at the Underhill site to accommodate more than 1,000 cars. The project will also include a playing field, dining commons, and office space. Mr. Young suggested that the lack of parking was not so severe as the campus administration has portrayed it to be. He noted that the plans for the Underhill project are based upon the campus= Long Range Development Plan, which was adopted in 1990. The campus is currently at 76 percent of the housing goal which was stated in the LRDP and 92 percent of the parking goal, which suggests that the campus should concentrate on providing more student housing. In addition, the Underhill project will locate too much parking in a single southside location.

3. ***South of Campus Development, Berkeley***

Ms. Elizabeth O=Malley reported that citizens of Berkeley were unhappy about the announcements by the campus of planned physical expansion, noting that people who reside in Berkeley value their quality of life.

4. ***Health Services Issues***

Ms. Mary Higgins discussed some of the accounting and personnel issues which face the San Francisco campus following the dissolution of the merger with Stanford University.

5. ***Item 402, Committee on Health Services: Update on UCSD's Discussion with Children's Hospital and Health Center Concerning Children's Services***

Ms. Karen MacLeod, a member of the Union of Professional and Technical Employees, explained that she was speaking on behalf of her colleagues at the San Diego campus regarding the proposed sale of UCSD's children's services to Children's Hospital and Health Center, which she characterized as the privatization of public assets. She reported that UPTE and the California Nurses Association would fight any privatization of the workforce, loss of jobs, and non-union jobs.

6. ***Item 203, Committee on Oversight of the Department of Energy Laboratories: Report on Security at the National Laboratories***

Professor Charles Schwartz, Berkeley campus, recalled for the Regents the many years of protest by students, faculty, staff, and alumni who believed that the University of California should not be involved with nuclear weapons. He pointed out that the normal procedure which occurs with regard to renewal of the management contracts is that two years before the contracts are to expire, the President presents the Board with a recommendation that the contracts be continued. He suggested that a debate on the fundamental issues would be in order.

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary