

ASUC SENATE MEETING

October 22, 2008

Ninth Week

This regular meeting of the ASUC Senate was called to order by Krystle Pasco at 7:14 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Ms. Pasco said people should have received an e-mail from Mr. Permaul about the power in the building going off at midnight. Any business they don't take care of would be considered next week under Old Business.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Pasco called for any changes to the minutes from the October 8 meeting.

Ms. Dhar said that the minutes should note that she missed the Advocacy Committee meeting was because of the Hindu holiday, the Hindu New Year. So it was an excused absence.

Mr. Nahabet asked if an absence was excused because of a religious holiday. Ms. Pasco said an absence that was excused didn't count as a Senator being absent. The Senator would be "Present" and the absence would be excused.

Ms. Tran said that on page 64, the minutes refer to "Mr. Tran," and she made the statement.

Ms. Pasco said the Chair would entertain a motion to approve the minutes. It was so moved and seconded by Mr. Mairena and Ms. Tran. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 8, 2008 MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Pasco called for any changes to the minutes from the October 15 meeting.

Ms. Raffi said that the minutes state that she was "Present" and she should be listed under "Legally Present." Also, under Elected Official Announcements, the minutes state that Poetry Night for Breast Cancer Awareness will be held on the 7th floor, but she said it will be held on the 4th of December.

Ms. Rodriguez said that in her Elected Official Announcements, the minutes should say that the dinner Sigma Phi Alpha was holding was to raise scholarship money.

Ms. Pasco called for any other changes to the minutes. A motion to approve was made and seconded by Mr. Tran and Ms. Ude. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 15, 2008 MINUTES, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Pasco referred the following bills to committee:

- SB 95, In Support of Ensorcelled Magazine, to the Finance Committee,
- SB 96, In Support of Israel Liberation Week, to the Finance Committee
- SB 97, In Support of API Education and Languages Now!, to the Finance Committee
- SB 98, In Support of the UFA-UMCG, to the Finance Committee
- SB 99, In Support of the “South Asians and Politics -- Getting Involved in the Political Process,” to the Finance Committee and to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee
- SB 100, In Support of Sigma Alpha Mu, to the Finance Committee
- SB 101, In Support of the Sikh Students Association, to the Finance Committee
- SB 102, In Support of Asian Americans Reaching Out to the Community’s Think Pink for the Cure Benefit, to the Finance Committee
- SB 103, To Select a New ASUC Lawyer, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee
- SB 104, In Support of the Cal Football Team, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee and to the University and External Affairs Committee
- SB 105, In Support of the Cal Literary Arts Magazine, to the Finance Committee
- SB 106, To Amend the By-laws to Clarify Impeachment Procedures, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee
- SB 107, In Support of the Halloween Meeting, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee
- SB 108, In Opposition to Midterms on Election Day, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee and to the University and External Affairs Committee
- SB 109, In Support of Perspective Magazine, to the Finance Committee
- SB 110, In Support of the ASUC Senate, 2008-2009, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee
- SB 111, In Support of the Golden Bears Bridge Club, to the Finance Committee
- SB 112, In Support of the 9th Annual Student Leadership Symposium, to the Finance Committee
- SB 113, In Support of Volunteers for Medical Outreach, to the Finance Committee
- SB 114, In Support of the Berkeley Undergraduate Sociology (BUSA), to the Finance Committee
- SB 115, In Support of the Cultural Association of Peruvian Students at Berkeley (CASP), to the Finance Committee
- SB 116, In Support of the Democratize the Regents! Student Group, to the Finance Committee
- SB 117, To Amend the ASUC Constitution, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee (e-mailed out)

On a point of personal privilege, Ms. Hussain said she turned in a bill to the Secretariat on Tuesday morning. She copied it in the AAVP’s office, the grants room. However, a white streak ran down the page. When she turned it in to the Secretariat, she asked if that would be okay or if she needed to print out a new copy. The person said she didn’t, so she turned it in. However, the bill was not included in the agenda packet. Ms. Hussain said she was sent an e-mail later that day to Ms. Lemus, who said her bill

was unreadable, although Ms. Hussain said she e-mailed the bill to Ms. Lemus the night before. She e-mailed Ms. Lemus back and said it was really important for the bill to come in to this week's agenda packet and Ms. Lemus never responded.

Ms. Hussain said she turned the bill in when it was supposed to be turned in, but it wasn't included. She asked if there was any way to the bill to that week's agenda packet. Ms. Pasco called for any objection to including the bill in this week's agenda packet. A motion to add the bill to the agenda packet was made and seconded by Ms. Hussain and Ms. Raffi. THE MOTION TO ADD SB 117 TO THE AGENDA PACKET, RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE ASUC CONSTITUTION, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. Ms. Hussain said she would e-mail it out.

Roll call was taken for attendance.

MEMBERS LEGALLY PRESENT:

Sheila Chen	Eddie Nahabet	Kifah Shah
Sarah Cho	Christina Oatfield	Will Smelko
Meghana Dhar	Tommy Owens	Lisa Tran
Mary June Flores	Tara Raffi	Obiamaka Ude
Saira Hussain	Claudia Rodriguez	Stephanie Yang
Oscar Mairena	Lyell Sakaue	Yishi Zuo
John Moghtader		

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Tu Tran

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (Oct. 29)

Ms. Pasco called for any changes to the agenda for next week. Mr. Mairena said that Special Committee Reports did not include a report from the Selection Committee for the Disability Accommodation Fund Director. That Committee was comprised of himself, Ms. Rodriguez, Mr. Smelko, Ms. Cho, and Ms. Shah.

Mr. Mairena said he was sorry about the Special Order that was canceled last week and said it was again being canceled again that week. They were pushing it to next week. He moved to add a Special Order on disability accommodation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Raffi. THE MOTION TO HEAR A SPECIAL ORDER NEXT WEEK ON DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Pasco called for any other changes to the agenda, and seeing none, called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded by Mr. Mairena and Ms. Tran. THE AGENDA FOR THE OCTOBER 29 MEETING WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES TO THE ASUC

Report from the Chancellor's Designee

Mr. Poullard said he wanted to introduce them to his new liaison, Felby Chen, who will work with him over the course of the year. She had an interest in the field of Student Affairs, which was why she was his liaison. Ms. F. Chen will work on two new projects. One will be a project for careers in student affairs and the other project will be on student leaders, looking at student-leader organizations and individuals doing phenomenal work on campus and in the community. People will receive a spotlight in the Daily Cal and also receive funding to continue their work on the campus to do more work for students. He would ask Ms. F. Chen to say a few words.

Ms. F. Chen said she's a second-year at Cal and was majoring in English. The reason she got so into student affairs was because she worked for Mr. Permaul and started talking to Mr. Poullard, and they just talked her into it.

Mr. Poullard said he wanted to talk about the Interfaith Action initiative. They worked with a foundation that provides grant dollars to organizations doing faith-based work. They applied for a grant of \$78,000 to hire a half-time coordinator to work with all faith-based organizations, to help with leadership issues with those communities, and to be a liaison with them. Mr. Poullard said he was happy to say they got \$60,000.

Mr. Poullard said he's been working with Auxiliary Director Permaul to cover the liability for student groups who work at all athletic events, although Millicent Morris-Chaney should get most of the credit for this. Coverage will be paid for out of the fund that was set up for this year. So students won't have to pay the liability coverage to work at those events, and could just work there and raise funds for their organizations.

Mr. Poullard said he found that it only costs \$2,000 to provide this coverage. So the big question was why their friend, Sydesco, was not willing to fork over \$2,000 to cover the students who work at events. That was a whole other issue. He called for any questions.

Report from the UCPD Representative

Sgt. Tucker said he was glad to talk to them dressed more casually than usual, and he didn't often get to wear jeans to work. It was Breast Cancer Awareness Month, and for a small donation, he got to wear the ribbon and the jeans on Wednesday.

Sgt. Tucker said he would hand out Crime Alerts, and unfortunately, he had several of them. He'd leave the details for them to read on their own. A series of robberies and attempted robberies occurred on October 21. All appeared to be without weapons, and only one of those three was actually successful, although in at least two of them, the victims did suffer some minor injury.

Sgt. Tucker said that on the last page of the handout, he included a copy of the University's press release regarding a story that was on the news wires, the arrest of two suspects for a Clark Kerr robbery. The UCPD was glad to bring the situation to a resolution, but sad because they believe the people responsible are students. They're also hopeful that this will be an opportunity for them not just to look at ongoing safety and security issues on campus, but to also open the door on some issues having to do with civility, racial tension, and communities on campus getting along. There was obviously work to be done. The University was taking steps to address some of those issues that occurred in part of this scenario. The UCPD hoped to be an important part of that process.

Sgt. Tucker said there was one other arrest that happened in the last week. Last Thursday evening Berkeley police arrested a robbery suspect they believe is a suspect to the robberies that have been occurring on the west and north sides of campus. They recovered a firearm and their investigation was ongoing. He just wanted to share that with them.

Also, apparently the fraternity at 2345 College had a tough incident. They reported a man with a gun on Friday, the 17th, at about 1 a.m. BP and UCPD officers arrived and arrested someone for possession of firearm that was unloaded. However, they returned on the 18th when someone at the house discovered another firearm that may or may not have been related. It's possible the person had two or that there was a second person. City police made the initial arrest and was following up on that.

Sgt. Tucker said that on Sunday at about 6 a.m., at Unit 1, Christian Hall, UCPD officers responded to a report of a person causing a disturbance. It turned out that someone was a little intoxicated and confused, happened to be in the wrong building, thought he was in his own building, forced his way into what he thought was his own room, and told the people there that they should leave. He wasn't very lucid and wasn't listening to reason and was arrested, unfortunately. That was another alcohol-related problem, a little on the humorous side, although the people inside the room probably weren't laughing, and he would have been scared out of his socks.

Sgt. Tucker said that one other thing to mention was the UCPD-Student Forum. It occurred upstairs that day from 4:00 to 6 o'clock. It was a productive dialogue, in his opinion. He co-moderated with Itamar Haritan. They talked about a number of things, about the UCPD, alcohol enforcement, differences between the Berkeley Police Department and the UCPD, and several other things. Mr. Haritan could tell the Senate more. They talked about the issue of UCPD perceptions of African-American students on the campus. They didn't really get to dive into that too much, unfortunately, although he knew they were going to revisit that. Pres. Winston was there and she broached that subject. She wasn't able to make the first part of the meeting, but did represent that discussion. So they started to talk about it, and they'll talk about it some more.

Following up on Lt. Wing's conversation and the forum that happened a couple of weeks ago, Sgt. Tucker said they're going to have another forum. They've already settled on the date, November 12, from 4:00 to 6 p.m. Hopefully they'll get more people there. Again, they'll talk about a range of things, topics that were important to students. He called for any questions.

Ms. Cho asked where the Forum will be held. Sgt. Tucker said he'll work with Mr. Haritan to identify a location. Upstairs would work fine, and last semester they held them in classrooms.

Report from the ASUC Store Operations Board

Mr. Permaul said he had a few notes before he started. First, for the first time in 29 years, the women's volleyball team defeated Stanford at Palo Alto. That was so long ago that he was a student. So it was a tremendous victory for the women's volleyball team. When the Cardinal come to visit Berkeley, he hoped that students will go out and support the women's intercollegiate athletic program.

Secondly, if they saw *The Chronicle* that day, in the Commentary section, there was a story about Sather Gate, and the fact that the University was spending \$1.5 million to restore Sather Gate. The work was going on at that time, and the scaffolding was up. What most people didn't know about that story was that it was a result of a student group, Rally Comm., that initiated that project. Students wrote a letter to the campus landscape architect and pointed out that when they were doing work on Sather Gate during Big Game Week, they discovered the Gate was falling apart and it looked as if it needed to be reinforced. Everywhere they put their hands on it, to put lights on it, it fragmented and disintegrated. Mr. Permaul said that letter resulted in a study by the University that resulted in a \$1.5 million renovation. This was just another example of what students could do that could cause change on the campus.

Regarding building hours and security throughout Eshleman Hall and MLK, Jr. Union, The Auxiliary was contacted by the UCPD, and a meeting will be established to sit down and look at alternatives to manage the costs for security changes to lock the building. If anyone was interested in attending that meeting when they talk with the UCPD about building safety, he would ask them to please let him know and he'll be happy to try and arrange it so it could accommodate their schedule.

Regarding the timeframe for repairing Eshleman security cameras, that morning their IT Manager David Fullmer and the UCPD did a walk-through of the building to assess the condition of the cameras. They are now looking to obtain an estimate from the UCPD to make the system functional and report the images to the campus police department. Once an upgrade is made, the system had to comply with campus policy. The ASUC's cameras currently record activity in the building but don't send those images to the Police Department. The ASUC will now have to comply with campus policy and send those images to the PD. That's what made it a very expensive project. He'll get back to the Senate about this as well.

Mr. Permaul said the next updates were from the Store Operations Board. Regarding The Scholar's Work Station, he and Associate Director Spivey met with representatives of Follett and the campus Capital Program to discuss the plans to relocate technology sales to the current location of the Convenience Store. The meeting was effective in identifying the process to advance the project, and to surface concepts and proposals for changes to that area of the Cal Student Store. One concept that emerged was possible additional space for the Pub, which he'd discuss next.

They had a meeting with the Pub vendor, who also owns Jupiter and Triple Rock Brewery. Mr. Permaul said he and Mr. Spivey met with the owner to discuss revised plans to renovate the Pub. They focused on new bathrooms that would accommodate more patrons and would address the issue of single-occupancy restrooms that have led to vandalism and damage to the current facilities. They obtained support in concept from the campus to expand the restroom facilities out under the staircase that comes from the deck of the Union to the Student Union Plaza, at the entrance of the Bear's Lair Food Court. In addition, they discussed the impact the Seismic Renovation Project for the Union and what impact that will have on the Pub. The Pub will be closed during the summer of 2009 while renovations go on in that area, as will the Bear's Lair Food Court. During that time there will be a reconstruction of the fireplace, a gift of the Class of 1910. This fireplace, immediately to the left, was given to commemorate the first student lounge and pub located in Old North Hall. The students in the Class of 1910 wanted to commemorate that experience.

So when the new Student Union was built in 1960, they had that fireplace put in. It will be completely restored as part of the cost of the seismic work, since that whole area had to be torn down.

In addition, Mr. Permaul said they wanted to capture some space for the Pub to put in an upstairs office and a cold storage area in the rear of what is now the Convenience Store. He's written to Follett asking whether or not they would be willing to yield the space to the Pub, either for financial considerations or for a change in assignment of the space. Mr. Permaul said they found out from the campus that the seismic project could put a doorway there. So it looked like they'll be able to expand that area, which should make the Pub much more effective and facile in its business operations.

Finally, they're looking at expanding the Pub itself, out into the lower Plaza, to create a Jupiter-like environment. It will be a very nice place. It would expand Pub seating and would also create a new kind of outdoor garden area for people. As he gets more information about this, he'd share it with the Senate. What was most exciting about this was that the Pub was moving along.

Regarding Campus Link, Mr. Permaul said he and Mr. Spivey met with Campus Link that past week. They came forward with a new proposal that will include plasma screen monitors, a content management system, advertising the Student Union complex and other areas of interest to the Auxiliary. They're assessing the capacity to meet this new goal, but they made it very clear to Campus Link that its past performance was totally unacceptable and that the Auxiliary would not approve the extension of the contract unless they could prove to the Auxiliary that they would be reliable tenants.

The Auxiliary is checking on Campus Link's new location, a major expansion at the UCLA Union. Campus Link has also made an extension at San Diego State and Long Beach State. And the Auxiliary will check other locations, not just those hand picked by Campus Link, to check on whether or not they're doing a good job. There are also other vendors who are interested in putting in a plasma screen system, and the Auxiliary wanted to make sure they get the best deal before moving forward with this.

Regarding the Naia Gelateria and Lounge, they're scheduling a meeting with Naia to follow through with the direction given to them by the Store Operations Board.

Regarding the Brazil Café, Mr. Permaul said they showed the campus Capital Program representatives the new location for the Brazil Café kiosk, on the roof of the Pub at the south end of the Student Union deck. The Auxiliary has already obtained approval from the Pub vendor to consider this option. If there was space in the Bear's Lair Food Court, the Pub would consider partnering with the Brazil Café to offer a joint venue out of the pub and the restaurant. But they don't have the space in the Bear's Lair Food Court, so that wasn't an option.

Regarding Amanda's, at the request of Sen. Oatfield, a meeting was scheduled last Friday with Amada's restaurant, and they had a walk-through of the Student Union. Sen. Oatfield joined with Associated Director Spivey and the owner of Amanda's. Unfortunately, Amanda's is a small business owner who could not make the investment into the Student Union infrastructure needed to bring her business here. In her world, those would be landlord improvements. At the ASUC, they work with their vendors for those vendors to make physical improvements, as the Pub, Follett, Tully's, Panda, Kaplan and even CUBS were doing. The Auxiliary does not have the funding to make such improvements. Perhaps sometime in the future, when the ASUC generated significant cash flow, it will be in a position to do that for specific vendors like Amanda's. But they'd certainly expect national vendors to be able to pay for their own improvements.

Regarding the emergency electrical shutdown, the EVP has already reminded the Senate of that. He would congratulate Sen. Owens on his efforts to end meetings earlier by having the campus shut the building down. The servers will go out at 11:00, so all student groups should get their computers shut down by that time.

Regarding AirBears, some of them know that AirBears has been having trouble in Eshleman, and some student groups have been complaining about it. The campus has determined that the current generation of cell phones is automatically pulling IP addresses from buildings using AirBears and causing the campus system to crash. Eshleman is one of nine zones on the campus, but unfortunately, there is no timetable for the restoration of the service. Complaints about the loss of Internet connectivity due to AirBears issues should be directed to the campus and not to the Auxiliary IT manager, David Fullmer. People with these problems should go to AirBears.berkeley.edu or call 642-9053.

Regarding EH&S compliance, last year the Student Union complex had eight hazardous materials deficiencies identified in the annual review by EH&S. This year they recently received, after the current review, a complete bill of health, and did not have a single deficiency. Their operations staff accomplished that goal, and he thought it was noteworthy since student government likes to take the high road and a principled position on issues of sustainability, working conditions, and environment.

Mr. Permaul said his last comments that evening were philosophic in nature and relate to his responsibilities as the advisor to student government. He wanted to speak to the issue of political polemics in student affairs and activities. In recent weeks both he and the Dean have spoken about the need for civility in the political arena of student government. But as they can see on the national political stage, the need for civility and honesty was needed at all levels of our society. If they believe that their causes were honorable, then confrontation was rarely an effective means of educating, communicating, or resolving differences. Confrontation achieved publicity and was a tactic in warfare, but it rarely had much to do with resolution. Instead, it often has more to do with imposition -- that is, trying to force one's opinion on others.

In his Rhetoric class that past two weeks they've been looking at the PBS production of "Eyes on the Prize," the struggle for civil rights in America from 1952-1972. They have recently focused on the Bus Boycott and the integration at Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas. What distinguished the lunch counter sit-ins, the boycott of the buses, and the integration efforts at Central High School, and what made these moments of high historical drama and memory, was how effectively the leaders and followers made their case without violence, confrontation, or dishonesty. They would not adopt the tactics of the opposition. They prevailed and became part of the fabric of history, rather than just another sad anecdote. There may be times when confrontation and polemics are needed, and he wasn't so naive as to think otherwise. But that was rarely the case in settings of civil discourse, where learning and understanding are the goals, and where there was so much opportunity to achieve those goals. He would leave them with that thought. He called for any questions.

Ms. Shah asked what locations were being projected for plasma screens. Mr. Permaul said one would be in the Eshleman lobby, right by the elevators. They hope to have a 60-inch monitor right next to the MCC, where the new coffee shop will be, focusing on the history of student life. It will be like the Free Speech Café, with a much bigger screen. It will provide an historical look at student life at Berkeley. Screens will also face out onto the Plaza, from the Cal Student Store, so students could go by and see information there. They also hope to have a screen in the Cesar Chavez center. Rec Sports has

approached the Auxiliary with a desire for one, and the Summer Session office, at the Golden Bear center, on University Ave., has asked for a screen. There is also a SUPERB showcase in the foyer of Wheeler Auditorium, where screens could be placed.

Once they're up, they'll see how effective they are. They can take RSS feeds from the student calendar and also put people's posters up. He showed staff that day some examples of how this was used at Washington State to advertise their student events. It was spectacular. There are all kinds of things CalTV wanted to do. There would be a wide variety of content. People running for political office could do interviews that could be shown around campus, students on the Plaza could give their opinions, there could be all kinds of content. The Daily Cal could put its front-page headlines on them. They hope to get some real substantive news content, something like BBC, to show in the Bear's Lair Food Court. They're looking forward a variety of different types of material, and they would welcome input from student government on the type of material they'd like to see.

Ms. Shah asked if there will be advertising for Auxiliary vendors. Mr. Permaul said there could be. They could do advertising, which would probably underwrite the cost of this effort. And they would control that. They'd have an advisory board to make sure content was appropriate. When the Auxiliary originally started this project, they agreed that students would help drive the content. So a student board will help them to make sure the content was student centered.

Mr. Moghtader asked if donations to ASUC-sponsoring groups are tax deductible, and if so, if there was a tax ID number. Mr. Permaul said they do have tax ID numbers that people could get through Millicent Morris-Chaney, on the 4th floor. Donations can be made through the ASUC, to student groups. Otherwise, they couldn't be made. They had to go through the ASUC to the student groups. They're processed by the Auxiliary.

Ms. Raffi said that in addition to creating a venue like Jupiter's downtown, she asked if there was also a possibility of having food and the type of service at Jupiter. She asked if that is what was intended. Mr. Permaul said it was. What was so nice about Jupiter is that it has a higher quality of food. That's what they're hoping to bring to the Pub as well.

Ms. Ude asked about the meeting with Naia, and asked what the issue was. Mr. Permaul said the SOB suggested that they ask Naia, since it was technically in violation of its contract by not opening up to service, to make the lounge available for student groups to use under the supervision of the Auxiliary, with building managers, so students could use the facility and it wouldn't just sit their closed and empty.

Begin written report from Auxiliary Director Permaul

October 22, 2008

ASUC Senate: Auxiliary Director
Store Operations Board Report

The next meeting of the Store Operations Board is November. As soon as the Chair establishes a date, I will let you know.

Written report from ASUC Auxiliary Director Permaul (cont'd)

I have updates for you on issues relating to the business enterprises and services of the ASUC and the Auxiliary:

1. Building Hours and Security for Eshleman Hall and MLK, Jr. Union:

The Auxiliary was contacted by UCPD and a meeting will be established to sit down and go over options for managing the costs of security changes in both MLK, Jr. Union and Eshleman. If anyone is interested in attending that meeting, please let me know and I will try to accommodate your schedule as we plan the meeting.

Time Frame for Repairing Cameras:

This a.m. IT and Technology Mgr. David Fullmer met with UCPD and did a walk-through of the building to assess the condition of the cameras. We are now looking to obtain an estimate from UCPD to make the system function, and report images in to the campus police department per campus policy regarding replacement and upgrade of camera systems.

2. ASUC Store Operations Board Meeting:

The Scholar's Work Station:

Myself and Associate Director Spivey, met with representatives of Follett and the campus Capital Programs to discuss the plans to relocate technology sales into the current location of the Convenience Store. The meeting was effective in identifying the process needed to advance the project, and to surface some concepts and proposals for changes to that area of the Cal Student Store. One concept that emerged was possible additional space for the Pub, which I will discuss in the Pub entry.

Meeting with Pub Vendor:

The owner of Jupiter's and Triple Rock Brewery, who is our vendor at the Bear's Lair Pub, met with myself and Tom Spivey to discuss revised plans for renovation of the Pub. We focused on new bathrooms that would accommodate more patrons and address the issue of single occupant restrooms that have led to vandalism and damage of the current facilities. We obtained support in concept from the campus to expand the restroom facilities out under the staircase that comes from the deck of the Union to Student Union Plaza at the entrance of the Bear's Lair Food Court. In addition, we discussed the impact the Seismic Renovation Project for the Union will have on the Pub. Since the Pub will be closed during the summer of 2009 while renovations go in that that area, as well as in the Bear's Lair Food Court, the result will be a reconstruction of the Fireplace that was a gift of the Class of 1910, as well as possible introduction of a door, office space, and cold storage at the rear of what is now the Convenience Store, in back room/storage space. We will be developing drawing with the Pub that propose an expansion of their space in a manner that would not undermine future development of Lower Sproul. Our goal remains to complement the Pub, named on Sport's Illustrated's list of top five college pubs in the nation, and top twenty-five bars in the nation, with an eating venue much like Jupiter's in downtown Berkeley.

Written report from ASUC Auxiliary Director Permaul (cont'd)

Campus Link:

Tom and I met with Campuslink this past week. They came forward with a new proposal that would include plasma screen monitors and a content management system and advertising for the Student Union complex and other locations of interest to the Auxiliary. We are assessing their capacity to meet this new bold initiative, and made it clear to them that their past performance was unacceptable. Before we move forward, we will check their installations at other locations, and references from those locations. We have other possible vendor options, and we want to move forward before the end of this academic year.

Naia Gelateria & Lounge:

We are scheduling a meeting with Naia to follow through with the direction given to us by the Store Operations Board.

5. Brazil Cafe:

We showed the campus Capital Program representatives the new location for the Brazil Café kiosk, on the roof of the Pub and south end of the Student Union deck. We had already obtained approval from the Pub vendor to consider this option. Indeed, if there were space in the Bear's Lair Food Court, the Pub would consider partnering with the Brazil Café to offer a joint venue out the pub and the restaurant.

6. Amanda's:

At the request of Senator Oatfield, we scheduled a meeting with Amada's restaurant to walk through the Student Union. Senator Oatfield joined with Associated Director Spivey and the owner of Amanda's. Unfortunately, Amanda's as a small business owner was not prepared to make the kind of investment into the student union infrastructure that would be needed to bring her business here. In her world, those are not tenant improvements, but landlord improvements. Here at the ASUC, we are working with our vendors to make physical improvements, as the Pub, Follett, Tully's, Panda, Kaplan and even CUBS will be doing, because we do not have the funding to make such improvements. Perhaps sometime in the future, when the ASUC has generated significant cash flow, it will be in a position to do that for specific vendors. We would certainly expect national vendors to be able to pay for such improvements.

7. Emergency Electrical Shutdown tomorrow morning:

As my e-mail to you this afternoon indicated, there will be a complete electrical shutdown of the building beginning at Midnight, and carrying through until 6:00 a.m. Computers should be shut down in the building at 11:00 p.m. when the servers will be powered down, and they will not be available again until 7:30 a.m. tomorrow.

8. Loss of AirBears Signal in Eshleman and MLK, Jr. Union:

Written report from ASUC Auxiliary Director Permaul (cont'd)

The campus has determined that the current generation of cell phones is automatically pulling IP addresses from buildings using Air Bears, and causing the campus system to crash. We are one of nine zones on the campus, but unfortunately, there is no timetable for the restoration of the service. Complaints about the loss of Internet connectivity due to AirBears issues should be directed to the campus, and not to the Auxiliary IT manager, David Fullmer. People with these problems should go to AirBears.berkeley.edu or call 642-9053.

9. EH & S Compliance:

Last year, the Student Union complex had eight hazardous materials deficiencies identified in the annual review. This year, we recently received after the current review a complete bill of health, and did not have a single deficiency. Your operations staff accomplished that goal, and I think it is noteworthy since student government likes to take the high road, and a principled position on issues of sustainability, working conditions, and environment.

10. Political Climate:

As the advisor to student government, I want to speak to the issue of political polemics in student affairs and activities. In recent weeks both the Dean and I have spoken about the need for civility in the political arena of student government, but as we can see on the national political stage, the need for civility and honesty is needed at all levels of our society. If we believe that our causes are honorable, then confrontation is rarely an effective means of educating, communicating or resolving differences. Confrontation achieves publicity and is a tactic in warfare, but it rarely has much to do with resolution. Instead, it often has more to do with imposition -- that is, trying to force one's opinion or beliefs on others. In my Rhetoric Class this past two weeks, we've been looking at the PBS production of "Eyes on the Prize", the struggle for Civil Rights in America from 1952-1972. We recently focused on the Bus Boycott and integration at Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas. What distinguished the lunch counter sit-ins, the boycott of the buses, and the integration effort at Central High School, and made them moments of high historical drama and memory, was how effectively the leaders and followers made their case without violence, confrontation, or dishonesty. They would not adopt the tactics of the opposition. And they prevailed, and became part of the fabric of history, rather than just another sad anecdote. There may be times when confrontation and polemics are needed, but rarely in settings of civil discourse where learning and understanding are the goals, and where there is so much opportunity to achieve those goals. I leave you with that thought, and hope it resonates with you.

Please feel free to send me an e-mail to ask follow up questions. Of course, you are always welcome to write me, or visit during my office hours (Thursdays from 2:30 to 3:30 p.m.), or to schedule a time that would be convenient to you.

Submitted by: Andean Permaul, Director of the ASUC Auxiliary

End written report from Auxiliary Director Permaul

Elected Official Announcements

Ms. Rodriguez she made an announcement last week about putting together a resource workshop in November, and only one Senator responded. If they had time, it would only take a short planning meeting. Possible dates were November 4 and 18.

Ms. Dhar said that one of her friends, Dristan Lombard, couldn't be there himself, so she was making this announcement for him. He wanted the ASUC to get involved with Berkeley Project Day, a really big event with a lot of great service. She thought Senators should try and go out to it. Sign ups were until October 29, next Wednesday. He also really wanted to encourage everybody to tell their interns to get involved. It was a really good way to give directly back to the community. She would ask people and their groups to try and support this event.

On a different note, Ms. Dhar said that next week was South Asian Awareness Week, being held by Indus. She was bringing this up because they're trying to get a lot of people out to learn about South Asian culture. This wasn't just catered to the South Asian community. There will be performances on Sproul and she would encourage people to check it out. It will be all week. On Friday evening there will be a showcase.

Ms. Flores said this was not only Breast Cancer Awareness Month, but also Filipino Heritage History Month. Filipino organizations and the Filipino community on campus and off-campus were having events. Thursday will be Maganda open mic. Maganda is a literary arts and performance magazine. If people have any poetry, spoken word, or poetry slam technique, the event will be on October 28 at 210 Wheeler at 7 p.m. Next week, on Tuesday, Gabriela Network, a women's solidarity group, will host a day of Filipino culture to commemorate and celebrate Filipino achievements and contributions to the arts and society. There will be a guest speaker, an attorney, Juliette Sarmiento. There will also be entertainment, performers, as well as a chocolate buffet.

Ms. Shah said she sent out an e-mail about the campus food drive, so if people didn't have five cans of food, she could get it from them later on. Also, she interns at Malcolm X and was bringing an event there, including films about shot hip-hop and about Palestinian hip-hop that's rising in Israel and occupied territories. A big hip-hop group, Sam, was coming on Friday. If people were interested in hip-hop Palestinians from Lid, in Israel, also known as Tel Aviv. This was a unity event and a discussion of the 11,000 political prisoners held within Israel who are Palestinian, along with the SF-Eight and Mumia Jamal.

Mr. Mairena said he would like to invite everyone to the Latin American Students Association Culture Show on Thursday night. They were there last week for an allocation. He would invite Senators to support them. It will be on Thursday at 6 p.m. in the Multicultural Center, inside Heller Lounge. There will be food and performances. He hoped to see people there.

Ms. Hussain the Coalition for Peace Not Prejudice was back again that year. It will be held November 17-21, and the theme that year was "Shattering the Stereotype." If people were interested in getting involved, they could send an e-mail to calpnp@gmail.com. She would encourage all of them to come out and participate in this event.

Mr. Owens said that next week, on Tuesday, they will discuss Immediate Consideration. He read the following:

Begin announcement by Mr. Owens

Thanks to Senators Cho/Rodriguez, only had 3/11 people show up
Please come next week: Tuesday @ 9 (Immediate Consideration), June Jordan

Introductory Remarks about the MLWG before we get into the minutes and what we agreed or did not agree upon.

1. Meetings are lasting too long
 - a. It's only October
 - b. Shouldn't be having 13 hour meetings this early
 - c. It's a bad precedent
2. Announcements/special orders: we need to get the ball rolling, we were able to begin Immediate Consideration at 9 pm so far – 2 weeks
 - a. My personal goal: is 10 pm. 3 hours of announcements is enough
3. Immediate consideration: we don't talk too much, but because we don't talk/ communicate enough
4. We're a better Senate than this, than 7 am meetings

End announcement by Mr. Owens

Begin Meeting Length Work Group minutes

MLWG Minutes
October 21, 2008
8-9:30

Special Orders

- Krystle/Salma should indicate how much time is left
- Please email them the before Wednesday
- Automatic discussion: 45, 30, 20
- Questions: try to be relevant

Elected Officials Announcement

- No angry EOAs: take a deep breath
- No debating with EOAs
- If you can talk off the floor, do it
- Just pass around flyers, email announcements to the Senate – doesn't need to be read into minutes.

Meeting Length Work Group minutes (cont'd)

The Executives

- Speak once every two weeks?
 - Idea not well received
- I will discuss this with the executives personally
- We'd like them to keep their announcements relevant (no health issues, midterms, new interns – just the basic report).

Pre-IC Recess

- Talk to Krystle
- 20 minutes – get food, stretch, talk to each other about bills
- Senate Tradition

3-2-1

- Time check w/ Krystle

Guest Announcements

- Refrain from yielding to audience member
- If must, motion to go into guest announcements

Miscellaneous

- No laptops during meetings
- Time limits on discussion of bills or topics
- Stick to increments of \$100 or more for financial bills
- Reduce amount of time executives have to speak
- Vote with conscience, not with party

End Begin Meeting Length Work Group minutes

Mr. Owens said a couple of weeks ago they were able to get to IC at 9 p.m., so they only had a couple of hours of announcements and Special Orders. He thought the three people who were at the MLWG meeting basically came to the consensus that the reason meetings last so long was not because people talk too much, but because they're not talking enough. Mr. Owens said at that point he now knew all 19 of them personally, and thought this Senate was better than this.

Mr. Owens said they came up with a recommendation that someone should indicate how much time was left in a Special Order so speakers get going. They also recommended that perhaps automatic discussion could be used on Special Orders and that maybe not every Special Order was necessary. People could send out information by e-mail, or do something else. For Elected Official Announcements, the Work Group recommended not having angry announcements. People should take a deep breath. When it's 5:00 or 6 a.m. and they're all tired and pissed off, it was tempting to be angry in an announcement. But people should basically take a deep breath. They also thought they shouldn't debate during Elected Official Announcements. That wasn't the place for it. If people could talk off the floor, he would ask them to please do so.

For Executive Officer reports, Mr. Owens said he broached the possibility of Executives reporting once every two weeks. That idea was not well received. He understood that. He will discuss when they come to a consensus next week about IC what the Executives should be doing. Personally, we'd like to keep announcements relevant, so that would mean not having discussion about Executives' health issues or midterm or new people in their office, and to just keep their reports to the basic facts.

Mr. Owens said they would also like to inaugurate a tradition of a 20-minute recess before Immediate Consideration so people weren't sitting there, thinking they had to go from thing to thing, and also so individuals wouldn't each take four or five minutes to get food.

Regarding Sen. Nahabet's point of 3-2-1, the Work Group would like the Chair to do a time check every one minute. So a motion to extend speaking time could be made for three minutes, then two, and then one minute, with the Chair giving time checks. As for Guest Announcements, he would ask people to please refrain from yielding to another member unless it was absolute necessary. If they really wanted to say something, they could move back to EOA.

Mr. Owens said he had a few miscellaneous things that people e-mailed to him, for which he'd thank them. There was the idea of not having laptops during meetings; having time limits for discussion on bills or various topics; sticking to increments of \$100 or more for financial bills; reducing the amount of time Execs had to speak; and voting with one's conscience, and not with their party. Mr. Owens said he wanted to thank them.

Standing Committee Reports

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Ms. Dhar said they discussed replenishing the Senate Contingency Fund, and Sen. Moghtader will take care of that. In terms of Old Business, SB 82 passed, for \$300; SB 51 passed with amendments. There were two waivers were approved, one for the Muslim Student Association and the second for Raza. SB 82 passed for \$300; SBs 85, 86, and 87 were passed, replenishments of Grant funds; SB 88 passed, \$500; SB 89 passed, \$650; SB 90, \$350; SB 93 passed; SB 91 passed, for \$550; SB 92 passed, for \$650; SB 94 passed. All members were present at the final roll call except for Finance Officer Chaney, EVP Pasco, and Pres. Winston.

Ms. Hussain moved to amend the waiver for the Muslim Student Association, since it wasn't for food, but for Pauley Ballroom. The motion was seconded by Mr. Owens. **THE MOTION TO AMEND THE FI-COMM REPORT TO SHOW THE MSA WAIVER TO BE FOR PAULEY BALLROOM, NOT FOR FOOD, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Begin written report from the Finance Committee

ASUC Standing Committee on Finance
Fall 2008 Session – week 8
Monday, October 20, 2008
9:00 pm, Senate Chambers, Eshleman Hall

Written report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

Chair: Senator John Moghtader | Vice Chair: Senator Meghana Dhar

Voting Members: Senators Chen, Cho, Dhar, Flores, Moghtader, Rodriguez, and Sakaue

Non-Voting Members: President Winston, EVP Pasco, Finance Officer Chaney

Approval of the Minutes from October 13, 2008 - Approved

Approval of the Agenda for October 20, 2008

Roll Call: All present but Pres Winston, Nathaniel Chaney

Committee Business

Senator Moghtader will draft a bill to replenish Senate Contingency fund this week

Old Business

SB82 - International Medical Relief: Amendment: \$300. Passed

SB 61- FSBC: Amendment: add Dhar, Flores as cosponsors. Amendment: Facility Usage → 900
Amendment: Total → \$2,345. Amendment: \$400. Passed

New Business

Waivers

Muslim Students Association - \$625. Pauley Ballroom. Passed

Raza - \$625. Passed

Appointments

SAO - Both approved

Bills

SB 82: Amended - \$300. Passed

SB85 - Education Enhance Fund: Passed.

SB86 - Public Service Fund: Amendment: Undergraduate applicant can apply for Up to \$750 per event. Passed

SB87 - Multicultural Fund: Passed

SB88 - Berkeley Review of Education (BRE): Amendment: Flores and Cho and cosponsors.
Amendment: \$550. Passed

Written report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

SB89 - Delta Dance-A-Thon: Amendment: Add Cho, Shen, Rodriguez, Flores as cosponsors.
Amendment: \$600. Passed

SB90 - Regents' and Chancellor's scholars Association: Amendment: \$350. Passed

SB 93: Passed

SB91 - UMA's "Cal Got Talent": Amendment: \$550. Amendment: Hussain, Rodriguez as
cosponsors. Passed

SB92 - SigEp's Pumpkin Drive: Amendment: \$650. Passed

SB94 - Theta Delta Chi's House of Horrors: Passed

Adjournment

Roll Call: All present but Chaney, Pasco, Winston

Adjourned 12:25am

End written report from the Finance Committee

Reporting for the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee, Mr. Nahabet said they had full attendance, except for the Solicitor General. SB 93 was passed as amended.

Mr. Nahabet said he wanted to mention as part of his report that ASUC Pres. Winston hasn't sent out a single letter that had to do with a bill that required her to do so. The Senate has been arguing, debating, and passing bills that require the President to send letters to administrators, or whoever it may be. The Senate argued about the bills and were very dedicated to them when it came to talking about them. But if they didn't follow-up with them, they meant absolutely nothing. So he would urge them, for those who sponsored a bill that required the President to send a letter to someone, they should follow-up on that. He wasn't going to do that for them, and unless people did that, nothing would happen.

Ms. Shah asked if he's mentioned this to Pres. Winston. Mr. Nahabet said he's talked with her and she told him to tell the Senate that the Senate should get on it.

Reporting for the University and External Affairs Committee, Ms. Hussain said they began at 9:07 p.m. They had no New Business. Under Old Business, they discussed SB 70, the Memorial Stadium bill. Several had comments and they're hoping that with that evening's Special Order, they'll get aspects from the other side, compared to what they heard last week. They would like to eventually make a decision about this bill. There was a bill to adopt a Student Code of Conduct for the ASUC and another to be

written. Ms. Ude wanted to support a bill against Prop. 4, mandatory notification of parents 48-hours prior to a minor getting an abortion. Those bills will be brought up next week. The Committee adjourned at 9:23. All Senators were present.

Begin written report from the University and External Affairs Committee

External Meeting Minutes—Monday, 10/20/08

Meeting called to order at 9:07 pm.

- I. Approval of Minutes
 - a. Passed
- II. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Passed
- III. Old Business
 - a. SB 70
 - i. Safety issue sticks out the most because of the geography professor; this had not been heard previously
 - ii. Sen. Zuo in communication with experts from other side, which will be presented to the Special Order this Wednesday
 - iii. Purpose of this bill primarily for student safety
 - iv. Has been talking with VC Brostrom and other VC in charge of technical aspects
- IV. New Business
 - a. Bill to be written to adopt Student Code of Conduct into the ASUC to hold elected officials accountable to the Code of Conduct
 - b. Bill to be written against Prop. 4, mandatory notification of parents 48 hours prior to a minor getting an abortion
- V. Adjournment
 - a. Roll Call—adjourned at 9:23 pm
 - i. Sen. Hussain, Sen. Raffi, Sen. Lisa Tran, Sen. Ude, Sen. Yang, Sen. Zuo

End written report from the University and External Affairs Committee

For Advocacy Committee #1, Equity and Inclusion, Student Health, and Mental and Spiritual Well-being, Ms. Shah and they did not meet that week. They decided to meet every other week. Their next meeting will be next Monday at 6 p.m. in the June Jordan Room.

For Advocacy Committee #2, Short- and Long-term Academic Resources and Security of Employment, Ms. Cho said the Committee did not meet. They're meeting every two weeks. They're next meeting is 7 p.m. next Tuesday in the June Jordan Room.

For Advocacy Committee #3, Bringing Business that Demonstrate Strong Values of Fiscal and Environmental and Social Responsibility to Lower Sproul, they had a good meeting to set out some of their

Consent Calendar -- Fee Waivers

- SB 61, In Support of Berkeley's Got Talent Hosted By the Freshman Sophomore Business Club at Berkeley

ground rules for a voting member. They're going to submit résumés and then vote as a committee on which person to adopt as a voting member. They'll officially invite the SOB to come and sit in on Committee meetings. At their next meeting, all members of the Committee will submit ideas for a checklist for better business practices. They have made it official that attendance will be taken at 8:10 p.m., with all members encouraged to show up at 8:00, when the meeting will begin. They have changed their meeting times to the first and third Monday of the month at the same time. They have switched their location to the OP lounge. Their next meeting will be November 3. Absent were Sens. Rodriguez and Moghtader.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The following bills and waivers were up for consideration under the Consent Calendar: SBs 82; 61, as amended; 82; 85; 86, as amended; 87; 88, as amended; 89, as amended; 90, as amended; 93; 91, as amended; 92, as amended; 94; and 93, as amended. Fee waivers: MSA, for Pauley; Raza.

Mr. Mairena moved to recess for three minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Owens and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, Ms. Pasco called for any changes to the Consent Calendar. Mr. Mairena moved to approve. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ude.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION: SB 82; SB 61, AS AMENDED; SB 82; SB 85; SB 86, AS AMENDED; SB 87; SB 88, AS AMENDED; SB 89, AS AMENDED; SB 90, AS AMENDED; SB 93, AS AMENDED; ; SB 91, AS AMENDED; SB 92, AS AMENDED; SB 94; AND SB 93, AS AMENDED.

The following fee waivers were approved under the Consent Calendar:

Muslim Student Association, \$625, for Pauley;
Raza, \$625.

The following Resolution, SB 61, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Paul Kim, Katelin Todhunter-Gerberg, and Ms. Chen, and was co-sponsored by Ms. Dhar and Ms. Flores:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF BERKELEY'S GOT TALENT HOSTED BY THE FRESHMAN SOPHOMORE BUSINESS CLUB AT BERKELEY

WHEREAS, the Associated Students of University of California strives to serve students' best interests by supporting, among other things, student groups that promote or sponsor community service, as well as encourage an awareness and understanding of the ideas, customs, arts, languages, and social contributions of specific cultures; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF BERKELEY'S GOT TALENT HOSTED BY THE FRESHMAN SOPHOMORE BUSINESS CLUB AT BERKELEY (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the Freshman Sophomore Business Club (FSBC) at Berkeley is an 8th year Student Activities Group (SAG); and

WHEREAS, FSBC is organizing the 2008 Berkeley's Got Talent, an event where all student performing groups are free to participate in the diversification of cultural expression; and

WHEREAS, this event, hosted by FSBC, will take place on November 23, 2008 in Pauley Ballroom; and

WHEREAS, Berkeley's Got Talent has the following goals:

1. To establish a yearly touchstone event for the advancement of free culture issues. To raise funds to support a local charity (kiva.org) in the Berkeley community.
2. To promote and raise awareness for the performing arts culture at Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, Berkeley's Got Talent will involve approximately 15 performing arts groups and will be publicized on campus by means of social networks, fliers, etc; and

WHEREAS, Berkeley's Got Talent charges \$5 per admission ticket; and

WHEREAS, all proceeds will go to a local charity (kiva.org) which is the world's first person-to-person micro-lending Web site, empowering individuals to lend directly to unique entrepreneurs in the developing world with the goal of alleviating poverty; and

WHEREAS, the budget for the International Conference, as of September 29, 2008, is: Total, \$2,345;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that \$400 (four hundred USD) be transferred from the Senate Contin-
gency Fund to FSBC at Berkeley.

The following Resolution, SB 82, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Shelly Singh and Mr. Nahabet and was co-sponsored by Mr. Tran and Ms. Hussain:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FOUNDATION FOR INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL RELIEF FOR CHILDREN

WHEREAS, the Foundation for International Medical Relief of Children's (FIMRC) collective vision is a world in which all children have an equal opportunity to benefit from modern medicine; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FOUNDATION FOR INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL RELIEF FOR CHILDREN (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the mission of FIMRC is to provide access to medical services for the millions of under-privileged and medically underserved children around the world and to raise awareness of various international health care problems; and

WHEREAS, FIMRC works to accomplish their mission statement through fundraising for the establishment of pediatric facilities in places lacking this health care for children and actively supporting individuals who want to travel to medically underserved areas in the world; and

WHEREAS, throughout the year, FIMRC (Berkeley Chapter) carries out projects that include organizing nutritional fairs at local elementary schools, developing informational resources on various health care issues to distribute, participating in medical goods drives, and fundraising for the national organization; and

WHEREAS, FIMRC plans to hold three health fairs this semester, two of which will be organized in cooperation with high schools within the area, and one in the Hall of Health Museum; and

WHEREAS, the following is the budget for the FIMRC (Berkeley Chapter) is as follows; Total: \$430;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate recognizes the Foundation for International Medical Relief of Children's (Berkeley chapter) as a first-year ASUC-sponsored Student-Initiated Service Group (SISG).

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate allocates \$380 from the Senate Contingency Fund to the Foundation for International Medical Relief of Children's (Berkeley chapter).

The following Resolution, SB 85, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Jessica Luk and Academic Affairs VP De la Cruz and was co-sponsored by Ms. Hussain, Mr. Tran, and Ms. Shah:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR THE EDUCATION ENHANCEMENT FUND

WHEREAS, the Education Enhancement fund is one of the five funds offered by the ASUC Grants Department; and

WHEREAS, the Education Enhancement Fund assists students who facilitate Democratic Education at Cal (De-Cal) courses or independent student initiated courses on campus; and

WHEREAS, the Education Enhancement Fund increases accessibility to resources for students who desire to facilitate courses at Cal; and

WHEREAS, these De-Cal courses may require expenditures for materials, guest speakers, travel, educational tours, or copies in order for the successful execution of the course; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR THE EDUCATION ENHANCEMENT FUND
(cont'd)

WHEREAS, undergraduate applicants can apply for up to \$200; and

WHEREAS, 64 applications were funded last year and \$7499.72 was allocated out of the \$8000.00 in the fund last year; and

WHEREAS, there is currently only \$3,000 in the Educational Enhancement Fund and the ASUC Committee for Educational Enhancement can not allocate more than 60% of the fund within the Fall Session; and

WHEREAS, \$641.29 has already been allocated to fall 2008 applicants by the ASUC Committee for Educational Enhancement during its first meeting;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC shall allocate \$5,000 the Educational Enhancement Fund from Carry Forward.

The following Resolution, SB 86, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Jessica Luk and Academic Affairs VP De la Cruz and was co-sponsored by Ms. Rodriguez and Ms. Shah:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE FUND

WHEREAS, SB 88 created the Public Service Fund in the spring of 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Public Service Fund is the only grant that provides funds for students who have repeatedly demonstrated interests and enthusiasm in seeking methods to fulfill the unmet needs of outside communities; and

WHEREAS, public service provides students with an opportunity to make a positive impact on the world outside of Cal; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for humanitarian and philanthropic efforts in our society; and

WHEREAS, these public service efforts may require expenditures for materials, travel costs, and/or housing in order for the successful execution of their endeavors; and

WHEREAS, undergraduate applicants can apply for up to \$750 and graduate students can apply for up to \$250; and

WHEREAS, only \$3,500 was allocated to the Public Service Fund and the ASUC Committee for Public Service can not allocate more than 60% of the fund within the Fall Session; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE FUND (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the Public Service Fund was introduced at the first Grants Workshop for the 2008-2009 academic year on October 8th; and

WHEREAS, the Public Service Fund has already received five applications;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC shall allocate \$8500 to the Public Service Fund from Carry Forward.

The following Resolution, SB 87, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Jessica Luk and Academic Affairs VP De la Cruz and was co-sponsored by Ms. Shah:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR THE MULTICULTURAL FUND

WHEREAS, the Multicultural fund is one of the five funds offered by the ASUC Grants Department; and

WHEREAS, the Multicultural Fund is the only grant that supports events introducing the campus to a culture and provides opportunities for student groups to hold unique and innovative events to increase campus awareness of multicultural issues; and

WHEREAS, the Multicultural Fund promotes core values of tolerance and appreciation for diversity by broadening students' perspectives on campus; and

WHEREAS, the Multicultural Fund fosters the sharing of personal cultural experiences and knowledge in an attempt to present a broad view of the culture; and

WHEREAS, these multicultural events may require expenditures for materials in order for the successful execution of their plans; and

WHEREAS, undergraduate applicants can apply for up to \$500 and graduate students can apply for up to \$250; and

WHEREAS, 26 applications were funded last year and \$10,425.00 was allocated out of the \$27,095.67 in the fund last year; and

WHEREAS, there is currently only \$850 in the Multicultural Fund and the ASUC Committee for the Fund for Culture Shows cannot allocate more than 40% of the fund within the Fall Session; and

WHEREAS, there are already five applications waiting to be allocated sufficient funds;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC shall allocate \$11,000 the Multicultural Fund from Carry Forward.

The following Resolution, SB 88, as amended, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Gabino Arredondo and was co-sponsored by Ms. Rodriguez, Mr. Mairena, Ms. Flores, and Ms. Cho:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF BERKELEY REVIEW OF EDUCATION (BRE)

WHEREAS, BRE, founded in 2008, is the student-run journal of the Graduate School of Education at the University of California, Berkeley, which is among the top ten schools of education in the United States; and

WHEREAS, BRE is a peer-reviewed interdisciplinary journal that engages issues of educational diversity and equity within diverse cognitive, developmental, sociohistorical, linguistic, and cultural contexts; and

WHEREAS, BRE is committed to promoting a diversity of viewpoints, interests, and backgrounds among its members at the Graduate School of Education and across the UC Berkeley campus, and the Editorial Board sees the Journal as an open forum, and our meetings and office space as a welcoming environment for all to express their views and concerns; and

WHEREAS, the scholarship of professors, practitioners, policy-makers, and graduate students will be published in the BRE; and

WHEREAS, BRE publishes two annual volumes of original research and theory; and

WHEREAS, BRE provides career development to students at the GSE and across campus through editing workshops, editorial and peer review experience, and publishing opportunities; organizes an annual speaker series; and puts together other social activities designed to promote a collegial environment for graduate students and faculty; and

WHEREAS, BRE is registered with Campus Life and Services, the Graduate Assembly, and the California Digital Library eScholarship program; and

WHEREAS, after receiving funds from the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC), BRE will be able to augment its efforts to host an on-campus symposium on diversity and equity in education; and

WHEREAS, BRE was not yet registered as a student group prior to the 2008-2009 school-year;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognize the Berkeley Review of Education (BRE) as a first-year student-run publication group (PUB) and allocate to the group five hundred and fifty dollars (\$550.00) from ASUC Senate Contingency Fund.

The following Resolution, SB 89, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Kimeshia Thomas and Ms. Ude and was co-sponsored by Ms. Cho, Ms. Chen, Ms. Rodriguez, and Ms. Flores:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE 2008 DELTA DANCE-A-THON: WILL YOU BE THE LAST ONE STANDING? DANCING FOR A CAUSE

WHEREAS, Since its establishment in 1921, making it the first Black Greek Letter Organization chartered on the West Coast, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., Kappa Chapter has been, and continues to be, an integral part of the UC Berkeley campus community; and

WHEREAS, service, scholarship, and community involvement are key components of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., both on a national and local level; and

WHEREAS, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., Kappa Chapter's work with community service has been a staple in the community and operates as a unifying factor among students on campus and people in the surrounding neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., Kappa Chapter has held social action programs for over 50 years in an effort to take a critical look at politics that affect us as minority students at UC Berkeley and encourage students to take a more active stance where politics are concerned; and

WHEREAS, this event will provide funding for the three scholarships that Kappa Chapter offers annually, mentioned below, and more importantly this event, in the spirit of social action, will raise awareness on social, political, economic, health, internal, and educational issues; and

WHEREAS, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., Kappa Chapter is offering three scholarships: the Naomi Sewell Richardson Scholarship, the Gloria Keith Dugan Scholarship, and the Vivian Osborne Marsh Scholarship; and

WHEREAS, the Delta Dance-A-Thon will be the culminating event of the two-day long social action political awareness campaign, a weekend that is dedicated to spreading awareness on various levels: economic development, educational development, international awareness and involvement, mental and physical health, and political awareness and involvement; and

WHEREAS, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., Kappa chapter will be highlighting the political uproar that is currently going on in Zimbabwe and tie it back to the upcoming election here in the US. By informing students of the shocking truth of the crisis in Zimbabwe, we hope that students will appreciate the rights we, as Americans have and take advantage of their right to vote on November 4, 2008 and encourage students to register to vote by passing out voter registration cards,

WHEREAS, the itemized budget for the event is as follows: Total, \$1,810.00;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$600 (six hundred dollars) from the ASUC Greek Opportunity Fund to Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., Kappa Chapter for 1st Annual Delta Dance-A-Thon, dancing for a cause.

Consent Calendar -- SB 89, In Support of the 2008 Delta Dance-A-Thon: Will You Be the Last One Standing? Dancing for a Cause (cont'd) - 27 -
-- SB 90, In Support of the Regents' and Chancellor's Scholars Association (RCSA)

The following Resolution, SB 90, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Melissa Tang and Mr. Zuo:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE REGENTS' AND CHANCELLOR'S SCHOLARS ASSOCIATION (RCSA)

WHEREAS, The Regents' and Chancellor's Scholars Association is an 8th year ASUC-sponsored SAG which helps students realize their potential on the UC Berkeley campus, through committee leaderships, social events, academic workshops, and much more; and

WHEREAS, although the RCSA members are chosen during the college admissions process, the events that scholars organize are generally open and welcoming to the entire UC Berkeley campus; and

WHEREAS, the RCSA is working to increase its campus visibility by promoting events that will benefit all Berkeley students; and

WHEREAS, the RCSA is organizing up the first annual Faculty/GSI game night on Oct 29th, 2008

WHEREAS, The Faculty/GSI Game Night will have at least ten faculty members and ten GSIs playing games with students in a casual setting. This unique event will provide students with an opportunity to meet their professors in an environment beyond the classroom; and

WHEREAS, Google has shown an interest in the event and has planned an appearance at the event, providing students with networking opportunities; and

WHEREAS, the RCSA currently receives an annual budget allocation of \$4,500 from the Scholarship Office, but the entirety of this fund has already been earmarked for other specific club expenses; and

WHEREAS, the \$140 allocated to the Regents' and Chancellor's Association last spring does not meet anticipated operating expenses for the event; and

WHEREAS, in order to establish a greater name for the RCSA and encourage campus activity, the RCSA needs additional ASUC funds to both publicize and organize the event; and

WHEREAS, the line item budget is as follows: Total, \$1,555.00;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC affirm its promotion of diversity of students and diversity of activities on this campus.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the ASUC allocate \$350 from the Senate Contingency Fund to the Regent's and Chancellor's Scholarship Association (RCSA).

The following Resolution, SB 91, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Priya Saiprasad and Ms. Dhar and was co-sponsored by Ms. Chen, Ms. Raffi, Mr. Tran, Mr. Nahabet, Ms. Hussain, and Ms. Rodriguez:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF UMA'S "CAL GOT TALENT"

WHEREAS, the Undergraduate Marketing Association (UMA) is a 12th year Student Activity Group (SAG) with a 2008-2009 budget of \$589.26; and

WHEREAS, UMA is the primary marketing association on campus that provides its members with opportunities to network with marketing professionals from top notch Bay Area companies through events such as speaker panels, office tours, marketing forum career fairs, hands-on consulting opportunities and case competitions; and

WHEREAS, the UMA is trying to expand its presence on campus and has created the event "Cal's Got Talent" in order to do so; and

WHEREAS, the event is one that showcases the diversity of student groups on campus by allowing various student groups to perform in front of a large audience; and

WHEREAS, the event will also serve as an opportunity for student groups to educate people about their causes and organizations; and

WHEREAS, Cal's Got Talent will strive to garner interest in group talent in order for the student body to support and attend the groups' events and performances in the future; and

WHEREAS, a portion of all ticket proceeds will be donated to the Berkeley-based "Blind Babies Foundation"; and

WHEREAS, UMA will also share a fixed percentage of all proceeds with the winning performance group; and

WHEREAS, the budget for the event is as follows: Subtotal, \$1.797;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$550 to the UMA in support of Cal's Got Talent

The following Resolution, SB 92, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Bharath Ganesh and Mr. Smelko and Ms. Dhar:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SIGMA PHI EPSILON'S 4TH ANNUAL PUMPKIN DRIVE PHILANTHROPY EVENT

WHEREAS, Sigma Phi Epsilon is an Inter-Fraternal Council (IFC) recognized fraternity; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SIGMA PHI EPSILON'S 4TH ANNUAL PUMPKIN DRIVE
PHILANTHROPY EVENT (cont'd)

WHEREAS, Sigma Phi Epsilon is a fraternity that provides growth and leadership opportunity for young men and promotes academic excellence while serving in the community; and

WHEREAS, Sigma Phi Epsilon is dedicated to raising awareness and funding for its national partnership: YouthAIDS, which raises awareness for and aims to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS among over 600 million young people; and

WHEREAS, Sigma Phi Epsilon began an annual philanthropy event in 2005 by selling mini pumpkins on Sproul Plaza during the week of Halloween; and

WHEREAS, Sigma Phi Epsilon will raise awareness and spread information about YouthAIDS while raising money through pumpkin sales; and

WHEREAS, in 2006, for the same event, Sigma Phi Epsilon received \$550 in Fall 2006 from the Greek Philanthropy Fund and was able to donate \$2034.39 to YouthAIDS after the event; and

WHEREAS, Sigma Phi Epsilon has set a new goal for 2008 to raise over \$2000 for the YouthAIDS organization through our annual Pumpkin Sale; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognize Sigma Phi Epsilon's annual Pumpkin Sale as an ASUC-sponsored event; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC shall allocate \$650 from the Greek Opportunity Fund to Sigma Phi Epsilon for the 2007 YouthAIDS Philanthropy Event.

The following Resolution, SB 93, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Mr. Tran, Attorney General M. Sinanian, Mr. Mairena, Mr. Nahabet, Ms. Oatfield, Mr. Owens, Ms. Shah, and Mr. Smelko, and was co-sponsored by Mr. Zuo and Ms. Raffi:

RESOLUTION AMENDING BY-LAWS TO INCLUDE UMBRELLA ORGANIZATIONS

WHEREAS, the ASUC supports the diverse array of student organizations and has in the past established "umbrella" groups specializing in disbursing funding for particular types of student groups; and

WHEREAS, umbrella groups continue to be effective and efficient in financial allocation while fostering community solidarity and community joint program-planning; and

WHEREAS, in recent history, there has been a considerable degree of ambiguity regarding the status of umbrella member groups in year-to-date standing, upon their decision to revert to direct ASUC sponsorship or decision to open an ASUC-sponsored account; and

RESOLUTION AMENDING BY-LAWS TO INCLUDE UMBRELLA ORGANIZATIONS (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the ASUC By-laws do not clearly enumerate the relationship between directly sponsored student groups and umbrella groups, which potentially leads to future inconsistencies; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the proposed Article VI (following) be added to Title II: Sponsorships of the ASUC By-laws.

ARTICLE VI – UMBRELLA GROUPS

- 6.1 An Umbrella Group shall be defined as any student group that independently allocates previously allocated funds from the ASUC Finance Committee during spring budgeting to member groups, regardless of how many member groups are receiving funds from the umbrella. An umbrella group must submit one budget application to the ASUC during the spring budgeting process; all member groups shall submit applications to the umbrella group for them to report in its spring budgeting allocation.
- 6.2 Year-to-date recognition of a member group shall be maintained so long as the group maintains ASUC sponsorship by either coming into the Senate and requesting recognition, or by ensuring that it is listed under the umbrella group's spring budgeting application. If a member group does not re-apply for sponsorship for two consecutive years, it is automatically reverted to first-year standing.
- 6.3 Existing member groups of an umbrella group may receive allocations from the Senate Contingency Fund for particular events but not for operational expenses. All operational expenses for an umbrella group's member groups shall be allocated during Spring Budgeting. Similarly, groups with first-year standing who join an umbrella group shall instead seek funding for operational expenses exclusively from their umbrella group.
- 6.4 Any member group reserves the right to simultaneously draw from their umbrella group's Programs account while also drawing from their ASUC-sponsored Miscellaneous account. However, it is prohibited for a member group to receive simultaneous funding from both the umbrella group and directly through the ASUC during spring budgeting.
- 6.5 Any member groups of umbrella groups who wish to be simultaneously recognized by the umbrella group and the ASUC, and wish to keep their year-to-date recognition, must abide by the ASUC Constitution and By-laws.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that this amendment to the By-laws take effect as of October 20, 2008.

The following Resolution, SB 94, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Scott Lynch and Mr. Nahabet and was co-sponsored by Mr. Owens, Mr. Smelko, Ms. Chen, Mr. Zuo, and Mr. Moghtader:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THETA DELTA CHI'S HOUSE OF HORRORS

WHEREAS, Theta Delta Chi, the eleventh oldest of the college fraternities, was founded in 1847, and the Berkeley Chapter was founded 1900.

WHEREAS, Theta Delta Chi is hosting its philanthropy event, the House of Horrors, in cooperation with the Green Stampede; and

WHEREAS, the Green Stampede is an organization dedicated to the support of the Oakland Athletics as well as the students of Oakland through mentoring, community action, and passionate fan support; and

WHEREAS, Theta Delta Chi will invite middle school and high school students from the Bay Area to assist in the planning and building of the House of Horrors at the Theta Delta Chi fraternity; and

WHEREAS, in addition to planning and building the House of Horrors these students will get an opportunity to interact and learn from the fraternity brothers about the Berkeley campus as well as Berkeley's Greek life; and

WHEREAS, Theta Delta Chi's House of Horrors is also open to the public; and

WHEREAS, all proceeds will be donated to the Green Stampede and Theta Delta Chi's national philanthropy called Autism Speaks; and

WHEREAS, Theta Delta Chi's House of Horrors budget is attached: Total, \$1,693.90;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate recognize Theta Delta Chi's House of Horrors as an ASUC-sponsored event.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senate allocate \$500 from the Greek Opportunity Fund to Theta Delta Chi's Haunted House event.

ELECTED OFFICIAL REPORTS

Report from the Attorney General

Mr. Sinanian said a couple of past Senate meetings have featured a lot of bickering and party politics, but he just wanted to say that the work done during Con-Review meeting was really indicative of the potential of this Administration to put everything aside, work together, and develop things. All of them should be aware of that potential.

Mr. Sinanian said the Web master brought the site up to date, so that issue was resolved and no action was taken. Mr. Sinanian said he was on the listservs that he needed to be on, so that has also been resolved. Regarding the office that he and the Elections Council were assigned, he still didn't have the contact information for everybody. Also, as it was the ninth week, he'll sign and date the revised copies of the Constitution and By-laws, in accordance with his duties. He was also working on some other things, but didn't have anything to report at that time.

Ms. Flores asked if he held office hours. Mr. Sinanian said he hasn't seen any language in the Constitution or By-laws that would require him to. If people felt he should, he could go ahead and schedule them. He asked Ms. Flores who she thought would come to those office hours, and if it would be Senators and people who had problems. Ms. Flores said it could be all of the above. Mr. Sinanian said that if anybody felt he should office hours, they should shoot him an e-mail and he would go ahead and do that. But he wouldn't do that off the get-go. He's been handling most issues on an e-mail basis.

Ms. Hussain said that for bills online, numbers 54 through 69 were missing. They're not on the Web site. Mr. Sinanian said he'd make sure they get up.

Mr. Sinanian submitted the following:

Begin written report from the Attorney General

October 22nd, 2008

Attorney General's Report to the ASUC Senate Regular Meeting:

The Webmaster has brought the site up to date and that issue has finally been resolved. No legal action will need to be taken.

I am now on all the listservs I need to be on and that's been resolved too.

Also, concerning the office that both the Elections Council and I are assigned: I will need to contact the Elections Council members to see if they need it, etc. If we agree that we don't, then we'll give that office up to be used by any other group that needs it. If they do (and I imagine that they will need it), then it's ours. Sorry ☺

Lastly, as it is the ninth week, I will be meeting with the Head Secretariat to sign and date the revised master copies of the Constitution and By-laws in accordance with my duties.

End written report from the Attorney General

Report from the Senate Aide

Ms. Vir-Banks said she wanted to apologize for being absent last week, but she had some personal issues to deal with. In the future she'll e-mail people if she won't be present at meetings. Also, for the

internship check-ins, she knew Senators were really busy, so she would ask them to just send her an e-mail about how they're doing with their interns.

Mr. Nahabet moved to go to Reports from Representatives to the ASUC. The motion was seconded by Ms. Raffi and passed with no objection.

Report from the Graduate Assembly Representative

Mr. Daal said the next Lower Sproul Student Council meeting is set for next Tuesday, October 28, at 6 p.m. at Anthony Hall. He hoped to see as many of them attend as were interested. Secondly, he wanted to draw their attention to the student fees audit that was recently completed by UCOP. There's concern that students' fees were not being used as they should be at some of the campuses. If people would like a copy of the report, Mr. Daal said he put it up on the GA Web site. They might want to look at it if they were interested in the ways fees were being used.

Ms. Oatfield asked if he's read the report about the fees, and if he could give the Senate the gist of what it said, or a couple of concepts it raised. Mr. Daal said he hasn't read the entire report, as it's 80 pages, with a lot of financial data. But for instance, the Student Regents were kind of critical of the use of student fee money to finance an officer for the Threat Management Unit, using the mental health fee for that. That was one thing students were kind of skeptical about, and there were others. He would encourage people to look at the report themselves.

Ms. Shah asked if he could elaborate at the Lower Sproul Student Council meeting what was discussed. Mr. Daal said one thing they discussed was the necessity to really be effective in getting students to buy into and support the plans for Lower Sproul. As the Senate knew, or maybe didn't know, that may be a problem, as a referendum is slated for next spring, spring 2010. It will probably be for a large chunk of change. So they need to start as early as possible to get students to have a vision for a functional and vibrant Lower Sproul. That will be difficult. They assume that they're starting basically with nothing, and only a few of them knew what was going on with Lower Sproul, the Senate and the GA. And they don't have much time, basically a year. He hoped everybody realized that a year wasn't a lot of time to raise hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. Owens moved to go to the Special Order. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tran and passed with no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY -- Memorial Stadium Retrofit Plans

Rob Gayle introduced himself and said he was Associate Vice Chancellor for Project Management for the Berkeley campus. That was the campus unit responsible for project delivery. He was there on behalf of

Vice Chancellor Denton and Vice Chancellor Brostrom. He would like to thank the Senate very much for the invitation to be there and talk about the technical aspects of the Stadium and the Stadium retrofit. Also with them was their Principle Planner Jennifer McDougall, from Project Management, and David Friedman, structural engineer and Principle in charge for Elssesser Engineers, the firm providing the structural engineering expertise for the Stadium projects, including the Student-Athlete High Performance Center, as well as the engineering concept that will be used for the seismic improvement of Memorial Stadium.

Because the request, the invitation to the Vice Chancellors, was characterized as a technical presentation, that's what they'll talk about that evening, and talk about what was the design response to the seismic challenges that the Stadium and the campus are confronted with. The Senate Resolution under consideration described much of the background. Memorial Stadium would be retrofitted, and aside from safety, Regents' policy requires campuses to systematically analyze and address any serious deficiencies in buildings that serve the campus. That's the policy under which the Stadium will be renovated.

Memorial Stadium is an historic building and is one of a couple of dozen national registered buildings on the Berkeley campus. It was designed by campus architect John Galen Howard and completed in 1923, he believed. So it was an important historic resource. It's protected from an historic point of view and it's in a seismically challenging situation, which Mr. Friedman will describe. They'll be happy to answer questions following the presentation.

Mr. Friedman introduced himself and said he was the principle for Forell/Elssesser Engineers, Inc. When he refers to work "they" do, he was referring to his project team Forell/Elssesser. This project has had the scrutiny of peer reviewers, of some engineering and technical professors who make up the Seismic Review Committee, and many, many other ancillary peer reviewers. So this is a much-oversighted project that he's been working on since 1999.

Mr. Friedman said he read the Senate's Resolution and thought it was very good. He was there to explain a little bit the science behind the Stadium. The punch line was simple. The retrofit will provide absolute life safety to the inhabitants and users of California Memorial Stadium.

The screen showed a rendering of the project, both the renovated project as well as the Student-Athlete High Performance Center that sits out in front, to the west of the Stadium. The next screen showed another rendering of the finished project, the retrofitted Stadium as well as the SAHPC. Another rendering was shown of the Plaza in front and the Student-Athlete Center.

The project started in 1999 as a seismic safety corrections project related to Memorial Stadium. The left side of the timeline showed the start. There have been literally dozens of different studies, engineering studies and geotechnical studies. The timeline shows the start of the Phase I project, from Chancellor Birgeneau announcing the plans, through the litigation, the injunction, and then finally, the lifting of the injunction that allowed the Student-Athlete Center to proceed.

This building has been steeped in controversy since really its inception. When John Galen Howard was retained to consider the design of the football stadium, Strawberry Canyon was not his first choice. There were many other sitings. So that was for starters.

The Stadium was completed in 1922. The screen showed a pre-construction shot of the Canyon, and with line of Strawberry Creek as it comes down the Canyon. Some pictures of construction shots were shown.

One, looking towards the Campanile, showed the excavation and the fill, the berm for the west portion of the bowl. Mr. Friedman said he'll be talking about the west portion of the bowl as being the western most portion that was above and on top of the western berm.

The next screen showed another construction shot, the elevated portion of the Stadium, the eastern portion. As they knew, it's carved into the ground and essentially was concrete slab on grade, and really was not affected by any earthquake forces. The Stadium was commemorated in 1923 with the Big Game. The screen showed a shot, in 1931.

Mr. Friedman said he'd promise to give a very quick version of earthquake engineering 101. He'd do his best to make it understandable. The screen showed a picture of the amount of cut and fill that was required for the building of Memorial Stadium. They could see the line taken by Strawberry Creek, a really funny meander through the Stadium.

The Hayward Fault runs right through the Stadium and that there are some other ancillary traces of the Hayward Fault, which were very well studied and plotted. But even at the time of the construction, they knew there was an earthquake fault there. What they didn't know then that they now know was earthquake engineering; and it's not even close.

The next screen showed a pre-development landform of the Stadium. Again, they'll see the meander of Strawberry Creek. They could see the contours of the Stadium. But most importantly, the zone shown in green is known as a "shatter ridge," which is actually part of the faulting activity that really kind of blocked off Strawberry Creek and moved it in a northern direction.

Mr. Friedman said everybody knows this is a seismically active area. The entire Northern California region is laced with earthquake faults. The two largest and most famous are the Hayward Fault and the San Andreas Fault. The Hayward and San Andreas Faults are what they call a "right lateral fault," a strike-slip fault, meaning that tectonically, it's moving one side against the other in a horizontal fashion. So as one stands looking at Memorial Stadium, the eastern half was moving, unfortunately, closer to Stanford University, and the other side was moving to the north.

Mr. Friedman said they know that an earthquake is basically a release of energy. But over time, the fault actually creeps. It actually is moving infinitesimal amounts every day, every month, every year. They call that "fault creep." The next screen showed some evidence of what the Stadium was already telling them about where the fault is and how the Stadium was responding because of this incremental movement called "creep."

There's been a lot of trenching, a lot of borings done all the way around the Stadium and around the buildings. The screen showed an offset on the curve. The red portion and the other part were moving away from each other. They could see this on the north side and the south sides of the Stadium, and also as they traverse into Berkeley they could see pavement cracked, which was another indication of fault creep.

The Stadium itself, the east bowl, was really connected to the east side of the fault. It's a rigid structure, just cast on to the ground. But the west side was actually split up. There are some expansion joints in the structure and they can actually see movement, particularly by the south and north end zones.

They also have been able to see, as the screen showed, damage and displacement that has been caused by fault creep on the south side, and a much-photographed KK section, where they could see the displacement very, very clearly. The screen showed the columns inside that the east side moving north and the west side moving south, and they could also trace damage on the north area that doesn't really follow the fault. But it's the concrete structure trying to hang on to this movement. They could see from the north tunnel, how it migrates to the east.

Mr. Friedman said the next screen clearly showed an exaggerated cracking, but it was meant to show that as creep continues on, they'll get more of this separation happening. The photographs showed some signs of the creep damage.

Mr. Friedman said he was a graduate of Berkeley Engineering and there isn't a class in earthquake engineering that doesn't go and study and look at the Stadium. The photograph showed towards the south side. This was the western half of the Hayward Fault moving to the north, and this was at an expansion joint. So it's a clear indication of not only what movement was happening, but what the actual structural performance of this concrete frame was going to be.

Mr. Friedman said that where the fault was located and where it wasn't located was a pretty critical question that had to be answered to be in compliance with the law, with Alquist-Priolo, which was mentioned in the Senate's Resolution. They had to make sure particularly for the Student-Athlete High Performance building, that the footprint of that building was not on an active fault. So they did lots of trenching and lots of boring. All of these green lines were trenches that were done. A couple of dozen borings were done to try and locate evidence of the fault. This was really left to the geotechnical consultants, the geoscientists who dug these trenches, jumped inside them, and catalogued them very carefully. To somebody, the photograph showing the inside of a trench meant something really important. He wasn't sure he could make it out. But to the geoscientist, it was significant. The trench being shown was to the south end of the Stadium.

In fact, they were able to see, with absolute clarity, the Hayward Fault that ran through here. There were many other trenches to the west side, also well documented, every square inch of it, and they found absolutely no traces of active seismic movement. That basically cleared the way for the construction of the SAHPC. The screen showed more trenches, more studies of what was going on, also within the Stadium, to make sure that they had a very good feel for where the fault was.

Mr. Friedman said that if they read the newspapers, they've read that the probability of an earthquake on the Hayward Fault gets higher by the day. As postulated by the USGS, there's a 62% chance of a 6.7 magnitude earthquake or greater in the Bay Area within the next 30 years.

Mr. Friedman said he really didn't do this to scare people, but the screen showed the newest USGS mapping of what they call the "Hayward Fault Scenario." They'll see that for an epicenter virtually right on the Hayward Fault, what the propagation of the earthquake was in terms of perception of ground motion. It's what they call a Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale. It's a perception of how intense the red zone was for a 7.0 magnitude earthquake. They could see the extent the earthquake forces, or how the perception of high intensity will propagate. It wasn't as though there will be an earthquake that will happen right at Memorial Stadium and nowhere else, but it will propagate all along the fault, and then radiate out. There's one flaw with this, in that it looks like it all goes to the east. But for some reason, this model did not take into account the softer soils of the Bay muds. So, in fact, he thought the perception of ground motion will be even higher in some of those regions.

Mr. Friedman said that earthquakes on the Hayward Fault were in the term period of every 140 years. The last one was 140 years ago, in 1868. They expect a magnitude earthquake 7.1 to 7.4 projected losses \$170 billion, 200,000 people homeless. They actually know pretty clearly where the fault is.

In an earthquake there are two seismic concerns. The one that most of the time they're concerned with is ground motion, shaking. That's what an earthquake produces. But close to a fault, it produces a higher pulse. Sometimes earthquakes they feel more as a sine wave, something they'll feel it come and go. But when they're so close to a fault, they'll get a sense of a pulse.

So they have designed for higher pulses. The ground shaking is normally the primary thing they're preoccupied with. But when one is on top of a fault, there is a secondary issue, the fact that the fault can rupture and displace, actually move not the creep amount he talked about earlier, but as much as six feet horizontally and up to one to two feet vertically. This is more of a strike-slip fault. So there will be more motion horizontally.

The uniqueness of the seismic challenge to California Memorial Stadium was how to deal with these sections of the Stadium that sit right over the fault. The screen showed the only engineering curve he'd throw out to them. When he talked about the vulnerability of being so close to a fault, closeness didn't matter, whether someone was one foot away from the fault or a mile away from the fault. The chart was a logarithmic scale. The forces that would be felt at Memorial Stadium are the same as they would be felt in downtown Berkeley.

If a new stadium was to be designed in downtown Berkeley, they would have to design for the same high level of seismic forces that they're designing the retrofit for of Memorial Stadium.

Mr. Friedman said that as earthquake engineers, they chase earthquakes all over the world. They try and study earthquakes to see how buildings behave. In 1971 they had the San Fernando Valley Earthquake, by the San Andreas Fault, which actually went underneath buildings, and they saw buildings that were damaged by the rupturing fault. The screen showed a hospital that straddled a fault. It led to State ordinances about seismic safety for critical care facilities. As the next screen showed, sometimes even nature didn't do well with the rupture of a fault.

What they have found from chasing earthquakes around the world is that when there's a more block-like, bunker-like structure, with a good foundation, with good ductility and a good stiff superstructure, these block-like structures actually behave pretty well. All they do is tilt a little bit, or twist a little bit; but they don't break up.

That was their clue that they actually could do something about the north and south end zone sections. And luckily, one of the leading experts in fault rupturing mechanics in the world is Prof. John Gray, from Berkeley's own Civil Engineering Department, who was a great resource to work with.

So the solution to the Stadium was shown on the screen, a cross-section. The Student-Athlete building, below the Stadium, will actually buttress the foundation underneath the Stadium. What they'll do for the west bowl was basically a series of concrete shear walls and some energy dissipating steel-braced frames. The historic perimeter wall will have an application of concrete to the inside face, to provide the kind of seismic strength and ductility that they look for these higher seismic forces.

Mr. Friedman said the next screen showed the perimeter wall of the CMS and showed how they would put in an application of concrete that will go all the way up the wall, and hopefully repair it at the same time. It needed some paint and spackling to make it look like it should.

So the issue that has gotten a lot of attention from them and a lot of study is what to do about the fault rupture zones. They know the zones on the north and the south, and they know where the fault is. So the idea was to basically carve out a wedge on the north and the south and turn it into a bunkers, with a nice, stout foundation, and a nice stout shear walls, a new concrete slab on top, but joint it from the rest of the Stadium, and give it a gap. So when the fault ruptures, what will happen is that the block will twist, tilt, won't hit anything, and it will be life safe.

Mr. Friedman said that when they engineer new buildings or retrofit old buildings, their issue was to provide life safety. That meant safety outside the building. That didn't mean the building couldn't be damaged, and it will crack, but their mandate as engineers was to provide life safety.

Mr. Friedman said the next screen showed a section through the fault rupture blocks. They'll put them on a soil and rock column to just stiffen the soil. This was necessary on the north end, where they have a lot of fill left over because the migration of the Strawberry Creek through that area. They'll put a layer of something like a plastic sheet, to somewhat disengage this block from the soil supporting it. And then they'd put in a fairly massive, 30-inch thick mat footing. And they'd have concrete walls that go up it. As they could see, against the berm, the lower part of the bowl, there will be a gap as much as five feet. The gap will be covered and no one will fall in the gap. This is something that is done all the time, on many buildings, to provide a sliding cover.

There's one more section that was cut between the fault rupture block and the adjacent Stadium. Again, it's the same five-foot gap with a cover plate for it. The purpose of those gaps was shown by the somewhat simplistic animation being shown. As the fault begins to rupture, those blocks begin to rotate and move. As it starts rupturing, it can account for any sort of tilting or twisting those blocks will do.

As for what was ahead, and some closing thoughts, Mr. Friedman said that this has been so well studied it was based upon absolutely secure engineering science. And Mr. Friedman said that wasn't just him talking, or his firm talking, but this has withstood the scrutiny of many peer reviews and many experts looking at whether this project was adhering to the science. This is a unique problem, but frankly, it was a very simple, dumb solution. There's no complex materials or systems that they're using. It's a very straightforward thing, and they know the way it will behave.

As for the risk, Mr. Friedman said they live in a risky area. They know that. They live with earthquakes all the time. The risk of going to six football games during the course of the season is about the same risk as going on one round-trip flight to New York and back. It's frankly the same kind of calculated risk. Mr. Friedman said he took a higher risk driving across the Bay Bridge to get there that day than going to a football game. Alquist-Priolo was written in 1973. It was well intended and really was meant determine that there was an active fault to make sure that new developments close to an earthquake fault stayed away from that fault. It was mostly a geologic directive to study faults, but it also did venture off to deal with existing buildings. It's been somewhat twisted over the last 12 months to be pre-emptive, but in fact, Alquist-Priolo was meant to encourage retrofits of buildings. And they actually know how to do that. He could guarantee people that not only his firm, but the campus has always been in strict compliance with the law and intend to be in strict compliance with the law.

As for the money, Mr. Friedman said that he thought people knew this, but it was worth stating. Any athletic facility on campus was not eligible for State funding. So anything that they do to California Memorial Stadium, even a seismic retrofit, all had to be privately financed.

Mr. Friedman said that as for the schedule, they hope to go really soon. That was the intent. They have a design, development, and contract document phase to go through. The hope was that by January 2010 they begin construction right after Cal plays in the Rose Bowl. They can practice up until that point, and then begin construction. And pretty close to that trip, the Student-Athletic Center should be completed. He would be happy to take people's questions.

Mr. Zuo said that since the Senate had limited time, he would ask people to limit discussion to safety of the Stadium. He asked if Mr. Friedman could address the concerns for a possible landslide in the event of an earthquake, or if Cheapskate Hill and the hills nearby could bury the Stadium in an earthquake.

Mr. Friedman said he was a structural engineer, not a geotechnical engineer. So he would qualify his response. Since 1999, every aspect of this project has been studied. There have been numerous geotechnical studies and reports, and he has never seen any mention of landslide. He knew one area of the hill, not actually behind the Stadium, but actually more above Bowles Hall, was a well-known zone that had a potential for sloughing. Sloughing was a little bit different than a rockslide or landslide, but there's a potential that a block of that earth could actually slide down a little bit. But in no study that he has seen in the last ten years has he seen any mention of any sort of threat to the Stadium, adjacent to the Stadium, of landslide.

Ms. Hussain asked if there were any current chief engineers, geologic professors, or faculty from the Geography Department sitting on the board for the retrofit. Mr. Friedman said there were, and they were on the Seismic Review Committee, which was populated by a number of professors. There are perhaps three geotechnical professors. But frankly, the entire Geosciences Department has been very involved in the study and oversight of all of this, as well as numerous other consultants outside campus. Mr. Gayle said that not only have there been structural engineering peer reviews, but technical peer reviews.

Ms. Oatfield asked if there were other examples of architectural designs where it was the intent of buildings on top of fault lines to separate into multiple pieces. Mr. Gayle said he certainly didn't know any other stadiums that sit on top of an earthquake fault. Because of Alquist-Priolo, they're not allowed to construct a building that straddles a fault. So that isn't done. He actually believed they could now do that. He thought Alquist-Priolo was an obsolete law, and thought it actually could be done. It wouldn't be the wisest thing to do, but in terms of an existing building and making it life safe, they absolutely could do it, and will do it.

Mr. Nahabet asked if there will be a report projecting the cost of what was being done. Mr. Gayle said that certainly the structural concept was well developed. He would say the architectural concept was probably slightly behind the structural concept, that is, the detail of how the building will be laid out, room by room. They have not yet developed one. When they do, it will be presented to the campus and Intercollegiate Athletics, in align with its funding capability, as well as going through a funding process. So they don't have a number at the moment. Nor did they have a funding capacity identified for this.

Mr. Nahabet asked if he could give an estimate when the final budget will be released. Mr. Friedman said they expect to develop that this winter. They need to go through the Regents for approval of a budget. So they will have that sometime that spring, within the next few months.

Mr. Tran said that out of curiosity, with earthquake engineering, he asked why there wasn't just two wider cuts, instead of four cuts, and a superstructure. That would result in two large blocks instead of four. Mr. Friedman said that although they're pretty sure they know where the fault is, as a mile of the earth's crust starts to rupture, and as they get into the fill area around the Stadium, it could propagate differently, to some degree. So he didn't think they could absolutely rely on it being an absolute line. He believed he understood the question, now, and why they didn't just put one cut right through, why that wouldn't have been enough. They're giving it two cuts, to frankly give the rupture two places to meander to. In fact, at one time there was some concern of how wide this was. They actually had this into two blocks. But their analysis has shown that it actually will behave better as a single block, and they could control the distortions better.

Ms. Shah said she knew upholding the law was important. She asked what measures or steps were being taken before the High Performance facility is made to address the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. Mr. Gayle said that if the Chair wished, they could respond to that, although it was clearly outside the area of questions they were asked to address. He said perhaps Ms. McDougall could comment.

Ms. McDougall said the campus has completed an archaeological study of the site. Two weeks ago there was an extensive boring operation going on to find out what archaeologically was happening under the ground to see if there were any sort of artifacts or finds. They don't yet know the results of that study. They should know within the next couple of weeks. But they don't expect there will be any sort of graves at the site. Mr. Gayle said that if there are, their obligations with regard to that were clear.

Ms. Shah asked if the culture resources management committee has been involved in this, in the archaeological digging or excavation. Also, she asked if there was any information about sacred objects, like the "grandmother oak." Ms. McDougall said she wasn't sure what the "cultural resources management committee" was. Ms. Shah said it was a part of the federal government that did archaeological excavations to preserve the heritage of cultural items, especially Native American items. Ms. McDougall said she was pretty sure there was a press release on the campus Web site about all of the operations related to the archaeological study. And if not, they could get a detailed list of all the things that were in the scope of work. It included having a Native American on the site to monitor what was going on during the exploration. She didn't know what would happen if something was found, although she knew the campus would comply with federal government rules.

Mr. Smelko said he heard that the seating would be decreased. He asked the amount it will decrease and if that had anything to do with safety. Mr. Gayle said he the current seating capacity was 72,000, and roughly 16,000-plus seats will be lost at the completion of all phases of the retrofit. That was largely not because of the seismic design so much, but due to the programming, the internal workings of the Stadium, and to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. It was bringing an 85-year-old building up to standards that people expect at a modern stadium with regard to amenities. Mr. Friedman said he thought it was expected to come down to about 62,000 seating capacity.

Mr. Smelko asked about the ideal date for starting the project and when it would be completed. Mr. Friedman said they're not sure when they're going to be authorized to start on the next phase of the design development phase. The designers, structural, architectural, and all the other engineering systems, probably need somewhere between a year and 18 months to complete the contract documents. To some degree, the timing was such that they'll have the SAHPC complete, which has a two-year construction period, and then, almost sequentially, it would be ideal to begin after that.

Ms. Oatfield moved to extend the time for the Special Order by 15 minutes as there were other speakers waiting to speak, and other questions. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Flores said it was mentioned that even if the Stadium was moved to downtown Berkeley, the same magnitude of impact would still be felt. She asked why that was the case. Mr. Friedman said that in studying earthquakes around the world, they've begun to learn about what they call a "near fault, fault-normal response." When one is so close to a fault and perpendicular to it, instead of a wave motion, which normally people sense when the epicenter of an earthquake was further away, shockwaves. But when one is close to the fault, they get more of a pulse. And that pulse tends to deliver an immediate, amplified force. So it's now actually in their seismic revisions of building this near-fault, near-field phenomenon, so it means that one is within this zone, that they design for exacerbated forces. If he could go back to a previous slide, it showed a distance scale from the fault. It's logarithmic, so different points were one mile, two, and three miles from the fault. Through that distance, what they call the "peak ground acceleration" remains very high. It's an amplified height of ground motion that exists up until they're about three miles away, after which it began to drop off. It doesn't mean it drops off to where design force level would be. So that's why he said whether or not one was one foot away from the fault or three miles away, these heightened forces were the same.

Ms. Tran said she took the EPS course last year and was confused, and asked them to clarify how it would be the same if the Stadium was built in downtown Berkeley. She assumed that if it was on the fault line that it would be more dangerous. Mr. Friedman said that was not the case. The fault-normal provision of the code basically says that these amplified forces will be as high right next to the fault as they would be three miles away, before it stops dropping off. That's why he was saying that the Stadium retrofit was designed for the same forces as a new building would be designed for, either on campus or in downtown Berkeley.

Ms. Tran said that in terms of retrofitting the Stadium, she asked what was being done with sections KK through L. When she took the class last year, there were cracks on the right side of the Stadium with only a pole holding up that section. She asked how that will be retrofitted. Mr. Friedman said that section KK was where he showed the columns at an expansion joint. Right now the Stadium was virtually a concrete frame building and had columns and beams connected together, with the exception of having a perimeter concrete shear wall. What they'll do in the retrofit is place concrete shear walls periodically through the Stadium to stiffen the building. There will be less distortion, so it will, in effect, protect the existing concrete.

Ms. Hussain said a Geography professor came last week and spoke about fault action on the west side of the Stadium. She asked if there was anything they needed to worry about liquefaction, or anything being done with the retrofit to alleviate that situation. Mr. Friedman said there wasn't. Liquefaction was not an issue for this building. Yes, there was fill, and there was a berm, but all of the existing footings in the Stadium in 1923 went down to solid-bearing material. They were not founded on top of the fill. Liquefaction was kind of the fictitious quicksand that you put something on. To have liquefaction two things are needed: granular sand, cohesional sand, and a lot of water. There needs to be a supersaturated solution. And then you induce an earthquake. They do not have a cohesional soil, even in the fill. But the fill is not supporting the Stadium. Footings are supported on lower, solid-bearing material. They just don't have the water content that is required, the same way they have at the Marina District in San Francisco, e.g., which did have super-saturated soil. Liquefaction was not an issue for CMS.

Ms. Oatfield asked if the graph took into account fault shear or fault rupture, or if that assumed there was no rupture. Mr. Friedman said it didn't. It was a ground motion issue. An earthquake produces two concerns. A primary concern was ground shaking. But when one is on top of a fault, they could still shake at that point, but there was also an issue of fault rupture displacement.

Ms. Oatfield asked what kind of damage they could expect to see from a significant earthquake after the retrofit, especially if there was some sort of rupture to the Stadium. Mr. Friedman said that if he's designed it correctly, they would still see some cracking in the shear walls. They would expect that, and if they're doing their job, they will crack. Earthquake engineering in its most distilled form was about dissipating energy that is released from an earthquake. So as a building moving back and forth, and it absolutely had to crack. By moving, it dissipates the energy. So what they'd see after the retrofit was some cracking in the concrete walls. Might they see some displacement? He sure hoped they wouldn't. But he wasn't sure it would be humanly perceptible. But the worst they should see was cracking concrete.

Ms. Oatfield asked if there was an estimate as to how much that might cost to fix. Mr. Friedman said they expect damage. What they would do in the case of something like that was to epoxy grout the cracks, although that was usually more cosmetic. They really don't expect to lose vertical or lateral load carrying capacity.

Ms. Ude asked about the way they'd experience an earthquake on the Hayward Fault, in the Berkeley community, and if they would feel a "jump," and then the sinoidal wave. She asked how they would experience it. Mr. Friedman said that was a good question. He asked to expand the scenario and asked where they would be. Ms. Ude said they'd be in Eshleman. Mr. Friedman said that he thought they would first sense a pulse. It will be a big, pounding feeling that will rock the building, and then gradually they'd begin feeling kind of a softening of that response. They will again feel more of a wave motion. They won't know if the epicenter was here, or 20 miles down the Hayward Fault. Earthquakes are very loud. The other perception she'd have besides the shaking was that if they were stand, they'd have a hard time staying standing; they'll have a very hard time walking; and they'll be overwhelmed with how much noise there is. That noise can be the fault rupturing or also buildings moving, glass breaking, things like that. He thought their first physical perception will be the pulse, and then shaking, and then it will be more auditory.

Ms. Ude asked what effect such an earthquake would have on the Stadium. Mr. Friedman said that if it happened to the Stadium before the retrofit, it would be a very different answer than what he answered before. They would see more than cracking, and they'd see significant damage to the Stadium. They do not expect the Stadium to collapse. They do expect there to be significant swaying and movement and damage of the Stadium. That was for today's Stadium, not after the retrofit.

Janice Thomas introduced herself and said she would like to address the last question about what would happen at the Stadium. They had to factor in 62,000 people. So whatever movement they'd go through, they'd go through it with 62,000 people. There was also a question as to how much this would cost. According to *The Daily Planet*, it will cost \$126 million for the SAHPC. But it will cost \$175 million for the retrofit of the west wall. She hasn't heard anything about the side of the Stadium where the students are located, so she didn't know how much that will cost. But already, they're over \$300 million. So it was an expensive project.

Ms. Thomas said the statement was made that earthquake forces were the same three miles out. But emergency access wasn't the same. The Stadium was an in accessible location. So they couldn't look at

these things in a vacuum. There were even politics in science. A fault ran down the face of a hill and there was a concentration of 62,000 people. As residents of the area, they had to think about how this would affect emergency response to all of them if there were 62,000 people at that location.

Ms. Oatfield moved to extend the time for the Special Order by 15 minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Raffi and passed with no objection.

Ms. Thomas said a statement was made by Mr. Friedman that since 1999 every area has been studied. She wanted to point out that additional geotechnical studies were done after the proposed public comment period. So the public did not have the opportunity to do the geotechnical studies before the close of the comment period.

Hank Gehman introduced himself and said he thought the Resolution was very important, and it was a very important decision the Senate will make. They'll actually take part in the approval. Their decision will be used by the University as an argument for going forward with this without really any public scrutiny.

Mr. Gehman said this earthquake will happen in their lifetime, and they had to be certain they could look back and say, "You know, my decision turned out to work out." Or they might think it was a dumb move, to have built and expanded development directly on the most dangerous fault in California. The University has always shortchanged, disguised, and hidden various risks, including the risk of landslide, the risks that fill presents to a rhythmic motion, and the risk of having so many people in the Stadium. Most experts say that would kill more than the actual collapse. Tighwad Hill has already been identified as a very dangerous hill, prone to landslide.

When Mr. Friedman said they would only have football games six times a year, that was no longer true. The University planned to exploit the new Stadium for commercial profit as an entertainment venue. The campus already claims it has the right to have an unlimited number of small events, less than 10,000. They'll take the occupancy and spread it from six days a year to most, or many weekends in the year. That will increase dramatically the risks people are put in.

Mr. Gehman said a paper was done by UC's own consulting geologist on this project, and in a study of the adjacent hills to Strawberry Canyon said that seismic forces were building there and when the earthquake happens, it will actually reverberate from the hills and magnify the effects at the site. When the graph was shown of near-field activity and seismic strength, they always had to take into account the local conditions. They couldn't generalize. There will be serious damage to the Stadium and it will never be rebuilt. All this money will be down the drain. He would ask them to imagine the situation after the earthquake. There will be up to \$200 billion in damage, maybe 4,000 people killed, maybe more. Imagine the State saying the Stadium should be rebuilt in its current location. People would stand back and think that was the most stupid thing imaginable.

Mr. Gehman said this was an experimental design. He asked if this was the place to start with an experimental design. Even if it succeeds, the panic and disruption it would cause to the rest of Berkeley. What happens is there's a natural triage. After a disaster, public safety will have to concentrate on areas where there's the most serious injury and death. They're going to have to ignore the people in West Berkeley to come to the Stadium and take care of things at the fault.

Mr. Gehman said he realized they're students. The Resolution talks about furthering the collegiate culture, of football and sports. He was all for the collegiate experience. He played college football and was

a grad student at Cal. What the Senate was really doing was trading a sports-centric University for an education-centric University. The effort being directed by the University to raise money for this project will pre-empt other attempts to build fundraising efforts to support the educational purpose of the University.

Students had the opportunity to play an important civic role and to rise above just looking after the next several years there, and having football games, and preserving the collegiate experience. They could get beyond being a student and look at the responsibility to initiate an independent review of this project. Right now they have two sides, the University and the people who oppose it, who are considered the "special interest," with the University considered the "general interest." What they need to have was a truly independent review of the seismic risks and of the viability of the design of the building. He didn't think there was a reason to rush into this. The student Senate could do a great public service, because it had standing. They could ask both sides to ask everyone to get geologists out of the woodwork. Everyone was afraid to talk, because as a professional in the Bay Area, if one was in a geotechnical field and opposed the University, they wouldn't work. Mr. Gehman said he's tried to find people who would advise him and to discuss, and people many times said, "Well, I think it's a terrible idea, but I can't talk to you about it because my business wants to do business with the University." Mr. Gehman said he had to find a geologist in Nevada to talk about these things. So just because they have experts didn't mean they didn't have commercial interests. So they need an independent review.

Mr. Gehman said one important part of an independent review has always been State supervision, the Division of State Architects, whose State engineers have designed and monitored construction of all high schools and community colleges. These buildings survive at a much higher rate. In the Northridge Earthquake, these educational structures with designs approved by the State had relatively very little damage. One campus had \$5 million in damage, and another had zero structural damage. UC Northridge had \$405 million of structural damage. When the University is allowed to go forward without independent review, it can't be trusted.

Mr. Gehman said the same seismic safety committee that approves this was now dominated by the head of Development, Ed Dent. In 1989 the Seismic Safety Committee vigorously objected to putting the football offices and athletic offices in the Stadium. But the University, unchecked by outside oversight, went ahead and did it any way, and now they complain that people work at the Stadium. A lot of particular, technical issues have never been honestly discussed in an independent manner. Mr. Gehman said he wanted to thank them.

Ms. Cho asked Mr. Gehman how he would respond to the gentleman who said the ground shaking was the same on the fault line as it was a mile away. Mr. Gehman said that also had to do with the actual site conditions. He wasn't disputing that statement, but what actually determined the amount of damage was the local site conditions in conjunction with the overall forces. The Stadium actually had a large quantity of fill. It is identified by the US Geological Survey very clearly as a liquefaction zone. The University says it isn't. So they have two opinions. That's the kind of question that should be resolved in an independent study.

Mr. Smelko asked if he could explain the panic argument that was made. Mr. Gehman said there will be tremendous shaking and a lot of noise. Just having people at a fault creates dangers. That was the purpose of Alquist-Priolo, to keep people away from faults. Even if a building survived, relatively speaking, the panic of people trying to get out, fighting over each other, was known to be a major killer.

Mr. Smelko said that since the force would be the same in a lot of different areas, he asked if there wouldn't be panic anywhere the Stadium was located. Mr. Gehman said it was more significant at the Stadium. Mr. Smelko asked how the effect would be different by not retrofitting. Mr. Gehman said there will be a big lateral movement. Mr. Friedman mentioned that it would be six feet, but people were now actually thinking they'd have to figure 12 feet.

Ms. Shah said she didn't think Mr. Gehman was saying there shouldn't be a retrofit. Mr. Gehman said there's the Stadium, a gym facility, an underground garage, totaling a lot of development the University was planning directly on the fault, or very close to it. The whole thing needed independent review. Alquist-Priolo limits additions or improvements to one half the value of the building. The idea was that as buildings become obsolete, it would only allow a certain amount of fixing up and improvement. So eventually, the building isn't as useful any more and it limits development and influences people away from the fault. The University has already costed this out and actually had very complete plans, which he's seen. But they won't state that because the University wanted to beat the law, and beat the system by chopping up the work.

Ms. Raffi moved to extend the Special Order by ten minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Raffi said that if the point was that 62,000 people would be in one location in an earthquake, and that there would be panic, and it wasn't a question of the structural damage the building might face, she asked what solution he would pose for having a stadium anywhere in Berkeley's vicinity. Mr. Gehman said the damage at the fault will be greater than the damage away from the fault. The chance of serious damage at the new Stadium was real. The expansion of the Stadium as a commercial venue was absolutely contrary to any common sense. An earthquake was coming, and all they could do was to discourage occupancy at the fault. The University's plan will increase it dramatically. No other stadium was in such a restricted location, and it was a prescription for a disaster.

Ms. Raffi said that if money to renovate the Stadium came from private donations, she asked how the University getting that from other sources would be detrimental to students and to the University. Mr. Gehman said the University has developed a big marketing department to raise money for sports from Cal alumni. They claim to have raised more money than any other school in America last year. But instead of building a network of donors that were aware of the brand of the University as the finest public university, they're building donorship on the basis of sports. They couldn't go back and build another donor network. There was a fiscal crisis and the period of big-time sports was over. The model the University was chasing was over all across America. The Senate should focus on how they can preserve their educational experience in the face of this economic downturn. Raising money for sports would inevitably divert money that could be given directly to education.

Ms. Ude said that in the event of a rebuilt Stadium, compared to the current Stadium, she asked how much a complete redevelopment of a sports complex would cost, beyond a retrofitted Stadium. Mr. Gehman said they've talked about \$300 million, \$285-295 million for the Stadium. But to do that they had to say the Stadium was actually worth \$600 million. That was absurd. This was a tremendous expansion, a doubling of square feet of the Stadium.

Mr. Tran asked how long a public review would take and how much he felt the ASUC would be able to mediate negotiations, and asked about the predicted time limit for a public review. Mr. Gehman said he

wasn't sure. There was no rush. It would be very politicized. The University was very powerful and didn't like to have anyone involved in its decisions except itself. They don't believe anyone else should be involved. So people would have to find geologists and structural engineers elsewhere. One place would be the State government. The Senate had standing and could ask for clarity.

Ms. Hussain moved to extend total time by ten minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Oatfield passed by hand-vote 12-3-3.

Doug Backwalt introduced himself. He said that if the Stadium was being planned that day, it would never be built, and the idea would be thought to be ridiculous. He thought that was irrefutable. So he asked why they would then want to support constructing a new stadium at that location; because that's what they're talking about, gutting the entire structure inside the shell. The entire thing will be rebuilt, with stadium seating, the press box, everything inside will be brand new. He asked why anyone would want to build a brand new stadium on top of a fault.

Mr. Backwalt said that Alquist-Priolo, as it was characterized by the speaker from the University, was misstated. It was said that it was just intended to prevent new construction on faults. That wasn't true and the campus rep knew it wasn't true. There are provisions in the law that talk about existing structures on top of faults. They cannot be retrofitted if the cost of such construction would be 50% of the current value of the structure. So the intent of the law was beyond new construction and was meant to discourage human activity on faults. A good idea for fault zones was to have green belts. Even if concrete structures are divided into the moveable units the campus was talking about, they can't engineer around human behavior, and there will be panic in these structures. It was stupid to build a massive, heavily used structure on the top of an earthquake fault.

Mr. Backwalt said he's a Cal graduate, Class of 1982. He sat and listened to the presentation that evening, and he'd tell the Senate what his teachers would have asked him after this presentation. They would have asked if he had the expertise to evaluate the claims that were made that evening. It was a very complex issue, with a theoretical design. Secondly, his teachers would have pointed out that they heard only one side of a technical presentation, and they would have asked if there were other sides to consider. The third question was if the evidence was presented in a clear and understandable manner. Mr. Backwalt said he watched every slide, and from where he was sitting, he couldn't read them. They saw little words and squiggly lines and claims were made about them. The fourth question was whether people presenting the claims have any self-interest in this matter. There were few people with a stronger self-interest in this matter than those who presented that evening. They have worked for the University on this project for a number of years and their careers were staked on the success of this project, and they will move hell or high water to get this thing built. He hoped people think about these questions as they evaluate the data and the claims that have been made.

Mr. Backwalt said this issue didn't have to be rushed, so he hoped the Senate doesn't make a decision on this without feeling convinced that they were fully certain that they had grounds to make this decision. Literally, lives could hang in the balance based on their participation in pushing this plan forward or to decide they need to no more. He wanted to thank them.

Ms. Hussain said she had a question about the sports-entertainment complex. When they met with Vice Chancellor Brostrom, he said there would not be many more events there. Ms. Thomas said the University's current commitment was not to add new commercial events at the Stadium. Mr. Gehman said that "current commitment" aside, he asked about when it was built.

Special Order of the Day -- Memorial Stadium Retrofit Plans (cont'd)
Report from the ASUC Lobby Corps Director
Appointments
Elected Official Announcements

- 47 -

Ms. Pasco said time for the Special Order has ended. Ms. Pasco said she would like to thank the presenters for the Special Order. (Applause)

Mr. Mairena moved to go back to Appointed Official Reports. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tran and passed with no objection.

Report from the ASUC Lobby Corps Director

Meghan Ballard said she finally submitted the DE-Cal syllabus to Poli.Sci., so it will be reviewed by that Department on Monday. She's been meeting with the Legislative Liaison, with each department in the EAVP's office, which was broken down into City, State, and National. She was hoping to have two State, one national, and City visits by the end of this semester. Lastly, on Monday, November 17, she hoped to plan a Sacramento trip where they'll actually meet with representatives at the State Capitol. If any Senators were interested in going, she would highly recommend that they come. She could also send out information about upcoming lobby visits as well so the Senate could get involved as well.

APPOINTMENTS

Ms. Pasco said the first appointment was Neil Gehlawat as Conduct Director, in the Student Advocate Office, with a stipend of \$550. A motion to approve was made and seconded by Mr. Mairena and Ms. Yang. THE MOTION TO APPROVE NEIL GEHLAWAT AS CONDUCT DIRECTOR, IN THE STUDENT ADVOCATE OFFICE, WITH A STIPEND OF \$550, UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Pasco said the next appointment was of Karen Baker, Financial Aid and Residency Director, Student Advocate Office, with a stipend of \$250. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE KAREN BAKER AS FINANCIAL AID AND RESIDENCY DIRECTOR, IN THE STUDENT ADVOCATE OFFICE, WITH A STIPEND OF \$250, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Hussain moved to go to Elected Official Announcements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Owens and passed with no objection.

Elected Official Announcements (cont'd)

Ms. Hussain said she would like to thank the Senate for the Special Order they just had. It was very interesting and enlightening. She wanted to make sure the Special Orders weren't abused, by sharing

opinions. They want facts, which was what Special Orders should be used for in the future. People shouldn't be told how to think, but presented the facts so they can evaluate the facts for themselves. The next time they have speakers, she would ask them to please make sure that the speakers share facts and not opinions.

Ms. Chen said she was TA'ing a class next semester, 2 units, P/NP or letter grade, "Personal Finances." People should talk to her if they wanted to know more.

Mr. Mairena said he's been take PE classes on campus for a while, and they were pretty tight. One of his instructors has been Toni Marsh, who was amazing. She's starting a new class next semester, "Core Strength." If people wanted to work on their abs, he'll probably be there and they could check him out.

Mr. Nahabet said that if people knew of chill international studies and breadth classes, they should let him know.

Ms. Hussain said she's a TA for Public Health 116. If people were interested, it would fill their L&S requirement.

Ms. Flores said to supplement her announcement about the Day of Filipina Women, there are cards she would distribute.

Ms. Oatfield said she met with a Vice President of the Berkeley Student Cooperative that day and was reminded her that last year, the President of the Co-ops and the BSC Liaison did a 10- or 15-minute presentation to the Senate about what the Co-ops were all about. She heard really good things about it, so she wanted to take a very informal straw poll of who would be interested in hearing Special Order of 20 minutes maximum. The External Affairs VP of the Co-ops would be happy to put together a presentation. Ms. Oatfield said she would let the VP know to prepare something.

Mr. Nahabet said he liked what Ms. Oatfield just did, taking a straw poll of what people wanted, since Special Orders were for the entire Senate. If they could all do that in the future, that would be great.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORTS

Report from the President

Ms. Winston asked how many people were familiar with the Sydesco, and said that Mr. Permaul seemed to have talked about it. Ms. Winston said she'll write an Executive Order that week to approve about \$2,000 being spent by the ASUC in order to make sure that student groups are ensured that have been volunteering their services at the Stadium in order to raise money for their groups. If people have questions she would ask them to please approach her before Friday.

Ms. Winston said she wanted to congratulate the EAVP and her office for spearheading an amazing voter registration drive. She was really excited and inspired. She told her roommates about it and was going to

cry, and her roommates didn't understand. Additionally, the OP has just started a blog. They're going to post really fun facts, such as things the office was doing, in addition to photographs of members of the office and the programs they put on, as well as special events and other things coming up in the office.

One thing a lot of students have talked to her about was being interested in knowing what the ASUC did, but they weren't sure where to go to find out information. The blog was just one thing they were trying in order to be more practical for students and help them figure out what was going on, and have contact with them. The blog is at asucop.blogspot.com, she believed. It was still beginning. It will get filled up in the next few days.

Ms. Winston said regarding From All Perspectives, she didn't receive the person's contact information people were going to send, so she didn't have a chance to interview or take a look at that individual. She'll look at them and let people know how she felt.

Next week there will be a Women's Caucus on October 28 at 7 p.m. in the Tan Oak Room. She was really excited because they were able to get a non-profit organization interested in mobilizing women voters to allow them to screen a video, "Engage Her," which was really focused in getting out the vote as that pertained to women. There were some really scary statistics. Last year 46% of Latino women who were registered to vote didn't go to the polls, and for African-American women, that number was 56%. That was a huge people who were registered but didn't feel motivated or propelled to go to the polls. The Women's Caucus was one way to work on that and to get information out to voters.

Ms. Winston said that on Tuesday they had an all-staff meeting for directors and interns. They had ice cream and played "The Song Game," which was a great icebreaker. Thursday will be "Love Your Body Day" hosted by the National Organization of Women on Upper Sproul from 12:00 to 2:00, with a bunch of fun things to do, like a "body secret," which was geared after post secret. There will be a lot of fun activities centered around loving your body.

Ms. Winston said she would like to make an appointment for the Finance Officer, Madeline Batac. She'll be at the Fi-Comm on Monday night and at the Senate meeting on Wednesday. Ms. Winston said she spent a lot of time interviewing people and a lot of time stressing out because she didn't like to reject people. It made her feel really guilty. So she spent a lot of time interviewing and evaluating. She also consulted with Finance Officer Chaney, so he could attest to this person as well.

Ms. Winston said that one thing they discussed last year when she was in the Senate was making sure there was some sort of continuity between the new and the old Finance Officers. So that's something they did for this year, and both of them were in contact with one another. Ms. Batac is a young Filipina from Haas. Ms. Winston said she would send out her résumé.

Ms. Winston said she'll be out of town that weekend. If people have tried to e-mail her, they'll probably receive something saying she was out of town. Part of that was because she was dealing with a situation. She didn't know if people saw the front page of the Daily Cal with the situation with two football players. It was really huge, and something she was very involved with, and something she was dealing with at that time. She was also working to make sure people felt safe and comfortable on the campus, which was a huge issue. She met the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs that day and met with the Associate Chancellor, and other people in the University Administration and the UCPD. She's been all over the place. This situation wasn't going away, and it's something she was very involved in. If people had questions they should contact her.

Ms. Winston said she didn't know how to express to them how important it was, in their every-day interactions, to foster an environment and a campus that was welcoming to all students. The undue stress that was caused by this type of stuff was really inappropriate.

Ms. Winston said she'll be out of town that weekend. As some of them may know, she turned 21 on Monday, along with Mr. Zuo, who turns 20. She was visiting her beloved parents, which will be very exciting. And the following week she will also be out of town because she's going to be campaigning for a presidential candidate. If people need to meet with her, she would ask them to please e-mail her ahead of time and she'd try to arrange her schedule. She called for any questions.

Ms. Hussain asked if she'll meet with Sen. Dhar within the next few weeks to discuss From All Perspectives. The Senate will appoint the show's director very soon, and there were several issues around that. She asked if that could be resolved so the Senate could vote on it in the next week. Ms. Winston said she hopefully will meet with the women Sen. Dhar forwarded. Ms. Winston said she thought it really was important for her to communicate with Senators and also meet someone before she appointed them. If there are other people anyone would like to forward they should let her know, so if one person didn't pass the test, the situation could be resolved as quickly as possible. Ms. Winston said she didn't feel comfortable appointing someone she didn't know. So she would need to meet the people beforehand.

Ms. Chen asked if she had a chance to send out the e-mail about the Judicial Council position. Ms. Winston said she didn't, but will do that.

Ms. Dhar asked if she received her e-mail on October 20 titled "Fab Co-Director," which Ms. Dhar said she also sent to Ms. Pasco, Ms. Afek, introducing her to Nicole Le Blanc and giving the contact information. Ms. Winston said she went through all her e-mails. She thought she responded back. Ms. Dhar said she didn't receive any response from Ms. Winston for the last week. Ms. Winston said she sent an e-mail before that and asked to have that person contact her about a meeting. She didn't receive an e-mail from the women until that afternoon, and Ms. Winston said she had meetings all day. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by three minutes passed with no objection. Ms. Winston said she could check her e-mails, but she sent Ms. Dhar an e-mail. She'll interview this person as soon as she had an opportunity. She only got the contact information that day.

Mr. Smelko asked what the situation was with the matter she spoke of. Ms. Winston said it was a really big question partially because she and two or three people, non-campus administrators, were the only people who knew everything that took place. A lot of what she knew the police didn't know, and the Administration didn't know. So a lot of these meetings have been about informing people about what has actually taken place. There's a lot of stuff that hasn't been reported and hasn't been filed. So people were being blamed for stuff they haven't necessarily done; and there are connections that didn't necessarily have to be made. She's been meeting with people to address campus climate and figuring out how to make this space safer for students. A lot of people didn't feel comfortable making reports to the UCPD or to the Administration because they didn't feel there was any fault or any sense of follow-up, and didn't feel safe, and felt nobody would do anything to protect them. That's what she's been trying to talk to administrators about, create a culture or environment that a student's University wasn't against them, but somehow working with them. It was huge. She didn't know the answer to that. She didn't know what the campus looked like, so she didn't know what to ask for.

Ms. Chen asked if Ms. Winston was more accessible via phone or e-mail, for future reference. Ms. Winston said she was pretty accessible through e-mail. Her favorite communication was in person. Ms.

Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by two minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Shah said that as far as the incident, there were a series of events that occurred with a young woman harassed by members of a sports team. Ms. Winston said that was in the Daily Cal article. A young woman was assaulted at a party, called racial slurs, and told to get out of the house. And that was it.

Report from the Executive Vice President

With Ms. Vir-Banks chairing the meeting, Ms. Pasco said she was excited, as it was only 10:27. As for a communication check, she would ask people to go around and state, from 1 to 10, how they thought communications was going in the Senate. Numbers were: 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 6, 5, 1, 8, 6, 5, 7, 10, 8, 7, 6, 5. Ms. Pasco said that meant they had some improvement, which was good.

Ms. Pasco said she wanted to give props to Mr. Owens for initiating meetings to talk about the length of Senate meetings. She thought a lot of feedback from that was really interesting and things the Senate could definitely explore and implement from now on. Hopefully so they will be well taken.

Ms. Pasco said that GA President Daal mentioned that the next Lower Sproul Student Council meeting will be next Tuesday, October 28, from 6:00 to 7:00 in Anthony Hall. She would encourage Senators to attend those meetings. That way, students could really dialogue about what they want for Lower Sproul, so the information was kind of out there.

Regarding the Web site, Ms. Pasco said it was updated. There were still some kinks here and there, but they could definitely talk to Mr. Hemmati about changes they would like to see. They should send him an e-mail, at webmaster@asuc.org. He was pretty quick with e-mails, really responsive. If people need anything updated, she would ask them to please let him know. It was really nice to have him in the office. He was at the staff meeting on Wednesday and fit in well with all of her other directors.

In terms of office and space allocations, the final decisions were not released yet. She brought the final decisions to Con-Review and there might be some changes that could be made. The Attorney General talked about it earlier. He may be giving up his office to give to student groups for either storage or office space. That was still being explored.

Ms. Pasco said she mentioned the EAVP staff meeting on Monday, which was organized by Ms. Afek. They had their interns also join them. They have about 10 interns in the office. So they had a little mixer so directors and interns could get to know each other. Ms. Pasco said she wanted to have an EVP office mixer at her casa November 10. It will be a potluck, and she was going to make chicken adobo. She also wanted to give props to the EAVP office for doing such an amazing job on voter registration. They will report on their amazing, record-breaking efforts.

Ms. Pasco said she will be out of town that weekend, going to Friendship Games, an annual social Filipino conference she goes to every year. It will be at a Cal State, and she was really excited to be seeing her *kababayan*, her community, in Tagalog, in one place.

Ms. Pasco said she wanted to wish people good luck in the second round of midterms, if they haven't gone through them already. Next week was the 10th week of school. That meant that by next Friday, at 5 p.m., that was the last day to change their grading option from a letter grade to Pass/Not Pass. They can't use P/NP for their major, minor, or other requirements, but could use it for breadth or interest classes. She called for any questions.

Ms. Hussain asked if there was any way to speed up the process with their business cards. Ms. Pasco said business cards were sent to the printer last week. They're just waiting for the printer to send back a proof. So it's actually out of their hands. She wished they could speed up that process as well.

In terms of lockers, Ms. Pasco said she e-mailed, phoned, and talked to Ms. Lemus in person, and also told Jan Crowder that they need lockers ASAP. Ms. Crowder said she's talked to Ms. Lemus multiple times. Ms. Pasco said she wished she could speed up that process. Again, they're still looking for the combinations for the lockers, and they haven't found them. Jillian Hagan, the Secretariat last year, actually has them. Ms. Pasco said she would guess there's been a lack of communication on their end. People could talk to Ms. Lemus themselves to put a little more pressure on her to get on those lockers. She knew people wanted to store things in them.

Ms. Chen said she thought it was reported a week or two ago that the business cards were sent off the week before. Ms. Pasco said she didn't recall, but she spoke to Ms. Afek that day. She letter the business cards last Monday, so Ms. Pasco said she could have reported that last Wednesday. Ms. Afek was taking care of that, and Ms. Pasco said she would e-mail them more details.

Ms. Rodriguez asked if they were using UC Printing Services, because it took another department forever to get business cards from them. Ms. Pasco said she wasn't sure which company they're using. Last year they used Alliance Graphics because they use recycled paper and soy ink. She could find out.

Mr. Nahabet asked when office hours will be updated on the Web site. Ms. Pasco said they should send Mr. Hemmati an e-mail. Mr. Nahabet asked if she relayed information they sent about their office hours. Ms. Pasco said she did.

Report from the External Affairs Vice President

Ms. Jirachaikitti said she came back from a town hall meeting in Oakland, where the Mayor of Oakland and the City Council held a town hall for people to come out and ask questions of their elected officials. There were over 100 people there, asking really tough questions. If people were interested in accountability and having representatives being accountable to the people who elect them, if they got a chance to go to a meeting like that, whether at Berkeley, Oakland, or their home town, she would ask them to please go. It was really eye-opening.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said a lot of stuff happened that week. Monday was the last day to register people to vote, and it was pretty intense. She skipped all her classes so she could be out there all day. She wanted to give a shout out to all the EAVP people in the Senate Chamber. On Monday they were there at 9:00,

9:30. They had 13 tables all over campus. Not only the EAVP, but volunteers from the Coalition, Cal Dems, Cal Berkeley Republicans, CALPIRG. She wanted to thank the Senators who came out and helped to volunteer, not only on the last day, but also the days leading up to it, including Ms. Hussain, Mr. Sakaue, Ms. Rodriguez, Ms. Yang, and Ms. Cho. It was nice to see them out there.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said the 2004 record of UC Berkeley registrations was 6,637. The record previously was by Liz Hall's office, the current Executive Director of the UCSA, when she was EAVP in 2004, the last presidential election. In 2004 they registered 6,637, which was amazing. But it wasn't as amazing as this year, because this year they registered 9,425. (Applause)

To let them know, Ricardo Gomez, in the office, did a lot of hardcore planning; Debbie Barron, Courtney, Megan, and Shiva; and all of them worked in the office. And of course, it didn't end on Monday and they were still working on things. They did not meet the goal of 10,000, but they made that goal knowing it was really high, and she never would have imagined they would get so close. So everyone was celebrating. Ms. Jirachaikitti said they didn't beat Santa Barbara, which registered 10,241. But that was okay. Ms. Jirachaikitti said people could have a conversation with her later if they wanted to know why that happened.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said they registered 1,500 students on the last day alone on the campus, which was pretty amazing. They had coverage in the Daily Cal on Tuesday and Wednesday, and KTVU, Channel 2 news came and talked to people in the Vote Coalition. ABC News came and there's a link on the station's Web site to a video Mr. Gomez and other people were in.

All the UCs registered over 40,000 students, all over the State. That was really amazing, and meant that students would have a lot of power when they go to lobby the Legislature, knowing they have 40,000 registered students behind them. That will be very useful for the rest of the year.

As for a couple of other things, now that students were registered, they need to make sure that they were educated to vote and actually go out to vote. So from now until Election Day, they're doing get out the vote, or GOTV. Next week on Wednesday and Thursday they're having informational events, with presidential candidates and then State propositions. It will be non-partisan and they'll invite every side. On Thursday they'll have local candidates talk, which was really important. There's been a lot of focus on the people candidates and the propositions, but hardly any news really about local candidates, and people were running for the Rent Board, for City Council, and the Mayor; and there were measures on the Berkeley ballot. A lot of students were registered at Berkeley and these things affect them. So it was important students know about that. The events will be at 7:00 in 10 Evans. She'll send out an e-mail.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said she had a library poster for people for Yes on Measure FF. The Senate passed a bill in support of this Berkeley proposition for libraries. It's a tax on people who live in Berkeley who own homes, which were usually not students. It will make sure their libraries are fixed up and were seismically safe. Technically, students won't pay for this but would benefit from the public libraries in Berkeley.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said they did voter registration at the Berkeley Thai Temple. If people haven't been to the brunch there, they should talk to her about it. The City of Berkeley and neighbors were trying to shut it down. Being there and doing voter reg in that community was really interesting. She personally felt very much about that issue, so if people wanted to talk about it, she would ask them to please let her know.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said that on November 4 they're working on a viewing event for Election Day. They've been working with the Auxiliary, and they already have the Bear's Lair, both the Pub and the non-Pub area to be viewing stations for students, from 6 p.m. to midnight, to watch the results of the election. They have a big-screen TV and were working with Operations and Peter Quintin. They have ordered 23 pizzas and they'll have egg rolls, nachos, for 150 to 200 people, even though there's only supposed to be 150 people in the Bear's Lair. People could also get alcohol if there 21 and over. They're also thinking about having a raffle, with a prize, from STA Travel, of ticket to Washington, D.C., and possibly a ticket to the inauguration. Ms. Jirachaikitti said they're working on that, but couldn't make any promises.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said Courtney McBride is on the Board of the US Student Association and will talk about what the office was doing on national issues. Ms. McBride introduced herself and said she was the National Campus Organizing Director. She serves on the USSA Board of Directors. If Senators need resources or had any questions about that, they could talk to her.

As for issues they're working on, Ms. McBride said the Department has taken on most of the issues that the USSA was sponsoring that year. They also decided as a group to work on issues dealing with the current economic crisis and how that will affect students. Hopefully, that year they'll be able to get out educational events on how this will affect students in the future.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said they're having a vote celebration dinner on Thursday and people were welcome to come. They'll have sushi, and people should let her know if they wanted to come so she could make reservations.

That day they had interns come for training. For future reference, they call their intern "externs" because it's the external office.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said she wanted to give an update on the Ultimate College Bowl. Cal was second for two contests, absolute number of voter registration cards and also percentages. Santa Barbara was leading in both of those and Berkeley was second in both. So thinking they wouldn't give two concerts to Santa Barbara, Berkeley could still possibly get a concert. Also, on Facebook, if they pledge to vote, there's a raffle and Berkeley could possibly win another concert.

Report from the Academic Affairs Vice President

Ms. Pasco said the Academic Affairs Vice President will not make a report that evening, but he did send a written report.

Begin written report from the Academic Affairs Vice President

Dear Senators,

I hope you are having a productive meeting tonight; I unfortunately will be unable to attend.

Written report from the Academic Affairs Vice President (cont'd)

The Academic Affairs Office has been busy this preparing the application for the Undergraduate/Graduate Mentorship Program. The application will soon be available in hard copy and on the Web site. I will update senate as more becomes available.

Last week, Bears Breaking Boundaries had their first fall award reception, where the winners of last year are recognized with a dinner and have the opportunity to present their project. Last year, the ASUC supported the event by funding 20,000 dollars to fund 'Curricular Innovation' and 'Student Life.' The two winning projects were a course curriculum on renewable energies and a bike share program. In the past, the ASUC and the student body has greatly benefited from the projects that have come out of BBB, such as the Bike Share program and Cal TV. I hope this year the ASUC can continue to support the project with at least the same financial amount (20,000) and possibly even more if they wish to see an increase in new projects or achievements in student life.

This past week, I personally have attended numerous committee meetings including SACUE, CAPRA, and a meeting with Harry LeGrande. Topics discussed were Welcome Week, Cal Performances, and issues with Tele-BEARS. We also addressed issues of campus safety, improved advising, and the eventual Campbell Hall relocation.

The Grants Department is really busy these days as applications are rolling in due to the increase in advertising. The Grants Department will continue to advertise all year long through personally contacting organizations and utilizing the new grants posters. We have about 250 grants posters, if any Senators would like one please come by the AAVP office. We'd like these posters to be all around campus in order to make ASUC grants visible to students and student groups.

Tomorrow I will be speaking at the textbook luncheon for the textbook adoption campaign. This is a luncheon to thank those faculty who have turned in their textbooks on time. Please continue to encourage your faculty and academic organizations to turn in their textbook list ASAP. We are currently at 35% compliance rate and we hope to reach 50% by the end of the month.

I will also be presenting at the fall Division meeting of the Academic Senate on November 23rd. Traditionally, the ASUC VP for Academic Affairs presents an issue of concern to the ASUC or student body to the assembled faculty during the "Announcements" portion of the agenda.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at aavp@asuc.org.

Best,

Carlo De La Cruz, Academic Affairs Vice President

End written report from the Academic Affairs Vice President

Mr. Nahabet moved to go to Old Business. The motion was seconded by Ms. Shah and passed with no objection.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Mairena moved to table SB 70. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hussain. Ms. Pasco said the Chair would like to remind the Senate that if bills under Old Business that were not considered would automatically be tabled and remained under Old Business.

Ms. Hussain moved to go back to Special Committee Reports. The motion was seconded by Ms. Yang and passed with no objection.

Special Committee Reports

Reporting for the Selection Committee for the Greek Affairs Officer, Ms. Chen she would like to nominate Carl Randall Champe Nash. Mr. Nash will be at next week's meeting. The application wasn't electronic so she couldn't send it out, but if people wanted to look at it, she brought it with her.

Reporting for the Selection Committee for the Fundraising Director, Ms. Rodriguez said they met last week. She forwarded it to the Senate so there was still time to forward it to people they know. It was due on Thursday at 8 p.m. to members of the committee.

Ms. Hussain said that committees have mentioned having applications and asked where they could be found. Ms. Rodriguez said they sent it out to as many people as possible and sent an e-mail to the Senate. It would be good to have them available online.

Reports from ASUC Representatives

Reporting as the ASUC representative to the Ethnic Studies Fifth Account Committee, Ms. Cho said they met that day and funded about five events.

Reporting as the ASUC representative to the Multi-Cultural Greek Council, Mr. Mairena said they met last Friday and they confirmed starting a fraternity on campus, Sigma Lambda Beta.

Ms. Oatfield moved to go to Elected Official Announcements. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Elected Official Announcements (cont'd)

Ms. Oatfield said she wanted to take a straw poll, in light of the Special Order they had that evening on the Stadium, she would like to see if people felt they should table the bill because there was so much information they couldn't make up their minds, or if they wanted to reconsider it, or consider putting it on the shelf indefinitely.

Mr. Mairena said all the information was overwhelming. He needed time to process it and didn't want to make a decision at that time.

Ms. Shah said she would like to digest it and discuss it with other Senators.

Ms. Raffi said they've known about this information for quite some time and they got a great deal of information last week as well. They should have utilized the week to find out both sides. This was a time sensitive issue.

Ms. Ude said she would like to hear from other people than the University, from people whose careers weren't on the line.

Mr. Nahabet said he thought the information presented was pretty straightforward. He'd like to consider SB 70 that evening and vote on it.

Ms. Shah a lot of new information was presented that evening and she would like to conduct her own research. Perhaps they could agree to vote on the bill next week.

Mr. Sakaue said he wasn't comfortable about voting and didn't know how much more additional information would convince him. He didn't feel he'd ever be qualified to speak on this issue.

Ms. Cho said there was a lot of conflicting information and people had a lot of research to do.

Ms. Yang said she felt she actually got the full spectrum of both sides that evening. The building was closing in 30 minutes and she didn't think they had enough time to discuss SB 70.

Mr. Nahabet said they've heard the two most informed sides. He didn't think dialogue was necessary unless it was information to clarify things. Otherwise they'd go in circles. They've already heard what there was to be said. He thought the Senate should talk about whether they should take a stance, and then vote. He didn't think pro and con arguments should be part of the discussion at all next week.

Ms. Raffi said it was hard to find a neutral opinion, so pursuing that might be a waste of time.

Mr. Mairena moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hussain and passed with no objection.

Roll call was taken for attendance. Members present were:

This meeting adjourned at 11:01 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak, Recording Secretary