

## GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

October 7, 2010

### SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called at 5:32 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

#### Announcements

UAW representative Sarah Knuth said they're hopefully coming to the end of bargaining on in the contract, which expired on September 30. They were basically stalled out at an offer that wasn't particularly favorable. They're paid below living wage. UC's last offer was a 2% increase over three years, below the projected rate of inflation. The childcare subsidy is another main point on the table. Childcare costs over \$1,200 a month, and the Union was pushing to at least double the per semester subsidy of \$450.

Ms. Knuth suggested that department meetings be held. The contract was for GSIs only, although any non-wage clauses covered GSRs as well, such as for childcare and health care. Under labor law, the Union can't bargain for GSRs. That's not the case in every State.

Vishalli Loomba, ASUC Senator, said a bill about the Coca-Cola contract was in committee. Also, that day was the Day of Action.

The Coke contract benefitted a "consortium" of Intercollegiate Athletics, Rec Sports, the ASUC Auxiliary, and RSSP (the residents.) It was noted that this is the money the GA uses for alcoholic beverages for social events. It also paid for GA lobby activities. People with concerns about the bill could contact its author.

Josh Daniels, former GA President, said he was running for the Berkeley School Board, and asked for people's vote.

Lucy Diekmann, Coordinator of the GA's publication/blog, *The Berkeley Graduate*, requested ideas from people and writers, and asked people to spread the word about it.

The GA was co-sponsoring a discussion, "UC Cyber Campus: The Future We Want?" The GA will also have a Coffee Hour. The Mario Savio Memorial Lecture was also being held, with Elizabeth Warren to speak.

Bright green GA logos were available to put on department bulletin boards.

#### Approval of the Agenda and Approval of the Minutes

A motion to table Resolution 1009c indefinitely, passed unanimously by voice-vote, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Orgs. The GA considered the bill at it' last meeting and approved part of it. Only clauses 2 and 3 were tabled.

### Resolution Referral

Resolutions were referred to committee: 1010a, On Budget Amendment to Restore Funding for Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE); and 1010b, To Create a Work Group to Review GA Structure, to the Campus Affairs, External Affairs, Rules, and Budget Committees

### Speaker -- Nadesan Permaul, Director, ASUC Auxiliary

Mr. Permaul said he was a graduate student at Berkeley in the 1970s and for the last 20 years has taught in the Rhetoric and Political Science Departments. His major job was Auxiliary Director.

The ASUC was founded over 120 years ago by undergrads. Students created the first Student Union and built many other facilities students use on campus, since they managed Intercollegiate Athletics until 1960. The ASUC was a financial success through the 1980s, when the campus went to the semester system. The ASUC fell into financial difficulty and got in debt. As a result, the campus and the ASUC signed the Commercial Activities Agreement, which stipulates the relationship.

The ASUC is composed of the GA and of the undergrad government. The Auxiliary manages the business services and facilities of the ASUC. A key issue ASUC faced by the ASUC was how to maintain its independence, as it was the only college student government in the US with its level of autonomy. The Auxiliary was in financial difficulty and in the last two years has used almost \$500,000 from reserves for operating costs.

The Store Operations Board has seven students, three administrators, and two faculty. The Board makes financial decisions for the Auxiliary and approves its budget. Operational Excellence has raised questions about ASUC structural autonomy. In response, student leadership points to the CAA, and has been very effective.

Passage of the BEARS Referendum means that by 2017, cash will flow back into the ASUC.

SOB businesses include the Bookstore, the Food Court, Tully's, the ASUC portion of the Coke contract, and businesses in the ASUC Mall. The Auxiliary has ranged from 25 to 28 employees.

### Report from the Funding Committee

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA substituted new information for figures in the printed report for GMER Round 2, "Total Group Allotment.

By voice-vote, the GA approved the Funding Committee Reports for Round 1 Grants and GMER and Round 2 Grants (\$10,418.57 awarded) and Round 2 GMER (\$14,664.00 awarded).

### Lower Sproul Project Report

Mr. Daal introduced Alyosha Verzhbinsky, the students' consulting architect, paid for as part of the BEARS Referendum.

Artistic renderings of Lower Sproul changes were shown.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 3

The GA conducted a study in 2005 on what grads would like to see in a new Lower Sproul, and came up with “The Graduate Student 10.”

Mr. Daal noted that the BEARS initiative passed with 65% of the vote. Student leadership contracted an agreement with the campus and has two MOUs laying out design features students wanted. One clause was to have Hearst Gym made available for student activity space. The fee will be highest in 2043, at \$396 (\$175 in 2010 dollars). The total cost of the project is \$223 million

Eshleman will be demolished and construction will begin in the third quarter of '12 and end in the second quarter of '15. Work on MLK and Chavez will start second quarter of '15 and end in first the half of '17.

Architect the project is Moore Ruble Yudell (MRY). They're currently deciding what activities will be in the buildings. There is a structure by which students can give input.

### GA Elections

Miguel Daal, experimental particle physics, was elected President. He was President last year and the year before.

Danielle Love, Goldman School, was elected Campus Affairs VP. She had been CAVP Chief-of-Staff.

Apple Williams, Law, was elected as one of the GA's Graduate Council representatives.

### Resolutions

Resolution 1009c was tabled indefinitely, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Orgs.

Resolution 1004b was amended and passed unanimously by voice-vote, Resolution to Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement. The bill creates a work group to revise the GA's current Mission Statement.

Resolution 1005a failed by voice-vote, Resolution on a By-law Amendment to Accelerate Funding Application Review. The bill would have removed Assembly approval of Funding Committee allocations, which the Committee itself would have approved.

Resolution 1009d, by unanimous voice-vote, was postponed until the November GA meeting, To Establish Funding Committee Procedures.

Resolution 1009e, passed unanimously by voice-vote, On an Action Agenda Item to Adopt a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target. The bill would set targets for campus-wide energy efficiency.

The meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

## **End Summary of the Meeting**

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Tiffany Ng at 5:32 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Ms. Ng said she would like to welcome them back after one week, after their first meeting.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Ng said the first announcement would be by the UAW representative Sarah Knuth. Ms. Knuth said she had fliers that they handed out at the pickets that day. It would be very helpful if people could take extras and distribute them to their departments.

Ms. Knuth said that basically, the sheet she distributed summarized what was going on in bargaining. Hopefully, they're coming to the end of bargaining, which was supposed to come to the end of bargaining on September 30, when their contract actually expired. Unfortunately, UC was not ready, for complicated reasons, including someone having to go to a high school reunion. So UC decided to basically to walk away from the table; although UC isn't saying it walked away from the table. But Ms. Knuth said they have been forced to accept their contract being extended for another week. There will be another bargaining session that coming week. They were basically stalled out at an offer that wasn't particularly favorable to them.

The sheet she distributed summarized all of the main talking points and the points of contention on the contract as it exists. Her e-mail and the e-mail of the local were included.

Ms. Knuth said that what a lot of people care about, obviously, was the wage issue. She thought it was a given that they were paid below a living wage. Even in the best-case scenario, what they're demanding would not take them to what was considered a living wage in the Bay Area. What they are asking for was a wage increase that was at least several percentage points more than what the University has offered them so far. UC's last offer was a 2% increase over the last three years. But that's below the projected rate of inflation, which is anywhere from 2.3% to 3% a year. That meant they would be taking a pay cut every year of the contract. So it wasn't a great deal for them.

In addition, the childcare subsidy was one of the other main points they still had on the table. The average cost per month of childcare is over \$1,200. The total per semester cost of the subsidy was only \$450. They're pushing for at least a doubling of that; and even that was pathetically small. But the University, in order to accept the very small percent wage increase, was asking that they just totally abandon that. So it wasn't good news.

Ms. Knuth said the University was also trying to cut compensation to Union reps in bargaining. Currently, someone will be able to get a semester's GSI SHIP, or the equivalent, to actually go bargain. The University wants to cut that, so people couldn't actually go to the table to bargain. Considering it's in LA, it was pretty hard to do with just a work release. It was very unresponsive to their actual working conditions. Ms. Knuth said this was a summary, and she was happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Knuth said the main thing now was that they had to see what will happen at the next bargaining session. They're likely going to call an emergency membership meeting, and she would ask people to please stay tuned for that. She thought people have seen an e-mail from the local as a whole. They may

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

have to go on strike on November 1 if nothing else happens. So this was important, and having department meetings was a really good idea. She would ask people to please attend monthly meetings and to please contact their department for a meeting to talk about these things.

A Delegate said this was just for GSIs, and asked about GSRs. Ms. Knuth said that what they were talking about was for GSIs only. Childcare and any health care bargaining, which they haven't seen much movement on, covers GSRs as well. Any of the non-wage clauses cover GSRs. The Delegate asked why, then, they don't help GSRs. Ms. Knuth said a lot of it had to do with labor law in California. The Union is not empowered, under labor law, to bargain for GSRs. That wasn't true in every State. But that's a legal fight, and they should represent everybody in the union. At least that was her opinion. But what they have now is that the GSRs and GSIs are on a separate childcare and health care plan.

Ms. Ng said the next announcement would come from the ASUC Senate. Vishalli Loomba introduced herself and said she was an ASUC Senator, and would give an update for that week. One thing that might be relevant to the GA was a bill dealing with the Coca-Cola contract that was currently being reviewed in committee. If Delegates would like more details, they could speak to the author of the bill, Sen. Elliot Goldstein. People could find his e-mail in the contact information on the ASUC Web site. He wrote the bill and it was co-authored by students who have concerns with the Coca-Cola contract. The bill outlines what they would like to see. It had a lot to do with more student representation in the decision making.

Other than that, Ms. Loomba said that day was the Day of Action. If people there participated, that was great.

Mr. Rabkin asked who votes to approve the Coca-Cola contract, and if it was the ASUC or also the GA. Mr. Marchand said the Coca-Cola contract benefits Intercollegiate Athletics, Recreational Sports, the ASUC Auxiliary, and RSSP, i.e., the residents. Those four groups meet as a quote "consortium." Recently the President of the ASUC has requested to attend these meetings. Mr. Marchand said he thought that Mr. Permaul, the ASUC Auxiliary Director, has confirmed that he could. Also, Mr. Permaul will speak later that evening so people could ask him questions about the Coke contract or the Auxiliary.

Mr. Rabkin said it was his understanding that money from the Coke contract was the only money the GA could spend on alcoholic beverages for University-wide social events. Mr. Marchand said that was correct, and it was commercial revenue for the GA. The only other way they could make commercial revenue that could be spent for alcohol was if the ASUC Auxiliary had a revenue surplus. Then the ASUC would start sharing that with the GA.

Mr. Rabkin said he would like the ASUC representatives to know that the GA really needs Coca-Cola money for the GA's social events to happen. He believed the GA's lobby activities were also paid for out of commercial revenue. So this mattered a lot to them.

Ms. Loomba said the bill doesn't express the views of every single Senator at that time. It's in committee and will come to the Senate, and hopefully the GA's issues and concerns will be addressed.

Mr. Pham introduced himself and said he was also an ASUC Senator. The beverage contract bill has gone through his committee, the University and External Affairs Committee. Personally, he had his own reservations with the Coke bill. It's a big issue in terms of what gets turned over for revenue to the ASUC and to the GA. A public forum will occur out of this bill. Whether or not it passes, individuals putting

Announcements (cont'd)

- 6 -

the bill forward will hold a public forum in the future. If grad students want to voice their opinions, the ASUC would be more than happy to send information to the GA President, or whoever. A lot of times at these meetings, it's very one-sided, which just kind of construes the student opinion.

Ms. Loomba said that if people have concerns about the bill, before it's considered, she would ask them to please contact Sen. Elliott Goldstein, because he co-authored the bill. He'd love to hear their concerns, and she thought their concerns would be best voiced in that way.

Ms. Ng said they would next hear from Josh Daniels, candidate for Berkeley School Board.

Mr. Daniels said he recognized some faces there. He introduced himself and said he was running for the Berkeley School Board. About two years ago he was sitting in the Chair's seat and served as President of the GA for two years. He's from Berkeley, born and raised, and was there to ask for their support.

Mr. Daniels said he'd let them know a little bit about him for those who live and vote in Berkeley. Since graduating, he's been a financial advisor to school districts. He currently works as an attorney, in school finance. They represent school districts suing the State of California for more money, for fewer restrictions, things like that. While he was at Berkeley he worked with the Administration and with student groups and community groups. He thought that actually being in the GA has taught him a lot about different aspects of Berkeley and how to work together to really make things happen. It was powerful for him to be there. His Web site is [electjoshdaniels.com](http://electjoshdaniels.com). If people have any interest in helping out, or phone banking, or precinct walking for him, or for any of the propositions, he would love their help. On Saturday, from 10:00 to 2:00, they're doing some work. If people were interested, they could send him an e-mail. He wanted to thank them very much.

Ms. Ng said that Lucy Diekmann would make the next announcement. Ms. Diekmann introduced herself and said she was one of the Project Coordinators of the Graduate Assembly and oversees *The Berkeley Graduate*, which is the GA's publication. Historically it's taken other forms, but for as long as she's had this job it's been a blog. It could be found at [www.theberkeleygraduate.com](http://www.theberkeleygraduate.com). The way she envisioned it is that it's space for graduate students to share their experiences, collective wisdom, and was more of an online community that cut across departments.

Ms. Diekmann said she was looking for three things. She always hopes to have more readers, and would also like to have writers. If people don't feel they have time to write, it would be great to get their ideas and hear about what they'd like to see on the blog, and how to publicize it and get more people involved. It would really reach its full potential when there's a lot of input from a wide range of people. She hoped Delegates take a look at the blog and spread the word to their friends, colleagues, and department mates. She was also more specifically looking for either a work group or a steering committee to help her direct the shape of the blog. If people think they would like to participate, they could send her an e-mail at [berkeleygraduate@ga.berkeley.edu](mailto:berkeleygraduate@ga.berkeley.edu). She also sent out an e-mail to Delegates. She wanted to thank them.

Ms. Ng said they had an announcement from Mr. Marchand. Mr. Marchand said he wanted to announce an event that the GA was co-sponsoring, along with the Berkeley Faculty Association, SAVE, the GSI Union, and the ASUC. It's "UC Cyber Campus: The Future We Want?" It's a discussion about the online University proposal. The panel will include the Dean of Law, the main mover of this proposal, a faculty member, a grad student, and a lecturer. He'd pass posters around and would ask people to take one for their department.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 7 -

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes

Ms. Ng said she hoped people picked up some fliers for the Coffee Hour that the GA will put on. They just established these coffee hours that year in order to improve communications between the leadership, the Delegates, and their constituents. So they hope people attend, chat, and get caffeinated.

Ms. Hsueh said she had a flier to pass around for the Mario Savio Memorial Lecture and would ask them to please take one for their department. Elizabeth Warren will speak, and it should be great.

Ms. Ng said that regarding all these fliers, for those who came to the last meeting, they distributed beautiful, bright green GA logos that people could put up on department bulletin boards. If they didn't pick one up, they could get them at Anthony Hall.

A speaker said they had a coffee cart there, but it was leaving at 7:00.

Ms. Ng said she just wanted to mention that they're expecting a motion from the Law Delegates regarding Resolution 1009c, On Assembly Review of Executive Authorization, Evaluation of Funding Outcomes, and Commitment to Student Organizations. She would like to acknowledge that she, Mr. Marchand, and other members of the Executive Board, were actually included in the discussions that led to the substitution amendment that was discussed last time at the Special GA meeting, which was still on the floor. They found some areas of agreement, as well as other areas where they agreed to disagree. But they wanted to acknowledge the spirit of cooperation and transparency by Law Delegates during this process.

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A speaker said she was part of the Law delegation. They've had several very productive conversations with Delegates outside the Assembly. Conversations are ongoing and they hope to continue them. So they would encourage everyone who would like to speak to the Law Delegates to come to them and they'd be happy to discuss everything with them. They'll move to table Resolution 1009c indefinitely. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Navab said they've already approved a couple of the clauses, and the motion would table indefinitely the remaining clauses. Mr. Marchand said that only clauses 2 and 3 were on the agenda.

Mr. Apgar moved the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. **THE MOTION TO INDEFINITELY TABLE THE REMAINING CLAUSES OF RESOLUTION 1009c PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON ASSEMBLY REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE AUTHORIZATION, EVALUATION OF FUNDING OUTCOMES, AND COMMITMENT TO STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS, WITH CLAUSES 2) and 3) TABLED INDEFINITELY.**

Ms. Ng called for any other amendments to the agenda.

Mr. Marchand said he submitted a motion for referral, 1010b, To Create a GA Structural Review Work Group, to review GA structure. It was posted online two days before the meeting. He moved to add

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes (cont'd)  
Speaker -- Nadesan Permaul, Director, ASUC Auxiliary

- 8 -

1010b to Resolution Referral. Resolutions referred at this meeting didn't have to be part of the meeting's written material.

A motion to add 1010b to Resolution Referral passed unanimously by voice-vote.

A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. The motion to approve the agenda, as amended, passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Ms. Ng called for any objection to the approval of the September 16 minutes, as posted online. Seeing no objection, the minutes were approved. THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SEPTEMBER 16, 2010 GA MEETING WERE APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

#### RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Ms. Ng referred the following bills to committee:

1010a, On Budget Amendment to Restore Funding for Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE), to the External Affairs, the Rules, and the Budget Committees

1010b, To Create a Work Group to Review GA Structure, to the Campus Affairs, External Affairs, Rules, and Budget Committees

Ms. Ng called for any objection to Resolution Referral, and seeing none, said the referrals were approved.

#### SPEAKER -- Nadesan Permaul, Director of the ASUC Auxiliary

Mr. Permaul said it was his privilege to be there that evening. He was among them as a graduate student there at Berkeley during the 1970s and got his BA and Ph.D. there in Political Theory. He's been teaching for the last 20 years in the Rhetoric and Political Science Departments. But his full-time job was Director of the ASUC Auxiliary. If any of them wanted to contact him, and he hoped they will, they could get together and talk.

Mr. Permaul said the ASUC was founded over 120 years ago by undergraduate students in the College of Letters and Science. It was a product of the German model of higher education, in those days, where the University only provided core academic services. All other services had to be provided for by the con-

stituents. UC Berkeley was in the midst of fields and was an empty location, down a long dirt road from Oakland, so the students had to provide services for themselves.

Students created the first Student Union in old North Hall, with a coffee shop and a lounge. They later built Stephens Union, which is now Stephens Hall, and Moses Hall, which was the original Eshleman Hall. The students built Memorial Stadium, the track, and many of the other facilities that students use on the campus. That's because they managed Intercollegiate Athletics until 1960. Undergraduates are fond of reminding the Administration that the school hasn't been in the Rose Bowl since the campus took over.

Speaker -- Nadesan Permaul, Director, ASUC Auxiliary (cont'd)

- 9 -

Mr. Permaul said the ASUC, in 1960, when the Lower Sproul complex was built on what was then old Union Field, went from being a long-term organization to being a mandatory one when they paid off the bonds for the construction of the buildings. When it did so, the graduate students withdrew from the ASUC. Grads had been, from the founding of the Graduate Division in 1915, until 1960, a part of the ASUC's undergraduate government, in various forms. It was represented by one, two, or three students on a council. But the graduate students decided to withdraw, and one year later they constituted themselves into a graduate student organization that, in various forms, has existed all the way to the present.

Mr. Permaul said that the ASUC was a financial success all the way through the 1980s. When the campus decided to go to the semester system, away from the quarter system, the ASUC lost one-third of its revenue overnight, because the Bookstore was only selling two repetitions instead of three. From that period through the 1990s, the ASUC began to fall into financial hardship. Unlike the support that the campus gave to Intercollegiate Athletics, the campus would not let the ASUC carry that debt. There were protracted negotiations that led to legal action. The ASUC had been independent from the outset and was a 501(c)3, and it sued the campus. The campus countersued.

There was a negotiated settlement that produced a document, the Commercial Activities Agreement, which can be found on the Auxiliary Web site. It lays out the terms and conditions for the relationship between student government and the campus. It recognizes that the ASUC is the designated representative of student government on the campus.

The ASUC is composed of the Graduate Assembly and the undergraduate student government. The Auxiliary was created to replace the old business unit that was managed directly by the students, from the 19th Century until 1999. Student government turned over every year, and the complexity of managing the business services of the ASUC, just as the complexity of managing Intercollegiate Athletics in the 1950s, finally caught up with it. So the campus insisted that there be a campus department that was hired by the students to manage those activities. And Mr. Permaul said that is the department that he oversees.

Mr. Permaul said the Auxiliary oversees the facilities, operations, financial affairs, and commercial activities of the ASUC, and also advise graduate and undergraduate student government. Historically, the GA has not been closely associated with the Auxiliary. When he arrived five years ago, he tried to make it his business to work much more closely with the GA. He had a close and very effective relationship with Josh Daniels; and he hoped he had a close and effective relationship with Mr. Daal. And he would like to be more involved in those activities that the GA feels he could be of some help with.

Mr. Permaul said one key issue the ASUC has faced over the course of its history was how to maintain its independence. This was the only college student government in the US with the level of autonomy it has. He's called regularly by advisors to student government around the country asking how they could be like Berkeley. And he says they can't be. The reality is that they were called out by the Regents as a unique

student organization. Every other student government throughout the UC System answers to its student affairs department. Student government at Berkeley does not. And the Commercial Activities Agreement establishes the relationship between student government and the Chancellor. The ASUC's legal counsel, Mark Himmelstein, has been the guardian of that relationship for the last 30 years. And now, Greg Brock, who will take over for Mr. Himmelstein, after a year of interning under him, will be charged with the responsibility of maintaining that relationship with the campus. It's been important because it has allowed Berkeley student government to have a kind of flexibility of speaking on behalf of students, and taking action on behalf of students, that other student governments could only wish to do.

Speaker -- Nadesan Permaul, Director, ASUC Auxiliary (cont'd)

- 10 -

Mr. Permaul said the ASUC was currently in financial difficulty. The financial status of the Auxiliary, and the ASUC, are tied together. All the funds belong to the ASUC, but it is pledged to pay for its services upfront. Any residual money is distributed to student government. Mr. Permaul said that when he arrived there five years ago he discovered that there had been a plateau of revenue dating back to 1999 and the signing of the Bookstore lease, and revenue had not changed. As a consequence, revenue remained flat and expenses, as they always do, continued to grow. He felt there was going to come a moment, very soon, when those would collide, and the ASUC would once again be in financial difficulty. That was in the 1990s, and it came to pass two years ago.

Mr. Permaul said that for the last two years the Auxiliary has had to use almost \$500,000 out of its reserves to bail out operating costs. For this year they're running a structural \$92,000 deficit for this year. Due to the work that was done and the seismic project, which closed some of their businesses, and depending on how quickly their revenue coming in from their new businesses, that deficit could grow by the end of the year. The campus at the Store Operations Board said they would not allow the Auxiliary to expend more than \$92,000 out of the reserves because they were rapidly going through them. The campus is responsible, and as he said, he answers to the Vice Chancellor of Business Administration and the Associate Vice Chancellor. And they basically told him the Auxiliary couldn't spend more than they already have in a structural deficit.

Mr. Permaul said that student leadership said this was the purview of the SOB and of student leadership. The money belongs to the students, and student leadership said they'd negotiate with the campus and decide how that would work. As far as he knew, Mr. Permaul said that student government was fulfilling that role.

Mr. Permaul said the key feature of the agreement in 1998 was the Store Operations Board. There had always been a board to oversee and govern the business affairs of the ASUC. The Store Operations Board was composed of six students and five administrators. When the GA and the ASUC signed the revenue-sharing agreement, the GA President was added to the Board. So there are seven students and five administrators, two of whom are faculty members. They make the financial decisions about the fiscal affairs of the ASUC and they review and approve the Auxiliary's budget and staffing.

Mr. Permaul said that Operational Excellence has raised some very interesting questions about the autonomy of the ASUC. The campus is moving on as if it is including the ASUC in what it's doing with OE and organizational simplification. Once again, student leadership has said to the campus that wasn't quite right, and that there was a signed legal agreement with the campus stating that all those questions come to the SOB. And then, if there's a disagreement with the Chancellor, they would negotiate directly with the Chancellor; and no committee would tell the aux what Auxiliary to do. But the campus was saying that the Auxiliary was part of the campus, and is an auxiliary, like other business operations on campus, and

expects the ASUC Auxiliary to continue to work with the campus on whatever planning OE is engaged in for adjustments and changes both to the Auxiliary and to its services, and to the simplification of the organization.

So the financial and structural independence of the ASUC were both bones of contention with GA and ASUC leadership and the GA and the campus. There could not be better people to be working with right now than the ones students have provided, in both graduate and undergraduate government. They've been very reasonable and very effective.

Speaker -- Nadesan Permaul, Director, ASUC Auxiliary (cont'd)

- 11 -

Mr. Permaul said the passage of the BEARS Referendum last spring creates a new horizon for the ASUC. Within a number of years, by 2017, there will be cash flowing back into the ASUC, both from its commercial activities and from the bond money used to renovate these facilities. Eshleman will be torn down in 2012. Between now and 2015, when Eshleman is rebuilt, there's a gap. That's an issue student leadership has been talking about, and will continue to do so.

Mr. Permaul called for any questions people might have about the Auxiliary and its relationship with the campus.

Mr. Rabkin asked how their legal counsel works, and if counsel was hired by the Auxiliary or student government. Mr. Permaul said counsel is hired by the students. Mr. Rabkin asked how counsel was paid. Mr. Permaul said students take funds out of their revenue. Mr. Daal said the GA doesn't share the cost of paying for legal counsel. Mr. Permaul said the undergrad government pays annually out of its student fee revenue, as it has for the last 30 years. Mr. Rabkin asked if that goes through the Auxiliary. Mr. Permaul said the Auxiliary oversees all finances, so the contract is something the Auxiliary implements. But the Auxiliary doesn't make a decision on the amount that's paid or who is selected. Mr. Rabkin asked if the Auxiliary had veto authority if the students tried to hire someone the Auxiliary didn't like. Mr. Permaul said it didn't. But the students have graciously invited him to participate in the hiring process. But he did not have a vote.

Mr. Marchand said the Auxiliary does the accounting for the GA and the ASUC, and the pots of money are separate. Auxiliary money is commercial revenue, which is a different pot of money, and is governed through the Store Operations Board.

Mr. Permaul said that as a correction, two years ago, Josh Daniels and Van Nguyen, Presidents of the GA and the ASUC, made it clear to the Chancellor that all money of the ASUC was student money, including commercial revenue. There's no money that belongs to the Auxiliary. The Auxiliary is a paid agent that is basically hired by agreement with the campus and the students. They're paid with student money. So none of the money belongs to the Auxiliary. It belongs under the ASUC and is governed by the Store Operations Board.

Mr. Daal said that that point was the students' perspective, but as far as he knew, there's no document conceding that point on the Administration side. Mr. Permaul said that was correct. The way that arose was that the Chancellor was going to sweep money from ASUC reserves two years ago. Mr. Daniels and Mr. Nguyen said that wasn't the campus' money, and that it belonged to the students. And they said that the ASUC Auxiliary was not the typical auxiliary, and the ASUC Auxiliary didn't answer to the Berkeley campus in the same way that other auxiliaries did. And the Chancellor de facto conceded because he did

not sweep the reserve funds. But he did take the STIP, short-term interest earned on reserves. And that has been a bone of contention since that occurred. STIP was about \$120,000 a year when the Chancellor swept up that money campus-wide, although it's much less with the depression of the market. The Chancellor didn't agree that that money belonged to students.

Mr. Mikulin asked what businesses were included in the SOB. Mr. Permaul said it's all of the commercial activities of the ASUC, including the Bookstore, the Food Court, Tully's, the ASUC's portion of the Coca-Cola contract, businesses in the ASUC Mall. They just agreed to lease space to Kaplan Test Prep inside the Mall. They're also negotiating an organic soup and salad restaurant that wanted to open up where Naia Gelateria was. They also have commercial sponsorships, which was another issue that

Speaker -- Nadesan Permaul, Director, ASUC Auxiliary (cont'd)

- 12 -

student leadership wanted to put on the table, i.e., how commercial sponsorships are developed at the Auxiliary on behalf of the ASUC.

Mr. Mikulin asked how many FTE they have and what the overall budget was in terms of annual gross. Also, if OE develops recommendations relative to ASUC operations, he asked what the process might be to review and accept those. Mr. Permaul said the ASUC Auxiliary has ranged from 25 to 28 employees. They laid off two employees two years ago because of financial difficulties and they haven't filled a number of positions because of financial woes. They didn't fill the undergraduate Publications Advisor and they withdrew the .3 FTE that supported the GA's Funding Advisor, and they eliminated the ASUC Library on the 7th floor, along with the student jobs that were associated with it, just to keep the structural deficit at about \$82-92,000. Their operating budget is about \$3.5 million. Revenues are about \$3.2 million. At this point they expect revenue to be closer to \$3.4 million by the end of the year. But because of delays in the construction of the Food Court, their businesses will open up months late, and revenue was also lost during the summer because of a seismic project. They have reserve funds that the undergrads put aside four years ago to help relieve those lost revenues, but they won't come into the budget cycle until later.

As for Operational Excellence, Mr. Permaul said he was being charged with eliminating layers of the organization and expanding supervision. Currently the Auxiliary has about 4.1 employees per supervisor. The campus, under the OE formula, in this area, expects 7.1. If they don't have 7.1, then they will look at structurally reorganizing the Auxiliary in some way to ensure they meet that goal. Mr. Permaul said he's already been doing this on paper, with his boss, and trying to keep ASUC Officers apprised. Mr. Permaul said he walks a thin line, because he answers to the Chancellor but he works for the students. He apprises the students so they can continue to work with their legal advisor, in particular, on how they want to approach this. He didn't think there is an agreement on how Operational Excellence will be implemented vis-à-vis the Auxiliary. The perspective of the campus was that if the campus eliminates some of the Auxiliary's administrative operations and sends them to a central office, such as Human Resources, then the Auxiliary may be freed of spending funds for those positions and could turn that back to student organizations and student government. The students asked OE to prove that a change would be as cost effective as what the Auxiliary does and would provide the same level of service, or better. OE has been working on developing service agreements with the Auxiliary to establish what they believe are the appropriate level of service for students.

Ms. Ng said that if people have further questions, they should take a business card. Mr. Permaul said it was pleasure to meet a lot of them and he hoped to see them again. (Applause)

Mr. Marchand said he would point out two questions on the feedback form. One dealt with the Coca-Cola contract. This contract is overseen by the Auxiliary, so students had feedback on what they thought should be discussed with this contract. The Executive Board recommended that Coca-Cola make an investment into recycling on campus. Another question asks what GA reps on the SOB, i.e., himself, Mr. Daal, and Mr. Nicholas, should consider in determining what businesses to bring to student-run buildings. These businesses are not just a way to get rent, but a means of providing services to students. In addition, there was a question about Operational Excellence. Ms. Ng noted that the survey also counts as attendance for the meeting.

Ms. Ng said that seeing no objection, they would hear the Funding Committee report at that time.

Report from the Funding Committee

- 13 -

### Report from the Funding Committee

Ms. Whelan said that two Funding reports were distributed, for Grants and Events. For Grants, Round 2, they had 12 applications. They didn't get to fund everybody. But a lot of really exciting projects were happening. The things they didn't fund just had some policy issues, like an ongoing issue about fellowships, and whether or not that was fair. The GA will discuss this when they talk about funding.

For Events, they had 15 applications and were able to give money to most people. The group that was most underfunded was the Engineering group. They got less than half of what they asked for, because with the super group process, which she explained at the last meeting. If people have any questions about super groups, they could e-mail her at [funding@ga.berkeley.edu](mailto:funding@ga.berkeley.edu). Most Delegates were probably associated with some student groups, and they could see which super group their groups were in.

Mr. Rabkin said that at the last meeting she said that in Round 2 the Math super group was fully funded. But that wasn't the case in the sheet that was distributed. Mr. Kline said it was fully funded in Round 1. Mr. Rabkin said they were told it was fully funded in Round 2. Ms. Whelan asked what department he was in. Mr. Rabkin said he was in Computer Science. Ms. Whelan said there shouldn't have been a change. Mr. Kline said the cuts to Round 2 were shown.

Ms. Navab asked about the controversy with fellowships. Ms. Whelan said they can't figure out what to do with fellowships and grants. There was a great grant, to pay for a room to hold an auction to raise money for fellowships to bring underrepresented students to Berkeley. The problem with funding that was that she could write a grant for "women in science" and just basically give \$1,500 to herself. The Funding Committee had a very long discussion on being able to guarantee how money was spent. They don't want this precedent to open the door to fraud and they need to discuss this policy further. After a long discussion they decided to write a policy before actually funding something like this. They understood that the fundraiser will hopefully pay for itself, so it wasn't as if the event wouldn't happen without this money. And it would really mess up the GA's budget if they completely funded fundraisers.

Ms. Whelan said this was the universal cuts sheet. She didn't have her computer, but the GA could trust her that those are the numbers that will eventually be funded.

Mr. Marchand asked when events start to be funded for this round. Ms. Whelan said it starts on Friday. Mr. Marchand said that postponing approval and having the Exec Board approve the Report would therefore be too late.

Ms. Whelan said the screen showed what the numbers should be. Groups got fully funded in super groups for Education, Physical Science, Humanities, and others. Some super groups experienced cuts. There was no actual restriction as to what the Funding Committee Report had to look like, so they could approve this what was on the screen.

Mr. Marchand said they'd probably need to amend the Funding Report to what was shown on the screen. The motion was to substitute the printed Round 2 Funding Report for GMER with the table, "Total Group Allotment," as shown on the screen. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Navab asked if they could get the correct numbers to them at the next meeting. Ms. Whelan said she would post the numbers on the Web site.

Report from the Funding Committee (cont'd)  
Lower Sproul Project Report

- 14 -

THE MOTION TO SUBSTITUTE THE PRINTED FUNDING REPORT TO THE REPORT AS SHOWN ON THE SCREEN PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Navab asked if they weren't voting on Round 1 and were assuming that was approved by the Executive Board, or if they were actually voting on both.

Mr. Rabkin asked if money from Round 1 allocations has already been spent. Ms. Ng said that some money has been spent, but none has been refunded. Ms. Whelan asked if they didn't approve it at the last meeting. Ms. Ng said it was technically approved by the Exec Board over the summer, but the GA had to approve the Exec Board's approval.

Mr. Marchand said the reason they didn't approve Round 1 funding was because funding was put into question by Resolution 1009c, To Create a GA Structural Review Work Group, which has now been tabled indefinitely. That's why the GA didn't confirm the E. Board's approval. Ms. Whelan asked if they approved the actions of the E. Board at the last meeting.

Mr. Ortega said procedurally, the approval of the E. Board can be approved by the Delegates, or they could take no action, which would mean the E. Board's decision would stand.

Mr. Rabkin said the question on the floor was to approve Round 2 GMER. Ms. Ng said the motion was to approve Round 1 and Round 2 together. Mr. Rabkin moved the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Marchand said that when they amended the motion, for the sake of the minutes, they should read what was in the table. The table says they already approved an amendment to the Funding Report for GMER Round 2. It says the Engineering super group will get 43% of their request; Public Policy, 54%; Law, 64%; Biological Science, 82%; and all other super groups will get 100% of what they asked for in GMER Round 2.

Ms. Navab the percentages don't include anything the Funding Committee deemed was inappropriate in the first place. Mr. Marchand said the percentages were of expenses that were deemed appropriate by the Funding Committee. From those expenses, cuts were made, resulting in the percentages stated.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORTS FOR ROUND 1 GRANTS AND GMER AND ROUND 2 GRANTS (\$10,418.57 AWARDED) AND ROUND 2 GMER (\$14,664.00 AWARDED), PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

### LOWER SPROUL PROJECT REPORT

Miguel Daal introduced himself and said he has been working on Lower Sproul for a number of years. He's the GA's designee to orchestrate planning of the Lower Sproul Initiative. In broad strokes, what they're trying to do was to revitalize this whole area, "Lower Sproul." That will include demolishing Eshleman Hall and replacing it with a shorter building that was longer, with respect to Bancroft. It will also include interior renovations to MLK, Cesar Chavez, and other renovations, such as sloped steps to

Lower Sproul Project Report (cont'd)

- 15 -

encourage congregation, perhaps a rain garden to collect and filter water on Lower Sproul before it goes into Strawberry Creek, and a more disabled access-friendly route for getting into Lower Sproul.

Mr. Daal said he would like to introduce a very important person, Alyosha Verzhbinsky. Part of the agreement for this Initiative, which was passed last spring by the students, was that the ASUC would be afforded its own consulting architect, just to make sure that things the campus was saying about the planning process made sense to the students, and that the campus was, in fact, correct as far as what students were told, and that the students should believe them, for instance. Mr. Verzhbinsky is from a firm in San Francisco, Tom Elliot Fish. He worked on the East Asian Library and the firm has also done many of the renovations to the piers in San Francisco, as well as the Metreon. So the firm was pretty well respected, and it is the ASUC's architect.

Mr. Daal said he would show pictures of Lower Sproul, artistic renderings. Eshleman will be replaced by a long building with an interior with a little more square footage. There will be green rooftops. MLK will have an addition, bringing it to Bancroft, which will be retail focused, to generate funds for students. There will be an addition to the south side of MLK, which will be built on top of the Bear's Lair, extending up to the level of Pauley Ballroom. It's contemplated as being a welcoming place for students to come, interact, and study, with shading by solar panels. The major push for the project is to be green and sustainable. It's thought of being a beacon of sustainability, showcasing Berkeley's heart for sustainability.

The screen showed a rendering of the inside of the new Bear's Lair, with maybe two more floors, or an atrium that was two floors high.

Mr. Daal said that when Josh Daniels was President, there was a Referendum that was kind of supported by the ASUC, to only afford funds for the planning of this project. It was \$500,000 to \$3 million, in that range. That referendum failed miserably. Students didn't want to pay for planning and wanted something of substance. He conducted a study as to why graduate students did not pass the referendum. The screen, "The Grad Student Vision for Lower Sproul," showed what the study found, which Mr. Daal said is

called “The Graduate Student 10.” They wanted to see a graduate-student-focused facility; proportionality between the ASUC and the GA in all respects, including revenue sharing and space; and spaces to socialize and study. Grads are Balkanized in departments and they don't get to see each other. It gets kind of lonely, especially if they're a ninth-year graduate student like he is. Grads also wanted academic spaces for GSIs; a career center satellite office for grads, since the Career Center is in downtown Berkeley; and a child-friendly Lower Sproul with facilities for childcare and maybe lactation facilities. Grads also wanted to promote the existence of affordable dining facilities, someplace where they could take a professor, have a group lunch, with liquor and wine, and not just beer.

Mr. Rabkin asked if they're allowed to get a liquor license, or if that's a University prohibition. Mr. Daal said they're allowed, but the University says that having liquor was not part of its philosophy. Students were working to bring at least wine to Lower Sproul.

Mr. Daal said that other things grads wanted to see in Lower Sproul were better safety; meaningful improvement to the aesthetics; and for it to be very sustainable.

Mr. Daal said this study was done in 2005. It's their guiding document. It's a result of surveying thousands of graduate students, a top-10 list of what grads wanted.

Lower Sproul Project Report (cont'd)

- 16 -

The next screen showed the text that grads voted on, “BEARS Initiative Ballot Text.” They get study spaces; a grad student lounge; increased aesthetics; child accessible, family-friendly facilities; explicit funding for safety, since this will be a 24-hour student center; a transit center for commuters to wait for buses; and the Career Center located across the street at Lower Sproul. They're still working on that, and there were still some issues. But it's funded and student leadership just had to approve it. They could get more into the issues involved if anybody asked.

Mr. Daal noted that the BEARS initiative passed with 65% of the vote.

The next screen showed Lower Sproul MOUs. Mr. Daal said that one thing they did really well was to have a contract. Other students across the country, when they approve large measures dealing with millions of dollars in their fees, don't have a contract. But at Berkeley, student leadership contracted the agreement. As a note of trivia for Law students, the ballot language and terms and conditions attached to the ballot were not legally binding. He noted that Law students indicated that they knew that. But when student leadership found that out, they were shocked. They wanted things promised. So they wrote not one, but two Memorandums of Understanding, signed between the Regents and the ASUC. Among many other things, the MOUs afford the things he mentioned that were of interest to graduate students. They also include the Multicultural Center, 24-hour study space, Anthony Hall remaining with the GA, and a separate graduate student center on Lower Sproul.

Other things the MOU includes is for Hearst Gym to both a student activity space, instead of sitting empty and closed at night. Student groups can reserve it and do things that require gym space, such as dancing and dodge ball. Five gyms will be open from 8:00 to midnight, initially, and then 8:00 to 3 a.m. There was also a possible relocation of the Career Center to across the street. Anthony Hall would be renovated. There would also be a \$1 million endowment for Anthony Hall, or other graduate student space across campus, for maintenance. There was also a long-term increase to funding for student government.

Mr. Daal said that in his talk, Mr. Permaul didn't connect some detail that needed to be pointed out. Currently, the 1998 Commercial Activities Agreement with the campus gives students a lot of things, and is binding. It states that student government gets to control Eshleman and MLK, but in return, that the students had to pay for the upkeep of the buildings, such as with electricity, all of that. Those expenses drain student budgets, and costs \$1.5 million out of the \$3 million budget that was mentioned earlier.

The Lower Sproul Initiative also included building a maintenance fund into it. So the \$1.5 million that is used to service these ailing buildings would now go back to student government and student groups. So indirectly, Lower Sproul guarantees that students will have more money.

Mr. Daal said the next screen showed the price for this tremendous opportunity, the fees students would pay, the actual dollars, by fiscal year. To compare, they adjusted the fee for very modest inflation. The highest the fee will go is \$396, by the year 2043. That should feel like \$175 in 2010 dollars. Another note is that the fee does not end necessarily in FY 2051-52. It's authorized to exist forever, and goes down to \$261, which will be a direct subsidy to the operation and maintenance of the buildings.

Mr. Daal said the project comes to a total of \$223 million in building, planning, and construction, plus interest, since they'll issue a bond. There will also be non-construction-related expenses. To move the Career Center is around \$13 million. Student government was asking if they should have the Career

Lower Sproul Project Report (cont'd)

- 17 -

Center moved, or to keep it where it is and decrease the fee, or to put that money into a graduate-student-focused facility. The question was whether the cost of moving it across the street worth it in comparison to other things they could get.

Mr. Daal said the next screen showed the schematic plan. For Eshleman, demolition and construction begins the third quarter, 2012 and ends the second quarter of 2015. Phase 2 would be renovation of MLK and Chavez. That will start in the second quarter of 2015 and end the first or second quarter of 2017.

A Delegate asked what happens to the facilities housed in the buildings. Mr. Daal said that's called "surge," and it's a non-construction expense built into the cost. They have to take everything out of the buildings, like student offices, and move them somewhere proximate. By May of this year, they hope to have agreed on a surge location. This was a point of contention in the negotiation of the MOUs. The CAA says they're guaranteed surge space that was equal in use and proximity to campus. The campus said it couldn't do that. They asked how many things could be done instead, and the campus gave things like Hearst Gym usage.

A Delegate asked when Hearst Gym will be available. Mr. Daal said the wheels at Berkeley turn slowly. They thought they could move that ASAP. But when a new facility is opened, policies and procedures had to be written, and they had to have concern for liability and had to get security, including security doors and surveillance cameras. That's slowed things down. They had expected to have it available by the end of the month.

The Delegate asked about safety issues for Hearst Gym, such as for fumes. Mr. Daal said it's seismically undesirable, but wasn't as bad as Eshleman, which was the most seismically undesirable building, rated seismically "poor," along with Kroeber. Being "seismically poor" meant that in an earthquake of a certain magnitude, a building with that status would not have any expected loss of life.

A Delegate asked how he knew the cost for demolition and construction if there weren't bids yet for the work. Mr. Daal said that last semester they engaged in pre-planning/master plan. Cost estimators did that work, consultants to the principal architect, Moore Ruble Yudell (MRY), of Santa Monica. The campus took the figure given by the cost estimators and inflated it by 5-10%. That's how they got the cost.

The Delegate asked what happens if change orders occur. Mr. Daal said they avoid change orders. They come at the expense of project scope. The Delegate asked if there could be an amendment or addendum to the agreement. Mr. Daal said there could be. They'll have a bond, a debt schedule, which would then have to be amended, and a student vote would be needed to increase the funds.

Mr. Verzhbinsky said there was also contingency, which was not a trivial amount, 8-10-20%. Mr. Daal said it's 5% there. Mr. Verzhbinsky said 5% contingency on the project budget would mean the construction contingency was probably 10%. Mr. Daal said it was approximately \$20 million. Mr. Verzhbinsky said change orders would be drawn against that contingency.

A Delegate asked if there were some sort of contingency funds for surge. Mr. Daal said surge was budgeted. The campus has a department on surge, which gave an estimate, about \$8 million.

Mr. Marchand said they're not doing both buildings at the same time in order to save surge money, as well as other issues.

Lower Sproul Project Report (cont'd)  
Questions for Officers and Staff

- 18 -

Mr. Daal said Anthony Hall will probably have to surge as well because it will undergo renovations.

Ms. Ng noted that there was a question on the feedback form requesting comments and suggestions for Lower Sproul.

As to how people could get involved, Mr. Daal said there is a Lower Sproul Communications Coordinator, an undergrad, hired to fill the positions, Waleed Abed. Unfortunately, a family member of his got in a motorcycle accident and he couldn't be at the meeting that evening. Mr. Abed is coordinating the information exchange as to what was going on with the project and stating to the Administration what students want.

Mr. Daal said they're currently in the programming stage of the process. "Programming" is when it's decided how much of what types of activities they want the buildings to hold, and what would be the adjacencies of those activities to one another. It's essentially figuring out what should go into the buildings. This question is of central importance to students because these will be student buildings, and students want them built in such a way as to have the structure of the buildings support student activities. Two weeks ago they had a series of programming workshops, where the executive architects, the consulting architect, and people from Capital Projects, listened to what about 15 broad groups of students said they needed and wanted in Lower Sproul. One panel was called "sustainability," and had five or ten sustainable student groups in it, representing grads and undergrads. There were two diversity panels. The architects will roll these in to some ideas, some possibilities for programming. They'll present that to probably the same groups next week, he believed, and ask if the configuration they came up with will support students' activities. Architects will take back what they learn from this upcoming workshop to create a master proposal for the programmatic composition of Lower Sproul, to be presented to the same

students, more or less, in November. They'll get final finishing touches at that time and then it will be up to a Program Committee for approval.

The Program Committee oversees all of the executive decisions for Lower Sproul. It has six student representatives. Per the MOU, the Committee could only make decisions via consensus. Seeing no other questions, Ms. Ng said she would like to thank him. (Applause)

Ms. Ng said that Mr. Daal has been spearheading graduate student involvement in Lower Sproul for a long time; and she wanted to thank him for that as well.

## QUESTIONS FOR OFFICERS AND STAFF

Ms. Ng said this was the part of the agenda where people can ask questions about officers' reports, which have been changed to more of a letter, or prose format.

Mr. Ortega said he would like to highlight some things in the External Affairs report. There were a couple of items to keep in mind. One was a "Meet Your Councilmembers" event on October 21 from 5:30 to 7:00, where students could learn what issues Councilmembers will push forward that were of interest to Cal students. Also, on October 21, from 12:30 to 1:30, they're co-sponsoring a lecture with Dean Brady, from the Goldman School of Public Policy, on what's happening with California, why it's faltering, and what California needed to do to improve the current system.

Questions for Officers and Staff (cont'd)  
GA Elections

- 19 -

Lastly, something they've working on with the Office of the President was the Professional Degree Fee and how it's implemented on each campus. They're trying to improve the transparency and accountability of how those funds are used and whether the amounts they request are approved by the OP. One key component is to get student input into each department. That's part of the Regental policy based on the fact that every division was supposed to work with their student representatives to oversee that fee. Mr. Ortega said they needed to gather some of that information to report back to the OP on how that process went. There will be a form for people to fill out. If they're not aware of this, he would ask them to please try and find out from their department.

Ms. Ng called for any questions for Officers or committee chairs.

## GA ELECTIONS

Ms. Ng said the GA will hold elections for the President, for the Campus Affairs Vice President, and for a Graduate Council representative. They'll begin with the election of the GA president.

Ms. Ng said the GA president represents the needs of graduate students to the campus Administration and other elements in the UC System. They ensure that Officers and committees communicate and are informed of pressing issues. The president chairs Executive Board and Assembly meetings, or delegates that responsibility.

Mr. Marchand said the president also works to make sure all components of the GA work together, and the position is the primary spokesperson for the GA when there's directed action from the E. Board or the Assembly.

Ms. Ng called for any nominations for GA president. A Delegate nominated Mr. Marchand, who respectfully declined. Mr. Samveg nominated Mr. Daal. A Delegate nominated Mr. Samveg, who respectfully declined. Ms. Ng said that seeing no other nominations, she asked if Mr. Daal would like to make a statement.

Mr. Daal said that as President, he planned to focus on organizational continuity issues, making the GA a more effective organization from year to year, for the benefit of the graduate students they represent. Specifically, he planned to work on improving GA institutional memory. As soon as they could get the Officers and Executive Board in and working on their jobs, then the sooner they could represent the views and wishes of their constituents. He planned to affirmatively respond to the issue of internal finance. There was a GA Action Agenda Item headed by Ms. Hagar to look at that, and he planned to use that to guide decisions and inform them regarding long-term finance. He also planned to continue the structural review of the GA to make many of the offices, especially that of president, more manageable to participate in. Mr. Daal noted that Mr. Marchand has already done a lot in a structural sense to make the job of being president more manageable through his delegation of authority.

Mr. Daal said he thought he had time to take on this position and to balance it with the research he was doing, because of delegations. They will continue on that path and re-evaluate the structure of the GA, including distribution of responsibilities. Mr. Daal said he's also worked out a plan with Mr. Marchand

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 20 -

to keep him involved, especially in those things he's passionate about. As President, Mr. Daal said he would designate Mr. Marchand as internal coordinator, for him to continue to oversee selected internal coordination issues in the GA, delegate communication, do outreach to grads, as well as do other things.

Mr. Daal said that as President, he planned to put in a system of being the public face of the GA, as the position demands, in terms of advocating for the students they represent. He will also continue to work on Lower Sproul to make it a more welcoming place and more of a home for graduate students. Right now, it's not. And he also wanted to respond to the rather troubling issues with regard to Operational Excellence and student government. Finally, he will continue a passion of his, which was to pursue more resources for the GA and for graduate students through his work on the Store Operations Board and the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation, which was newly formed, via Delegate approval. It's, their almost-completed 501(c)3. He called for any questions.

Mr. Kohut asked about his plans to restructure the job, and where responsibility would go. Mr. Daal said there are some unique opportunities to increase the participation of staff in internal management of the GA. Since they have a vacant Funding Advisor position, they could modify the job description to help to do some things grads were already doing themselves. There were also possibilities of further distributing the workload among existing Officers of the GA, and maybe other ways. They might find they need another position, or could get rid of a position, something like that.

Mr. Marchand said that Resolution 1010b will come back in November and deals with the issue of restructuring the GA. It would establish a work group. They have until March, when elections will take place for next year, to adopt any permanent changes to GA structure.

A Delegate asked about Mr. Daal's background. Mr. Daal said he's in experimental particle physics, working to detect dark matter by making cryogenic radiation detectors. The Delegate asked about his history with the GA. Mr. Daal said he was President last year as well as the year before; before that he was Campus Affairs VP; and prior to that, he was on the Graduate Council; and before that, he served as a Delegate.

A Delegate asked what would happen on the SOB since the GA would lose a position, since he was Chair of the SOB. Mr. Daal said he would drop his position as SOB Chair and they'd choose somebody else on the SOB to be the Chair. The SOB would continue to function as it does, or hopefully not, since they're undergoing a review of the SOB's By-laws. The GA President sits on the SOB, and he'd continue to do that.

Seeing no other questions, Ms. Ng said they would discuss Mr. Daal's candidacy and she would therefore ask Mr. Daal to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Ms. Ng asked to have Mr. Daal brought back into the room and said she would like to congratulate him on his election as GA President. (Applause)

Ms. Ng said the next election would be for Campus Affairs Vice President. The CAVP monitors campus policies affecting grads and works on specific issues that may change from year to year, as directed by the president and by the Delegates. The CAVP chairs the Campus Affairs Committee, which meets once a month. The position also places Delegates on GA and campus committees. This is an Officer position, so any Delegate elected would relinquish their seat and their voting rights in the Assembly.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 21 -

Mr. Samveg nominated Danielle Love. Mr. Apgar nominated Aleks Polosukhina. Ms. Ng said that Ms. Love had been serving as CAVP Chief-of-Staff and was now serving in the interim position.

Ms. Love said she's had the opportunity to meet a lot of Delegates over the past couple of weeks and it's been an exciting time serving as interim CAVP. She's a second-year at the Goldman School of Public Policy. She became Chief-of-Staff in August and started a lot of work of the CAVP and the Campus Affairs Committee in August and has continued that until now. She's been very active in student affairs at the Goldman School and was excited about being more involved in the broader graduate community.

Ms. Love said she thought the use of a student-run survey would be relevant to this position. Such a survey is administered at Goldman. She was part of a five-person committee who wrote a report and has been advocating with their Dean to implement some of the changes they recommended. She thought those skills and her record in having been very successful in doing that would transfer well to the GA position. In addition, she leads a student group at the Goldman School, and in that capacity, she designed and ran a one-credit graduate course last semester. So she had effective leadership skills that she's exercised. She called for any questions

Mr. Kohut asked what group she led. Ms. Love said it dealt with youth and educational policy.

A Delegate asked if she'd still be willing to be Chief-of-Staff if Ms. Polosukhina was elected. Ms. Love said she'd have to speak to Ms. Polosukhina about that.

Mr. Samveg asked how many more years of graduate school she had and if she planned to continue GA involvement after her term. Ms. Love said this was her last year, and she'd be able to continue her full term. She'd bring much needed order and effectiveness and efficiency to the GA that, at least since her involvement, has been lacking.

Ms. Polosukhina said she's a fourth-year Visual Science student. She was really excited to be running for the position. She'll be there for another three years. She's talked to past Officers and was told that it took about a year to get to know the system and be very efficient. She hoped to continue being involved in the GA for as long as she was there. As for experience, this was her second year in the GA. Last year she was in the Campus Affairs group as well as on the Student Affairs Committee, and this summer she and Ms. Ng recruited Delegates from underrepresented departments. She also organized a newsletter, which is sent out to all graduate students, informing them what the GA was up to.

Ms. Polosukhina said she hoped to work with Mr. Daal and Mr. Ortega on restructuring the GA, helping to keep track of records and maybe have a work group. She also wanted to work on improving childcare on campus. She went to a Woman's Committee meeting that week and established some contacts with undergraduate parents, who will hopefully work with Campus Affairs on this issue.

Ms. Navab asked if she would be willing to work with Ms. Love that year, learn from her, and then potentially take over from her next year as CAVP. Ms. Polosukhina said she would. Ms. Navab asked if Ms. Love were elected, if Ms. Polosukhina would be willing to continue working. Ms. Polosukhina said she would be. Ms. Ng said that to clarify, Ms. Polosukhina is currently a Grad Council representative.

A Delegate asked if she would relinquish her position on the Grad Council if elected. Ms. Polosukhina said she believed that would be required.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 22 -

A Delegate asked if she was interested in the CAVP position last year, when she was already involved in the GA. Ms. Polosukhina said she ran for the position last year.

Mr. Samveg said it was mentioned that she would continue to be involved in the GA beyond this year. Ms. Polosukhina said she would be.

Mr. Rabkin asked if this was her first year on the Grad Council. Ms. Polosukhina said it was her second year.

A Delegate asked about her Graduate Council position. Ms. Polosukhina said they sit on the Grad Council with a lot of professors and they review departments and policies, and forward that to the GA. So far they've had two meetings that year, and so they haven't accomplished that much.

Mr. Daal asked if the candidates could state what their involvement has been. Ms. Love said she started with the GA in August and served as Chief-of-Staff until Ms. Jibrin resigned, at which point she was appointed interim CAVP. Ms. Polosukhina said she was a Delegate from her Department last year and on the Budget and Campus Affairs Committees. This year she was on the Grad Council and the Sproul Committee.

Seeing no further questions, Ms. Ng asked the candidates to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Ms. Ng said that Ms. Love was elected Campus Affairs Vice President. (Applause)

Ms. Ng said the next position up for election was for Grad Council representatives.

Grad Council representatives inform the Graduate Council, a committee of the Academic Senate, about the GA's positions on various issues. Meetings occur once per month and members of the Grad Council are also members of the GA's Exec Board. There's one seat currently open for a primary rep, a one-year term ending July 30. There are three primary reps and one alternate. She called for nominations.

Mr. Samveg nominated Apple Williams. Seeing no other nominations, Ms. Ng asked Ms. Williams to give a statement about herself. Ms. Williams said she's a parent, so she was especially sensitive to those needs. She's been in Berkeley since 2003. She got her Masters in English Literature from Mills College and she's in Law.

Ms. Ng said that according to the By-laws, 2.4.4, ideally, the Graduate Council representatives should reflect the academic diversity of the graduate community. But currently, all of their Graduate Council reps are in the sciences.

Ms. Ng asked Ms. Williams to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion off the record and a vote, Ms. Ng said that Ms. Williams was elected Graduate Council representative. (Applause).

## RESOLUTIONS

1004b, To Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement

- 23 -

Ms. Ng said that Resolution 1009c has been indefinitely tabled.

The following Resolution, 1004b, was authored by Mr. Froehle:

### RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AN AMENDED GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MISSION STATEMENT

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has not updated its mission statement in a considerable length of time; and

WHEREAS, budget shortfalls are causing the Graduate Assembly to reconsider its core goals; and

WHEREAS, an updated and agreed upon mission statement will help focus the Graduate Assembly's efforts in the future;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly adopt the following text as its mission statement:

The Graduate Assembly engages and empowers graduate students to advocate for positive academic, political, and social change and protect the quality of graduate student life. As an elected student government, we represent graduate students within and beyond the campus. As a diverse and collegial group, we support under-served student communities and provide financial resources and infrastructure for graduate students to build community directly. As a historic Berkeley organization, we are dedicated to enacting positive change on behalf of our diverse graduate student community.

Mr. Froehle said that Mr. Daal approached him last spring and asked him to provide them with a mission statement. He drafted something, but didn't think it was the best, and he would recommend that this be referred back to committee. He thought the Communications, Rules, and probably the Campus Affairs Committees were probably appropriate to consider this. That was his recommendation.

Mr. Rabkin said he wanted to comment on why this was being considered. There were widespread feelings last year that they wanted a mission statement for the GA. Somebody put this statement together to start discussion. The Committees will say that no one wanted to spend the time to craft a mission statement. So he would rather not refer it to committee, but instead, would prefer to kill this matter, until somebody has text they want to adopt. Instead of resolving to change the mission statement in the form it has been presented, the GA should form a group to figure out what a better mission statement would be. He moved to create a work group to craft a mission statement. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Daal said that for some background, a mission statement was actually important for matters they're dealing with at that time with respect to Operational Excellence. They talked about this a little before. OE might recommend that the GA's administrative unit, which looks after them, be dismantled and disbursed across the University. A mission statement would encapsulate those things that the GA does which are critical to its existence. They could then go to the Chancellor or other decision makers and say if they were to try something, then the GA would not be able to fulfill its mission. That's the kind of issue they want to address in having a mission statement.

Ms. Ng said the amendment was to amend the Resolved Clause in its entirety to read:

1004b, To Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement  
1005a, A By-law Amendment to Accelerate Funding Application Review

- 24 -

“Resolved, that the GA create a work group to revise the current Mission Statement.”

The work group would be open to whoever wanted to be on it.

A Delegate asked why a work group was better than a committee. A Delegate said it wouldn't necessarily be better, but the recommendations of the work group should go to all the committees for their perspectives, and to determine whether or not the recommendations reflect what the GA does as an organization. It was better to have a work group in the sense of numbers and to organize people to put something down on paper, and then see if that actually reflected what people thought.

Mr. Ortega said that so people were aware, for about a year they have attempted to work on this they, trying to get a working group together. While they've attempted to have different types of discussions, there hasn't been much interest. He didn't know if there would be more interest with a new work group.

Ms. Ng asked if anybody would be interested in serving on this work group, and noted there were five volunteers.

A motion to call the question on the amendment was made and seconded. The motion to end debate passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE RESOLVED CLAUSE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Ng called for any other discussion on the Resolution and seeing no speakers, said the question was automatically called.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 10004b, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AN AMENDED GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MISSION STATEMENT.

The following Resolution, 1005a was authored by Christopher Klein and Mary Whelan:

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO ACCELERATE FUNDING APPLICATION REVIEW

WHEREAS, the By-laws currently specify that "the Funding Committee's report on funding allocations is subject to the approval of the Delegate Assembly"; and

WHEREAS, the Delegate Assembly does not in practice avail itself of a serious review of the Funding Committee's reports, choosing to trust the Committee and approve the Committee's allocations through a quick vote preceded by a brief or nonexistent discussion; and

WHEREAS, the requirement of this perfunctory approval impedes the Funding Committee's desire and ability to review funding applications and inform student groups of funding decisions in an efficient and timely manner;

1005a, A By-law Amendment to Accelerate Funding Application Review (cont'd)

- 25 -

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO ACCELERATE FUNDING APPLICATION REVIEW (cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the By-Laws of the Graduate Assembly (specifically sections 4.15.4 and 6.7.3) be amended to remove the requirement of the Delegate Assembly's approval for the Funding Committee to make funding allocations; specifically amending the By-Laws as follows:

Section 4.15.4 currently reads:

Funding. The Funding Committee shall make recommendations to the Delegate Assembly on how to allocate the funds under the authority of the Graduate Assembly. The goal of such recommendations shall be to improve the quality of graduate student life by supporting individual graduate students, departmental activities, and graduate student groups.

This resolution shall amend Section 4.15.4 to read:

Funding. The Funding Committee shall allocate the funds under the authority of the Graduate Assembly. The goal of such allocations shall be to improve the quality of graduate student life by supporting individual graduate students, departmental activities, and graduate student groups.

Section 6.7.3 currently reads:

Final Approval. The Funding Committee's report on funding allocations is subject to the approval of the Delegate Assembly.

This resolution shall remove section 6.7.3.

Mr. Kline said that Ms. Whelan, the Funding Committee Chair, was the other author of the bill. Mr. Kline said the bill wasn't in the material for the meeting that evening and the text was in the meeting material for the September 16 meeting.

The bill would remove Delegate oversight of funding allocations made by the Funding Committee. Mr. Kline said the reason he wanted to do this, and the Funding Committee chose to offer this amendment to the By-laws, is that the GA only meets once a month. That constrains how the Funding Committee can make allocations. The Committee would like to work outside that time framework to better facilitate graduate student group funding needs and provide faster turnaround, particularly with respect to Funding Committee awards. The Funding Committee could do a review within a week, but then they had to wait for possibly a month for the next Delegate meeting to actually approve the Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Kline said that if Delegates pass this amendment to the By-laws, the Funding Committee would no longer have to wait for the GA's approval to make allotments. He would also point out that in the past, the Delegate Assembly has not used its power to review Funding reports in depth. Even if they could, and even if the Assembly were to take a stance on line items, it would be very difficult for them to be informed without actually having seen any funding applications and without having been privy to the discussion at the Committee meeting.

1005a, A By-law Amendment to Accelerate Funding Application Review (cont'd)

- 26 -

Mr. Kline said there were lots of reservations about this policy change, and they were very understandable, and people should hear both sides.

Mr. Apgar asked if the By-law amendment would still require Delegate Assembly approval. Mr. Kline said that if the GA passes this amendment, the Funding Committee would make allocations on its own. It would still furnish the GA with a Funding Committee report. The GA will no longer have to vote on it.

Mr. Apgar asked if the GA still could vote on it. Mr. Kline the GA couldn't vote on it. It could remove the Funding Committee if the GA didn't like the decisions it was making. The GA, with this change, would be allowing the Funding Committee to have that power.

Mr. Mikulin asked if it was necessary to have this amendment applied to all funding applications, or if it could just apply to the Contingency Fund. Mr. Kline said they would love to have it applied to all applications, but that was significantly more funding power. He would still support the bill if it only affected Contingency Fund.

Mr. Mikulin moved to amend the bill, the first paragraph of the Resolved Clause, to add “contingency” in between “make” and “funding,” to read, “Resolved, that the By-laws... be amended... for the Funding Committee to make contingency funding allocations....”

Mr. Kline said they'd also have to amend “funding” to “contingency funding” in the third paragraph of the Resolved Clause.

The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Mikulin said that in general, student groups know the funding cycle, and know the application process. He had a student group that was funded through the GA and he knew what the funding process was like, and knew it took time to get the money reimbursed. He definitely saw the value of an amendment like this when it came to the Contingency Fund. A lot of times that money was needed quickly, and a lot of events or opportunities come up to student groups for things they want to fund events on campus with very short notice. He thought the change made common sense in that regard. But he thought to give general funding authority to the Funding Committee, without review by the GA, would be somewhat irresponsible as an Assembly to do. He thought Contingency made sense and changing policy for allow the Funding Committee to award Contingency funding would be a targeted reform to the By-laws, versus just kind of giving blanket funding authority to the Committee.

Mr. Ortega said that Delegates always have final authority and can reverse Funding Committee decisions.

Mr. Apgar said that’s what the By-law was changing. Mr. Ortega said the Board could decide to revise decisions.

Ms. Navab said that regardless whether it was just for the Contingency Fund or for all funding, she thought it was irresponsible to approve this. The Contingency Fund had \$50,000 in it, and it was the second year it's been that large. They haven't seen it used in the way people were proposing to use it, so she would caution giving away any of the GA’s oversight power. That was one of their main responsibilities as Delegates. The Funding Committee, while honest and great, didn't represent the entire campus. The Rules Committee has talked about drafting By-laws about procedures to spend the Contingency

1005a, A By-law Amendment to Accelerate Funding Application Review (cont'd)  
1009d, To Establish Funding Committee Procedures

- 27 -

Fund, and she would ask people to give the Committee a chance to have those conversations, rather than taking away the GA’s approval rights.

Ms. Ng said that Contingency funding was currently at \$18,000.

A Delegate said she understood that in September, this was referred to committee. She asked there was a committee report. Mr. Rabkin said that nobody on the Rules Committee was enthused by this and a number of them were really disturbed by it. It was clear that funding was usually uncontroversial, but sometimes it was really controversial. That evening, for instance, they had a really long Funding report. If something happened that people disapproved, it would take some time to undo it. A motion would need to be introduced, fast tracked with a three-fourths vote, or if not, would be considered after another month’s cycle, and that was a long delay to pull back the money. That was problematic. Maybe six people on the Committee would never do anything wrong. The Exec Board is elected and can be held

accountable. But people on the Funding Committee weren't employees and Regent elected, and if there was fraud by the Funding Committee, he didn't know if there would be good remedies if something bad happened.

Ms. Ng said the Rules Committee strongly opposes 1005a because the Funding Committee's allocations are significant enough to require Delegate review, regardless of whether the power of rejection has been exercised or not. However, the Committee anticipates that an express approval could be developed for Contingency allocations.

A Delegate asked what happened to Contingency funding that isn't used. Mr. Kline said it was allocated for GA meetings. He would recommend a portion be rolled over for general funding and a portion be spent in support of projects.

The motion to approve Mr. Mikluin's amendment, to add "contingency" to the Resolved Clause, failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Ng said they were out of time and would proceed to a vote.

The motion to approve Resolution 1005a failed by voice-vote, Resolution on a By-law Amendment to Accelerate Funding Application Review.

The following Resolution, 1009d, was authored by Philippe Marchand and Mary Whelan:

#### RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

BE IT RESOLVED that the following Funding Committee procedures be adopted:

##### 1. Categories of Funds

The GA distributes four categories of funds: group meetings, events and resources (GMER); group grants; individual travel grants; and contingency funding. The dollar

1009d, To Establish Funding Committee Procedures (cont'd)

- 28 -

#### RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES (cont'd)

amount allocated to each of these four pools for the academic year is determined in the GA budget.

##### 2. Funding Rounds

Funds in each category are distributed over several funding rounds. The application deadlines and time period covered by each round are set in the Funding Guide. The allocation of funds between the different rounds in a given funding category is determined by the Funding Committee, based on historical patterns of funding demand.

##### 3. Funding Limit

By the start of the academic year, the Funding Committee may set a limit for the amount that can be requested by any applicant in a given funding category.

#### 4. GMER Allocation

In order to serve the maximum number of students across campus, the Funding Committee establishes disciplinary "supergroups" by the start of the academic year. Supergroups include one or more academic units in related disciplines, and are guaranteed a percentage of available GMER funds corresponding to the percentage of graduate students that are part of the supergroup's academic units.

If the funding requests in a supergroup are below its guaranteed allocation, the remainder of funds is distributed to remaining supergroups in proportion to their graduate student population. This process is repeated until all funds have been allocated.

If the funding requests in a supergroup exceed its allocation, each student group in this supergroup receives a fraction of the amount requested; that fraction is equal to the ratio of the allocated funds over the requested funds for the whole supergroup.

#### 5. Group Grants Allocation.

Group grant applications are evaluated based on merit by the Funding Committee. Grant applications either receive the full amount requested (up to the funding limit) or are denied funding.

#### 6. Travel Grants Allocation

If the amount requested in travel grants exceed the available funds, the applicants receiving the grants will be determined by lottery.

#### 7. Contingency Funds Allocation

Applications for contingency funding will be granted funds at the discretion of the Funding Committee, based on the application's merit and urgency. Contingency funds may also be allocated by the Funding Appeals Committee to resolve funding appeals.

1009d, To Establish Funding Committee Procedures (cont'd)

- 29 -

1009e, On an Action Agenda Item to Adopt a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target

Mr. Marchand said this was his motion. This was meant to be a vehicle for the Committees to review funding procedures. The motion explains procedures they use. From his understanding, only Rules reviewed it. So he would move to postpone this to the next meeting so the other Committees, particularly Funding, had time to review it. The motion was seconded.

**THE MOTION TO POSTPONE 1009d TO THE NOVEMBER MEETING PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH FUNDING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES.**

Ms. Ng said the bill would be considered by the Committees and considered at the November GA meeting.

The following Resolution, Resolution 1009e, was authored by John Mikulin:

RESOLUTION ON AN ACTION AGENDA ITEM TO ADOPT A UC BERKELEY CAMPUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGET

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley does not have a stated target for campus-wide energy efficiency; and

WHEREAS, the Cal Climate Action Partnership (CalCAP) has set a 2014 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target for the campus (i.e. reduce total campus GHG emissions to 1990 levels = 166,600 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) by 2014 versus 201,110 in 2009); and

WHEREAS, according to the 2010 UC Berkeley Sustainability Report, campus-wide energy use included 157,105,948 kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity, 156,301 million British thermal units (MMBtu) of natural gas, and 844,972 MMBtu of steam in 1990 versus 218,515,767 kWh of electricity, 219,401 MMBtu of natural gas, and 1,075,197 MMBtu of steam in 2009; and

WHEREAS, the close interrelationship between energy consumption and GHG emissions makes it prudent to establish a campus-wide energy efficiency target that compliments CalCAP's existing GHG emissions reduction target; and

WHEREAS, reducing energy consumption saves money and reduces pollution, which is in the interest of all UC Berkeley students; and

WHEREAS, getting more students involved will provide additional guidance and support for administrative efforts to improve campus resource efficiency and conservation; and

WHEREAS, it is important for UC Berkeley to maintain its role as the environmental and resource efficiency leader within the UC System; and

WHEREAS, John Mikulin is the Coordinator for this GA Action Agenda Item;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Action Agenda Item Resolution #1002d (March 4,2010):

1009e, On an Action Agenda Item to Adopt a UCB Campus Energy Efficiency Target (cont'd) - 30 -

RESOLUTION ON AN ACTION AGENDA ITEM TO ADOPT A UC BERKELEY CAMPUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGET (cont'd)

Goal:

The GA adopts and will support the implementation of a campus-wide energy efficiency target for UC Berkeley that reduces energy consumption across all campus buildings to 20%, below 2009 levels by 2014.

Metrics for CalCAP Consistency:

In 1990, total GHG emissions for the UC Berkeley campus were 166,600 tons, of which 69% was from purchased electricity, steam, and natural gas. In 2009, campus GHG emissions were 201,110 tons, of which 78% was from purchased electricity, steam, and natural gas. Hence, the campus needs to reduce its emissions by 17% in order to meet the 2014 CalCAP target. The GA recommends reducing campus electricity, steam, and natural gas consumption to 1990 levels by 2014 in order to help achieve the CalCAP target. If campus square footage increases at 1.95%/year (the 2008-09 growth rate), then electricity consumption in existing buildings would have to fall by 40% and steam and natural gas consumption by 30% in 2020 (assuming new buildings are built to achieve the same energy consumption per square foot as existing buildings in 2009). Thus, absolute energy consumption in existing buildings should be reduced by 20-30% below 2009 levels by 2014 to comply with the existing CalCAP target.

Implementation:

The Coordinator shall convene with CalCAP Steering Committee members, GA, and Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) Delegates, and other relevant UC Berkeley students, faculty and staff members on an as-needed basis to implement the GA's adopted campus-wide energy efficiency target in a cost-effective, technologically feasible, and timely manner.

Mr. Mikulin introduced himself and said he was a Delegate at the Goldman School of Public Policy and is the Action Agenda Item Coordinator for Campus Energy Efficiency and Conservation. The Resolution would adopt a 20% campus-wide energy reduction target by 2014. He sits on the Cal Climate Action Partnership, a steering committee, that has adopted a campus-wide greenhouse gas emissions target to 1990 levels by 2014. However, there's no complimentary target related to on-site campus energy consumption. The Resolution would be the GA's recommendation on how the campus goes about implementing such a target. There are a number of metrics associated with statistics around campus energy consumption from 1990 versus the most recent year's data available. The best he had was 2009. All the percentages shown are basically a comparison from the most recent year to 1990. Should the Resolution pass, he'd bring back a supplementary Resolution with recommended strategies the GA could recommend to operations and departments to actually help to achieve this target. There are a number of campuses in California and throughout the nation that have implemented and achieved similar targets over the last decade. The Energy and Resources group was very helpful in providing guidance on what was achievable and feasible for the campus. He highly recommended that the GA support the Resolution.

1009e, On an Action Agenda Item to Adopt a UCB Campus Energy Efficiency Target (cont'd) - 31 -

A motion to call the question and come to a vote passed unanimously by voice-vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE Resolution 1009e PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON AN ACTION AGENDA ITEM TO ADOPT A UC BERKELEY CAMPUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGET.

Ms. Ng said they reached the end of the agenda and the meeting was adjourned.

This meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak  
Recording Secretary

The following Resolution, 1004b, was amended to read as follows:

Resolution to Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly has not updated its mission statement in a considerable length of time;  
and

Whereas, budget shortfalls are causing the Graduate Assembly to reconsider its core goals; and

Whereas, an updated and agreed upon mission statement will help focus the Graduate Assembly's efforts  
in the future;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the GA create a work group to revise the current Mission Statement.