Overview and Results
On February 21 – 23, 2006, a student fee referenda election took place in which students decided whether or not to approve two fees: (1) a 7-year renewal of the Class Pass program, starting at $58.50 per semester and increasing to $80.00 per semester; and (2) a fee to support the relocation of the Career Center closer to campus, starting at $12.00 per semester and increasing to a maximum of $16.00 per semester over 10 years. The online election was hosted on a secure Web site overseen by Student Information Systems. Both of the sponsoring departments (Parking and Transportation and the Career Center) developed their referenda with guidance from student-staffed advisory committees, as provided in the Campus Guidelines For Establishing, Increasing, Reducing or Eliminating Campus-Based Fees. The full text of the Class Pass and Career Center referenda, as presented on the final voting ballots, are attached to this report as Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, respectively.

Students who voted in the election were required to make a selection on each of the Class Pass and Career Center ballots, choosing “Yes,” “No,” or “Abstain.” Only “Yes” and “No” votes were counted towards the minimum voter participation required for a referendum to be valid (20% of currently registered students). With 32,429 registered students in Spring 2006, the 20% minimum of 6,486 was easily surpassed for both of the proposed fees: 10,950 students (33.8%) voted “Yes” or “No” in the Class Pass election, and 10,549 students (32.5%) voted “Yes” or “No” in the Career Center Election. In total, 11,167 students submitted ballots (some of which included abstentions, as noted below).

Students approved the Class Pass referendum by a wide margin:

- **Voter turnout:** 10,950  (total number of “Yes” or “No” votes)
- **Yes votes:** 8,723 (79.7%)  (5,476 “Yes” votes required for passage)
- **No votes:** 2,227 (20.3%)
- **Abstentions:** 217

Students did not approve the Career Center referendum:

- **Voter turnout:** 10,549  (total number of “Yes” or “No” votes)
- **Yes votes:** 2,497 (23.7%)  (5,275 “Yes” votes required for passage)
- **No votes:** 8,052 (76.3%)
- **Abstentions:** 618

Ballots submitted Tuesday, February 21: 7,282 (65.2%)
Ballots submitted Wednesday, February 22: 2,415 (21.6%)
Ballots submitted Thursday, February 23: 1,470 (13.2%)

Graduate students submitting ballots: 3,932 (35.2%)
Undergraduate students submitting ballots: 7,235 (64.8%)

The voting results were verified on February 24, 2006 with Helen Lee (Associate Director) and Yu-Tin Kuo of Student Information Systems, in the presence of Gitanjali Borkar and Sara Tillim (members of the Committee on Student Fees), Rachel Luna and Andrew Kwun (independent student witnesses), Tom Devlin (Director of the Career Center), Nad Permaul (Director of
Parking and Transportation), Mark Lucia (Election Manager), and Jodie Rouse (co-chair of the Student Fee Referendum Committee).

No technical problems with the online voting system were reported during the election. None of the comments or complaints submitted to the Election Manager was related to voting irregularities. Student Information Systems received no calls or emails during the election requesting technical support or registering complaints related to voting or the election.

By way of comparison, turnout and results at recent student fee referenda were as follows:

**Spring 2005 “Safeguard Student Health Care” Fee Referendum:**
- Voter turnout: 9,384 (29.6% of students)
- Yes votes: 6,350 (67.7%)
- No votes: 3,034 (32.3%)
- **Approved**

**Fall 2001 Class Pass Referendum:**
- Voter turnout: 9,590 (29.8% of students)
- Yes votes: 8,482 (88.5%)
- No votes: 942 (9.8%)
- Abstentions: 166 (1.7%)
- **Approved**

**Spring 2001 Student Fee Referendum:**
- Voter turnout: 6,507
- Yes votes: 3,573 (54.9%)
- No votes: 2,934 (45.1%)
- **Approved**

**Fall 1999 BEARS Referendum:**
- Voter turnout: 8,419
- Yes votes: 3,219 (38.2%)
- No votes: 5,186 (61.6%)
- Abstentions: 14 (0.2%)
- **Not Approved**

**Spring 1999 Class Pass Referendum:**
- Voter turnout: 9,347 (30.9% of students)
- Yes votes: 8,307 (88.8%)
- No votes: 1,035 (11.2%)
- Abstentions: 5 (0.05%)
- **Approved**

Compared to previous elections, this one had the best voter turnout of any fee referendum election in recent history. Some of the key factors that most likely contributed to this high level of participation were:

- **Two Issues for Approval.** As the first fee referendum election to feature two fees for approval by students, this one was able to draw in voters who may only have had an interest in one of the two issues. Because students were required to make selections on both ballots, some of the voter participation may have included students who would not have voted at all if only one of the two fee referenda was up for approval. The discrepancy in abstentions (217 for the Class Pass and 618 for the Career Center) indicates the possibility that students may have had incrementally more interest in the Class Pass issue.

- **Student Government Involvement.** As described in more detail below, the ASUC and Graduate Assembly were both strongly opposed to the Career Center Fee and mustered an extensive effort to publicize this opposition to the referendum. Although the student government typically advocates for its position on fee referenda (as when it endorsed the Class Pass Fee this year and the “Safeguard Student Health Care” Fee Referendum
last year), its opposition activity related to the Career Center was more intense and widespread than its endorsement activity related to the Class Pass. The added attention given to opposing the Career Center Fee may have motivated more students to participate in the election.

- **Drawing for Prizes.** The incentive to vote – entry in a drawing to win one of 8 iPods – was substantial this year. Anecdotally, several students cited this as a useful motivation to participate in the election, although most of the students who actually won the iPods said they were not aware of the prize drawing before they decided to vote.

**Student Opposition, Funding of Opposition Campaigning, and Formal Complaints**
Both the Class Pass and Career Center fee referenda attracted intense interest and focus from students. Although the ASUC and GA initially opposed the proposed allocation of funds from the Class Pass Fee in the fall semester, after further discussions with Parking & Transportation, both endorsed the Class Pass Renewal Referendum. One student did emerge to organize an opposition campaign to the Class Pass, and requested funding from the Election Manager to support this opposition. Sufficient funds were provided to enable the printing, and posting throughout campus and local businesses, of informational flyers detailing the opposition arguments. These Class Pass opposition materials are attached as Appendix 7 to this report.

The ASUC and GA were opposed to the Career Center Fee, and undertook an active campaign to encourage students to vote against the referendum. Opposition arguments and materials were distributed on the ASUC Web site, in emails to numerous campus listserves, in an email on the first day of the election sent to all registered students, in two full-page advertisements in the Daily Cal, on a banner hung from the 2nd floor Eshleman balcony, and through extensive flyering efforts on campus. Samples of the ASUC and GA’s Career Center opposition materials are attached as Appendix 8.

Two formal complaints were filed with the Election Manager during the election. The first complaint, related to the completeness of information provided about the Class Pass Renewal Referendum, was submitted by the student who organized a campaign in opposition to the Class Pass Fee, and was resolved by the Election Manager before conclusion of the election. The second complaint, related to publicity efforts by the Career Center in support of its fee referendum, was submitted by the ASUC and GA, and was referred by the Election Manager to the Student Fee Referendum Committee for resolution on March 7, 2006. The two complaints, as well as the resolution of the Class Pass complaint by the Election Manager, are attached as Appendix 3. The referral of the ASUC/GA complaint by the Election Manager to the SFRC, which includes analysis and recommendations for potential policy updates, is attached as Appendix 4.

**Election Manager Activities: Web Site, Voting System, and Voter Education**
The Election Manager coordinated numerous activities to publicize the election and educate students about the referendum, some in collaboration with the Committee on Student Fees. These activities included the following:

- **Official Election Web Site/Election Date Planning:** With the Class Pass election originally slated to take place in November 2005, we began setting up the official election Web site with nonpartisan information about the Class Pass in August 2005. Early in the fall
semester, the Career Center began its planning for a fee referendum election in the spring, and soon after, Parking & Transportation elected to shift the Class Pass election to the spring semester. In November 2005, the Student fee Referendum Committee approved the inclusion of both fee referenda in a single election, and selected the dates of February 21 – 23 for the election. The Web site was adapted to include nonpartisan information about both fee referenda, and included the following information:

- Background information about each referendum.
- FAQs about each referendum and the purpose of student fee referenda.
- Nonpartisan Voter’s Guides for each referendum, prepared by the Committee on Student Fees. The full Voter’s Guides for the Class Pass and Career Center Referenda are attached as Appendix 5 and Appendix 6, respectively.
- Sample ballots for each referendum, including the exact language of the ballots used in the election.
- Information about resources available to students who might be opposed to either of the fee referenda, as well as links to student arguments in opposition to each of the fees.
- Details about the election process, including the complaint procedure, information about online voting, an explanation of how to vote using a CalNet ID and passphrase, and steps for acquiring or changing a CalNet passphrase.
- Links to the Web sites of the Committee on Student Fees, the Student Fee Referendum Committee, the student advisory committees for each of the fee referenda, and the Web sites of each department sponsoring the referenda.

**Election Web site metrics:** As with last year’s fee election, traffic on the official election Web site was modest from the time of initial setup until one week prior to the election. During the month of January, the election Web site home page averaged approximately 25 unique visitors per day. In the seven days leading up to and including the election (February 19-25), the daily average jumped to 1,348 unique visitors per day.

**Online Voting System, Prize Drawing Entry, and Bear Facts “Advertising”:** The Election Manager worked with Student Information Systems to design a new voting Web site, with a unique URL, that would contain separate ballots, on distinct sequential pages, for each of the two fees. Using a separate Web site, instead of hosting the voting within Bear Facts (as had been done in two previous online referendum elections) allowed greater flexibility for design and administration of the voting system. Students logged into the voting Web site [https://sis.berkeley.edu/vote](https://sis.berkeley.edu/vote) using their CalNet ID and passphrase, then went through the following flow:

- **Welcome page:** An explanation of the voting process, the method used to count votes, information about the prize drawing, and links to more information about each of the referenda.
- **First Ballot:** The order of the two ballots was randomized, as determined by the SFRC in its December 2005 meeting, so that no advantage was conferred upon either fee referendum by virtue of being the first (or second) ballot to appear. Voters had the option to chose from “Yes,” “No,” or “Abstain” before proceeding to the second ballot. Those who failed to make a selection could not advance to the next ballot until they did.
Second Ballot: After making a selection on the first ballot, students arrived at the second ballot, and were required to select “Yes,” “No,” or “Abstain” before they could submit their final votes.

Voting Summary Page: After making selections on each of the two fee referenda, students had the opportunity to review their selections before submitting a final ballot. Next to each selection was a link to “Change my vote,” which took students back to the fee referendum ballot with a cleared selection. To submit their final selections, students clicked a “Cast Ballots” button.

Drawing Entry: After submitting final ballots, students were given the option to enter a drawing to win one of eight 30GB iPods, which were provided by Parking & Transportation and the Career Center as an incentive for students to vote. Entry in the drawing required only one additional mouse click, and was kept separate from the election to (1) preserve the anonymity of students who voted, and (2) enable the maintenance of separate databases of who voted, how individual students voted, and who entered the prize drawing. (The iPods were distributed to the eight winners of the drawing on March 6 and 7, 2006.)

Screen captures of the voting pages are attached as Appendix 11. A reminder of the election, and a link to the official election Web site, was posted on the Bear Facts student login page starting a week before the election commenced. During the election, the Bear Facts login page also included a direct link to the voting Web site.

• Daily Cal Advertising: We placed several advertisements in the Daily Cal to inform students about the election and to remind them to vote. These began one week in advance of the election with a full-page ad containing the nonpartisan “Voter’s Guide” prepared by CSF, and was followed on the first day of the election with another full-page Voter’s Guide advertisement. During each of the three days of the election, we ran quarter-page ads reminding students to vote and directing them to more information on the official election Web site and the CSF Web site.

• Cal Mail Distribution: As in 2005, every registered Cal student received two email reminders from the Chancellor about the election. The first email was distributed one week before the election (February 14), and the second was delivered on the evening of the first day of the election (February 21). Each email included links to more information about the election, and the second email included a link to the voting Web page. Also as in 2005, the mass student emails were likely the most effective and resource-efficient tools we employed to disseminate election information and remind students to vote. Traffic on the election Web site increased significantly after the first Chancellor email, and the largest spike in vote submissions happened during the evening and night of the first day of the election, after the second Chancellor email.

• Advertising in “The Facebook”: We ran a ten-day announcement on the popular Web site “The Facebook.” The first seven days preceded the election and linked to the official election Web site. The final three days were during the election and included a link to the voting Web site. The Facebook is a useful vehicle for reaching students, because thousands of them use it each day, and the advertising rates are reasonable ($18 per day). The election
advertising was cycled through the site’s “announcement” space with numerous other ads during this 10-day period.

- **Informational Tabling on Upper Sproul Plaza:** Beginning two weeks before the election, the nonpartisan election staff hired by the Election Manager, as well as members of the Committee on Student fees, provided information to students about the election from a table on Sproul Plaza, handing out informational flyers and answering questions about the referendum. During most of these days, members of CSF joined the nonpartisan election staff to distribute Voter’s Guides and answer questions. Traffic at the information tables was moderate, with increasing activity in the week of the election.

- **Information at the Office of Student Life:** We posted nonpartisan flyers, provided informational handouts, and answered student questions about the election at the front desk of OSL in 102 Sproul Hall.

- **Campus Computer Labs:** With the permission of Workstation Support Services and University Library Services, we affixed 8 x 2-inch high flyers to the tops of more than 600 computer monitors at 15 campus computer labs and library computing centers during the three days of the election, reminding students to vote. This seemed to be another highly effective tool for getting out the vote, since most students at the campus computing centers were online anyway and therefore only a couple of clicks away from being able to vote.

- **Residence Halls and Residence Hall Computing Centers:** The Residence Hall staff assisted us by posting 250 informational flyers about the election in the residence halls. At the residence hall computing centers, students were also reminded to vote in the election upon logging in to their computer workstation accounts by means of a small popup window. Residence Hall student peer advisors were also provided with quarter-sheet informational flyers that they shared with their peer advisees.

- **Campus Events Calendar:** The election was included in the campus events calendar and, upon request, was noted as a highlighted event during the week of the election.

- **Voting Information Booths:** During the three days of the election, we staffed three information booths across campus – at North Gate, in between Wheeler and Dwinelle Halls, and on the east side of Kroeber Hall near Bancroft Way – to provide informational materials and answer questions about the election. Each station had prominent banners reminding students to vote. As in 2005, traffic at the information booths was not heavy, but remained fairly steady throughout each of the three days. The Voter’s Guides were once again the most popular handouts taken by visitors to the information booths.

**Other Publicity**
The referenda election was publicized by numerous other means on campus, most notably by the activities of the student advisory committees for each referendum, efforts by the Committee on Student Fees, and media coverage.

- **Student Advisory Committee Activities:** The student committees advocating for the two fees, along with the sponsoring departments, each engaged in extensive efforts to advocate
in favor of their referenda and encourage students to vote. The Class Pass Advisory Committee passed out flyers at the Cal-Stanford basketball game, printed full color “Vote for the Class Pass!” bookmarks, advertised on campus shuttle buses, coordinated with AC Transit to advertise at city bus shelters and on AC Transit buses, advertised in the Daily Cal, and organized activities on Upper Sproul Plaza. The Career Center distributed professionally printed flyers and handbills around campus and on campus bulletin boards, placed three full-page ads in the Daily Cal, publicized the election during a noon event on Upper Sproul Plaza, and made public presentations at lecture halls and student group meetings.

- **CSF Activities:** As noted above, CSF prepared nonpartisan Voter’s Guides for each of the fees and was involved in daily tabling on Upper Sproul Plaza during the two weeks prior to the election, and at information booths during the election, to provide information and answer questions about each of the referenda. The CSF Voter’s Guide was a very useful source of information for hundreds of students who visited the information tables and booths.

- **ASUC and GA:** As previously noted, the student government was actively involved in the fee election, endorsing the Class Pass Fee and widely distributing materials in opposition to the Career Center Fee.

- **Media Coverage:** The Daily Cal ran several news articles about each of the referenda, wrote editorials in favor of the Class Pass Fee and in opposition to the Career Center Fee, and published letters to the editor in favor of and opposed to each of the fees. A list of Daily Cal articles (including links) relating the fee referenda is attached as Appendix 12.

**Recommendations**

As a supplement to the activities described above in support of the fee referenda election, the Election Manager submits the following suggestions (based upon observation and ideas from both student and staff participants in the election process) for consideration in future student fee referenda. Several of these recommendations are repeats of those contained in the memorandum from the Election Manager to the SFRC related to the ASUC/GA complaint about the Career Center Fee and attached to this report as Appendix 4.

- **Clarifying/Specifying Proper Use of Departmental Funds:** In their formal complaint, the ASUC and GA argued that the Career Center should not have used professional staff time or departmental funds to campaign in support of the Career Center Fee, although no provision of the *Campus Guidelines for Establishing, Increasing, Reducing or Eliminating Campus-Based Fees* prohibits the use of department funds or professional staff to promote a referendum that it is sponsoring, and this has been the standard practice in each of the three fee referenda since spring 2005. It would seem untenable to forbid the use of departmental funds or, especially, staff time in the implementation of a fee referendum that is in fact sponsored by the department. However, it does seem advisable to create more specific guidelines around the scope of departmental resources that may be brought to bear in support of a referendum. One solution would be to designate a specific cap on the amount of funds that a department may spend on its campaign efforts in support of a referendum, and to allocate the same amount of funds for student groups and the student government to
use, as they may wish, in opposition to the referendum. These student funds could be administered and distributed by either the student government or by the Election Manager. A specified cap would not only equalize the funds available to both sides of a potential fee debate, but would also free the Election Manager from the difficult position of trying to interpret and “negotiate” (as provided in the Campus Guidelines) the appropriate amount of money that should fund an opposition campaign, if one emerges. I would not recommend limiting the staff time that a department may dedicate to a fee referendum.

Another possibility, perhaps in addition to the foregoing, would be to limit the scope of publicity efforts by sponsoring departments to specific activities. For example, departments (through their student advisory committees) could be permitted only to post flyers on campus, meet with student groups, send informational emails, and table on Sproul Plaza – and forbidden to advertise in the Daily Cal, print multicolor posters, or distribute various forms of advertising collateral (such as glossy postcards, buttons, stickers, bookmarks, or other knickknacks). Common sense requires that these specific guidelines be simple and easy to enforce, so it might be best to decide what forms of publicity should be specifically permitted, rather than trying to formulate a laundry list of activities that are not permitted, so that any activity not on the “permitted” list is disallowed. To ensure fairness, these limitations, if enacted, would need to apply to the department sponsoring a referendum, its student advisory committee, and the student groups (including student government) that might oppose the referendum. A genuine concern here, however, would be the potential restriction of a department or students’ free expression, as well as the ambiguity inherent in attempting to describe and interpret “permitted” or “prohibited” activities.

- **Wider Distribution of Voter’s Guides:** The nonpartisan Voter’s Guides prepared by the Committee on Student Fees are a crucial resource to students for evaluating the merits of a fee referendum. Although the Voter’s Guides are published on the CSF Web site and the official election Web site, and printed copies are handed out on Sproul Plaza and at election information booths, students would benefit from an even broader distribution of these guides. One possibility would be to include them as an attachment to the reminder emails sent by the Chancellor to all registered students, so that every student eligible to vote has quick access to them.

- **Ensuring Equal Access to University Spaces:** The ASUC and GA claimed in their complaint that student government was not allowed the same access to certain university spaces as the Career Center in campaigning against the Career Center Fee. Although there were no apparent grounds for this claim (see Appendix 4 for more details), it is a good idea to proactively address the potential for any difference in treatment between campus departments and student groups or student government in this regard. One means for doing this would be to require that the campaigning and publicity efforts undertaken by sponsoring departments be subject to the identical policies and procedures imposed upon registered campus organizations for such activities. Perhaps the simplest method of assuring this is to place responsibility for coordination of publicity efforts upon the department’s student advisory committee, which typically follows the necessary steps at the Office of Student Life to become a registered campus organization. If all publicity efforts are funneled through the student representatives of the sponsoring department, acting on behalf of their student group, then their access as a registered campus organization will
necessarily be equal to that of the student government or any other registered campus organization involved in any side of a referendum campaigning process.

- **Factual Evaluation of Campaign Materials:** Throughout the election campaign, claims were made on all sides that the sponsoring departments and/or the opposition campaigns made inaccurate or misleading claims in their publicity materials. In all cases where a sponsoring department was asked by the Election Manager (typically in response to a student request) to clarify or provide more information about their fee referenda, the department responded immediately by making the requested changes or providing the additional information. The campus departments also voluntarily complied with a request that they submit their campaign materials to the Election Manager in advance, for a basic review of accuracy and tone (to ensure that none of the claims in pro-fee materials seemed misleading or inflammatory). Campus departments are rightfully responsive to these requests, both because they have an obligation to provide clear and accurate information to students, and because they are subject to the formal complaint process if they do not comply with reasonable requests by students and/or the Election Manager to provide clear and complete information. On the other hand, the ASUC was not responsive to requests by the Election Manager to clarify a few points in its Career Center opposition campaign materials that were potentially misleading to students – and no mechanism of accountability exists to help ensure that students who may oppose a fee referendum follow similar guidelines of accuracy. The suggestion has been made that student groups or government that publish opposition materials submit those materials in advance to the Election Manager for review. This does not seem like an advisable policy: to demand advance review and approval of student campaign materials is tantamount to the exertion of administrative censorship rights over students’ expression of their political views, no matter how neutral the Election Manager may be. While it may be somewhat unfair to hold departments to a more rigorous standard of accuracy in their materials than students, the downside of potentially restricting student expression appears too great. This is where the Committee on Student Fees could play an important role, as a nonpartisan student voice, by reviewing and counseling student government and student groups on the opposition materials they plan to distribute, and offering commentary on the CSF Web site about the quality and accuracy of materials distributed by each side of a fee referendum campaign. This nonpartisan analysis by their peers would offer students an excellent resource to evaluate the campaigning on both sides of an issue.

- **Unbiased Referendum Language:** Although ballot neutrality is not specifically articulated as a requirement in the *Campus Guidelines*, every effort should be made to ensure that the language of a fee referendum is neutral and free of any perceptible advocacy slant. The SFRC should consider adding this principle to the *Campus Guidelines*. Because “neutrality” is not a quality that can easily be codified, the review process by the SFRC is the most effective means for ensuring adherence to the spirit of such a guideline, and any referendum language approved by the SFRC in the future should be presumed to meet the standard of neutrality recommended by this guideline.

For purposes of simplicity and clarity in following such a guideline, the SFRC should consider adding a clarification to the policy that the language of a referendum ballot be limited to the basic neutral information, a description of the costs and conditions attached to
the fee referendum (including any anticipated fee escalations), and a neutral question for
approval. Information that has been included in each of the past three referendum ballots,
under a heading titled “About the Referendum,” can be well covered by the official election
Web site – which can be easily linked to from within the online ballot itself.

- **Finalizing Referendum Language:** As noted last year, it is crucial to finalize the language
  of any student fee referendum as far in advance of the election as possible. We did better
  this year than we did last year (in 2005, the referendum language was finalized two weeks
  before the start of the election; in 2006 each referendum was final almost three weeks before
  the start of the election). This brief time between finalization of a referendum and the
  beginning of the election provides a rather narrow window during which the general
  student population can review, digest, and comment upon the terms of the referendum
  before voting on it. A mitigating factor here is that along with student advisory committee
  involvement, the ASUC and GA are both represented on the SFRC and can play active roles
  in shaping the language of referenda during the drafting stages.

- **Remote Computer Voting Setup:** Student participation in this election confirmed last
  year’s conclusion that setting up a few computers at campus information booths for voting
during the three days of the election is not a cost-effective strategy. With an expense well
into the thousands of dollars, as well as logistical, security, voter privacy, and voter
anonymity challenges, the other means utilized to encourage voter turnout and remind
students of the election when they were near computers were more than adequate to ensure
ease of participation for all students.
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Class Pass Renewal Referendum

To allow students to take unlimited rides on AC Transit buses (including Transbay lines to San Francisco and the Peninsula) and Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding the Richmond Field Station lines), do you approve the continuation of a mandatory fee to support the Class Pass program?

If approved, the fee will continue the current Class Pass program of unlimited rides all year long (including the summer) on:

- Any AC Transit bus
- Transbay service to San Francisco
- The connector from the Fremont BART Station to Stanford University
- Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding the Richmond Field Station line)
- LBNL shuttle buses

Among the enhancements students will see during the term of the program are:

- Direct AC Transit service from San Francisco to downtown Berkeley between 1 a.m. and 5 a.m.
- New AC Transit Rapid Bus service from downtown Oakland along Telegraph Avenue, terminating at the campus West Crescent on Oxford Street.
- UC funding to install technology at campus bus shelters to let riders know when the next bus will arrive (may also be available online and via cell phone).

This fee is subject to the following costs and conditions:

- Collection of the fee will begin in the Fall 2006 semester. It will be a $58.50 charge per semester and will replace the current Class Pass Fee of $37.20 per semester. The increase in the Class Pass Fee over this current amount pays for inflationary and other cost increases (including fuel costs), and reflects parity with the increased fares paid by regular patrons of AC Transit. The Class Pass Fee will remain in effect for seven (7) years, through Summer 2013, at the following rates:
  
  - 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 (Years 1-3): $58.50 per semester
  - 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 (Years 4-6): $69.50 per semester
  - 2012-13 (Year 7): $80.00 per semester

- Students not enrolled at U.C. Berkeley in the Spring semester during the period covered by the referendum, who attend the Summer Session and want a Class Pass, are required to pay a fee equal to 50% of the fee for the following fall semester.

- The Class Pass Program Advisory Committee, an independent committee consisting of representatives from both the undergraduate and graduate student bodies, the administration, and AC Transit, will periodically evaluate the program and ensure that fee monies are allocated appropriately.

- In accordance with campus policy, one-third of the Fee will be returned to financial aid to help offset the cost of this Fee for students who are eligible for financial aid.

- The Fee is nonrefundable due to contractual obligations with AC Transit, and applies to all registered graduate and undergraduate students.

Do you approve this mandatory fee to continue the Class Pass program?

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Abstain

About the Referendum

Beginning with the Fall Semester 1999, the Berkeley campus implemented a bus pass program for registered Berkeley students that allows them free use of the Alameda-Contra Costa County Transit
District (AC Transit) system anywhere it provides service. The first referendum was approved by 89% of student voters. In November 2001, 88% of the UC Berkeley students who voted in the Class Pass referendum approved the continuation of the Class Pass for an additional period of four years. The free, unlimited ride program includes:

- Transbay service to San Francisco
- The connector from the Fremont BART Station to Stanford University
- Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding Richmond Field Station line) all year
- Unlimited rides during the summer.

Each year, UC Berkeley students have taken over 3.5 million rides on AC Transit bus lines. As transportation costs continue to rise, this Fee will ensure that Berkeley students have access to affordable, reliable bus transit services for the next seven years.

If the Class Pass referendum is not approved, Bear Transit services will be severely reduced. Students will no longer have free, unlimited access to AC Transit services, and would instead be required to purchase single tickets or monthly rider passes. Single rides on AC Transit buses are currently $1.75, and a monthly pass is $70.00.
Career Center Referendum

In order to move the Career Center from its current off-campus location to a newly renovated building across the street from Lower Sproul by August 2006, do you approve of a mandatory fee to be exclusively used to lease the building for ten years?

This fee will ensure that the wide range of face-to-face services that the Career Center offers are available to Cal's undergraduate and graduate students in a more central location. These services are:

- individual career counseling
- law and medical school advising
- on-campus recruiting and interviewing
- employer seminars
- alumni panels and job search seminars
- graduate and professional school advising
- job and internship advising
- career assessment
- academic and non-academic career advising for graduate students
- career planning and internship workshops
- practice interviews and resume critiques with employers
- career information library
- career computer lab
- mini-appointments

The fee will be exclusively used for a ten year lease for the newly renovated building at 2440 Bancroft Way, across from Lower Sproul Plaza. The Career Center will move to 2440 Bancroft Way by August 2006. The Career Center's current off-campus location is at 2111 Bancroft Way in downtown Berkeley.

The fee is intended to supplement but not supplant the portion of UC Berkeley’s Registration Fee currently allocated to provide services to students by the Career Center.

The fee is subject to the following costs and conditions:

- In accordance with campus policy, one-third of fee revenues will be returned to financial aid to help offset the cost of this fee for the neediest undergraduate and graduate students who are eligible for campus-based financial aid.
- Collection of the fee will begin in fall semester 2006 and will be assessed each fall and spring semester through spring 2016. No fee will be collected during the summer term. The fee schedule is described below and accounts for adjustments due to lease increases. The schedule reflects the maximum amount to be collected each semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee per semester</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to move the Career Center from its current off-campus location to a newly renovated building across the street from Lower Sproul by August 2006, do you approve of a mandatory fee to be exclusively used to lease the building for ten years?

__ Yes
__ No
__ Abstain

About the Referendum
From February 21 to 23, 2006 all UC Berkeley students will have the opportunity to vote online on the Bring the Career Center Back Home referendum. Passage of this measure will establish a new mandatory fee (starting at $12 per semester) to allow the Career Center to lease space across from Lower Sproul Plaza.
Voting for this referendum will be conducted online, via Bear Facts (a secure campus server). A majority of student voters must approve the fee before it can be implemented.

**Why a Referendum?**
Since 1993 the Career Center has been located at 2111 Bancroft Way, approximately 100 feet from Shattuck Avenue in downtown Berkeley. In 2005, the Committee for Student Fees, a Chancellor’s student advisory committee which annually reviews select student service units, evaluated the operations of the Career Center. Their major recommendation was to move the Career Center closer to campus. The Committee for Student Fees "considers the under-utilization of Career Center services, which results from its off-campus location, to be an inefficient allocation of student fees, and thus strongly supports the Career Center’s goal to move on-campus."

Given the recent decline in campus support available for student services, currently only 60% of the Career Center's budget is derived from student Registration Fees. The balance comes from the Career Center's ability to generate funds from external sources. Funding from these external sources would not be able to support either leasing or buying a building. Furthermore, the campus is currently unable to afford the cost of the lease or building a new facility for the Career Center.

If this fee is not adopted, the Career Center will remain at 2111 Bancroft Way. Currently, there are no alternate locations available to move the Career Center closer to campus.

**What improvements will be made to the building at 2440 Bancroft Way?**
The owner will be investing $1,600,000 in the building to provide the first class accommodations that will enable the Career Center to best serve the needs of students. The facility will include the interviewing rooms, counseling offices, career resource library, computer workstations and seminar rooms that all currently exist in the Career Center. New additions will include larger interview rooms, dressing rooms for students and two large workshop classrooms.

**What if the renovations aren't completed by the beginning of fall semester 2006?**
If a delay occurs in the renovation of the building and the Career Center moves after the beginning of classes, the fee of $12 for the fall would be prorated.

**What level of career services will be available if the referendum passes?**
Since we anticipate an increase in student traffic when the Career Center moves to 2440 Bancroft Way, the Division of Student Affairs will increase the staffing level by approximately 2.5 individuals for the next three years to accommodate the greater demand. Thereafter, the staffing level will be reviewed to determine whether the increase should be continued. If the referendum isn’t approved, there will be no change in the current level of services.

**What's happening on other campuses?**
Among UC schools the Berkeley Career Center is the only one that is not located near the main hub of student activity. The number of students who visit the Cal Career Center averages approximately 50-75 a day compared to UCLA (375-400), UCSD (300-350) and UC Davis (200-225). Additionally, over the past ten years, several UC schools such as UCLA, UC San Diego, and UC Santa Cruz, as well as other major public and private institutions such as Arizona and Stanford, have significantly invested in their career services by building new career centers or renovating existing facilities.

**What will happen at the end of the lease?**
The fee will be collected for 10 years, through Spring 2016. At that time, the Career Center may be relocated elsewhere, a referendum could be held to decide continuation of the lease, or the campus could decide to buy the building.
Background
The Career Center prepares undergraduates, graduate students, and alumni to make informed decisions about their futures by providing comprehensive resources, programs, and counseling on career development, internships, employment, and graduate school. Services to alumni are available only on a fee-for-service basis.

We fulfill our mission through: 1) First-class customer care that represents the highest level of customized quality service; 2) A wide range of partnerships with employers, graduate schools, and campus academic and administrative departments that contribute to the breadth and effectiveness of our services and 3) state-of-the-art technology that maximizes accessibility to our resources and services.

Career Center services include:
* indicates personal services provided in the Career Center

@cal Alumni Network
15 minute Mini Appointments with career counselors *
25 career and graduate school listservs
45 minute appointments with career counselors *
Alumni Advantage: services for alumni *
Article archives of hundreds of career, internship, and graduate school articles
Assistance with choosing a major *
Bioengineering Career Fair
Cal Career Fair
Cal Transitions, a program for students with disabilities *
CalJobs: Listings of on and off campus full-time and part-time jobs, plus internships
Career Advising for Masters and PhD students *
Career Assessment interpretations with career counselors *
Career Week: 35+ career exploration programs
Civil & Environmental Engineering Career Fair
Computer Workstations *
Cover Letter Critiques *
Diversity Career Fair
Drop-In Appointments at Campbell Hall (Letter & Sciences Advising Office)
Early Bird Internship Fair
EECS Career Fair
Environmental Design Career Fair
Externship job shadowing program
Finding Your First Internship Workshops
Freshmen, Sophomore, and Transfer Student Pre-Med Workshops
Graduate School Advising *
Graduate School Fair
Graduate School Workshops *
Information Lab with hundreds of books, binders, and periodicals *
International Affairs Graduate School Fair
International Career Symposium
Internship & Summer Job Fair
Internships in ... Workshops *
Internship web resources for 14 career fields
Job Search Guide with sample resumes and cover letters *
Just In Time Job Fair

Law School admissions statistics
Law School Advising *
Law School Application Essentials Workshop *
Law School Fair
Letter of Recommendation service for graduate and professional school *
Letters of Recommendation Workshops: What Every Student Should Know
Masters & PhD Career Fair
Masters & PhD Student Job Search Workshops *
Medical School admissions statistics
Medical School Advising *
Meet the Law and Medical Schools: Admissions Panels
Mock Interviews with Employers *
Mock Job, Medical School or Graduate School Interviews with career counselors *
Nonprofit/Public Service Fair
OCR: On Campus Recruiting interviews *
On Campus Recruiting (OCR) Orientations
Online "Ask the Counselor:" answers to questions in two working days
Online Reviews of graduate, medical, and law school admissions statements
Peer Advisor Program *
Preparing for Successful Interviews Workshops *
Preparing for the Career Fairs Workshops
Resume Critiques with Employers *
Specialized web resources for 12 career fields
Fellowship Information and Listings for Undergraduates *
Take an Interest in Your Major: Career Assessment Workshops
Vault Employer & Industry Guides
Videotaped Practice Interviews *
What Can I Do with a Major in ...: job, graduate school, and salary information
What You Can Do with a ... Major? panel presentations
Writing a Winning Statement for Graduate School Workshops
Writing an Effective Resume and Cover Letter Workshops *
Complaint #1 (Re: Class Pass, submitted via email 2/21/06):

From:  Sarah Syed <ssyed@berkeley.edu>
Sent:  Tuesday, February 21, 2006 2:39 AM
To:  electionmanager@hotmail.com
Subject:  Class Pass Referendum Non-Compliance

Dear Mark Lucia:

I would like to make a formal complaint regarding the Class Pass Referendum and its non-compliance with the Campus Guidelines for Establishing, Increasing, Reducing or Eliminating Campus-Based Fees. This election violates the guidelines and should not be considered valid.

Section C on Campaigning is violated by the Class Pass Referendum, as full and complete information on the referendum has not been provided to students.

Excerpt from http://students.berkeley.edu/committees/sfrc.asp?id=3:

C. Campaigning
The Student Fee Referenda Committee, in conjunction with the Elections Manager, will determine time, place, and manner protocol for the publicity of campaigns in favor of and against the proposed fee initiative to ensure that there is opportunity for all sides to comment and that full and complete information on the referendum is provided to students:

Related to the project:
1. Why is this project needed?
2. Is the project, as reflected in the referendum, feasible financially?
3. What efforts were made to fund it from other sources?
4. What other resources are to be used to support the project?
5. How are the funds raised to be expended?
6. If the project is a facility, what is its location, physical description, and the cost of maintaining?

End excerpt.

As a student voting on this proposal, I have tried to educate myself regarding this fee increase. There is no information available regarding the break-down of the fee increase between AC Transit and Parking & Transportation. I do know that Return-to-Aid receives 33%, but no other information is available online. http://students.berkeley.edu/osl/referendum.asp?id=1227.

This information should be made available to students BEFORE they vote. The student fee referendum guidelines require the provision of full and complete information. In addition, the efforts to fund it from other sources has not been revealed. Full and complete information has not been provided.

I can read online about how the current class pass funds are divided: http://pt.berkeley.edu/classpass/referendum.html

In past class pass referendum, the expenditure plan was disclosed completely.

The division of the proposed class pass increase seems to be purposely withheld. The non-partisan Committee on Student Fees analysis sheds no further light.
In closing, this election violates the Campus Guidelines for Establishing, Increasing, Reducing or Eliminating Campus-Based Fees and should not be considered valid.

Sincerely,
Sarah Syed

MCP/MS Candidate, 2006
Dept. of City & Regional Planning
Dept. of Civil & Environmental Engineering
University of California, Berkeley

Election Manager Resolution of Complaint #1 (sent via email 2/21/06):

Dear Sarah:

Thank you for your message. There is detailed information about the intended use of funds from the Class Pass Fee in the election Web site (in the FAQ, the sample ballot, and the CSF Voter’s Guide), and the Parking and Transportation Web site. In each case, the services and enhancements to be paid for by the Class Pass Fee are specifically articulated. As one example among many, the sample ballot on the election Web site (which is the same as the official ballot upon which students are voting now) states:

"If approved, the fee will continue the current Class Pass program of unlimited rides all year long (including the summer) on:
• Any AC Transit bus
• Transbay service to San Francisco
• The connector from the Fremont BART Station to Stanford University
• Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding the Richmond Field Station line)
• LBNL shuttle buses

Among the enhancements students will see during the term of the program are:
• Direct AC Transit service from San Francisco to downtown Berkeley between 1 a.m. and 5 a.m.
• New AC Transit Rapid Bus service from downtown Oakland along Telegraph Avenue, terminating at the campus West Crescent on Oxford Street.
• UC funding to install technology at campus bus shelters to let riders know when the next bus will arrive (may also be available online and via cell phone)."

In this manner, Parking and Transportation has clearly met the terms of the Campus Guidelines, both in letter and in spirit, by specifying in detail how the fee will be expended. You also note “efforts to fund [the Class Pass] from other sources has not been revealed.” This is a guideline that falls under the purview of the Student Fee Referendum Committee throughout the referendum planning and voter education process. Perhaps because the Class Pass is a continuing program, and because the most likely funding alternative would seem to be for students to simply pay individual fares on AC Transit, the SFRC has not required Parking and Transportation to articulate efforts to fund the Class Pass from other sources. It should be added that throughout the development of its referendum, Parking and Transportation has worked extensively with SFRC and a student advisory committee, which includes representatives from student government, in articulating the purpose and use of the Class Pass Fee. Parking and Transportation has made numerous modifications to its referendum based upon detailed review and feedback from all of these parties.

In sum, the Class Pass Referendum (and in turn, Parking and Transportation) has complied with the Campus Guidelines as monitored by the SFRC, and I can emphatically assure you in that no information about either fee referendum has been purposely withheld from students. In the meantime, in the interest of absolute clarity, a specific breakdown of how the Class Pass Fee will be allocated between AC Transit,
Parking and Transportation, and Return-to-Aid has been added to the election Web site at http://students.berkeley.edu/osl/referendum.asp?id=1227

As provided by the complaint procedure for fee referenda elections, I conclude that no violation has occurred, and view this matter as resolved. If you would like to appeal this resolution to the SFRC, please let me know.

Best Regards,
Mark Lucia

Complaint #2 (Re: Career Center, sent via email as attachment on ASUC letterhead, 2/23/06):

Date: February 23, 2006
To: Mark Lucia, Fee Referendum Elections Manager
Cc: Nadesan Permaul, Jodie Rouse, Co-Chairs, SFRC
John Cummings, Assoc. Chancellor
Susie Castillo-Robson, Acting Dean of Students
Tom Devlin, Career Center Director

Re: Official Complaint Over the Career Center Referendum

Mr. Lucia,

On behalf of the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly, we are writing to officially file a complaint in regards to the educational and electoral procedures which took place for the Career Center Referendum.

In particular, we are concerned about the following three potential violations:

1) Inappropriate use of Career Center funds and full time employees
2) Unequal access to university spaces and to the voting community for election materials
3) Biased referendum ballot language

As we outlined in a letter to the Chancellor on February 16, the Career Center has allocated resources intended for student services, including full time employees and funds, toward payment and distribution of extravagant campaign literature.

As we alerted you last week, large partisan Career Center Referendum signs have been placed free standing in the entrances of Moffit and Doe Libraries, as well as the Student Learning Center, creating the perception that this measure is endorsed by the University. The Student Code of Conduct prohibits any student group, or the student government, from using University property for advertisement unless otherwise authorized (section III.102.06). This obviously infringes on our right of access to the voting community as stated in section II.D on Democratic and Fair Elections in the Campus Guidelines for Establishing, Increasing, Reducing or Eliminating Campus-Based Fees.

Finally, the on-line ballot for the Career Center referendum this week contained clearly biased language. Rather than consistently referring to the referendum by its official name, the Career Center Fee Referendum, the ballot contained the advertising slogan promoted by the Career Center staff, the “Bring the Career Center Back Home referendum. This violates the principles of democracy and fairness, among others, which are vital for a proper election to take place.
We are very concerned that these potential violations have undermined the integrity of the election process, and we formally request an opportunity to further document and present our detailed case with evidence on these violations. We look forward to your timely response.

Most sincerely,

Manuel Buenrostro
President, ASUC

Lola Odusanya
President, Graduate Assembly

Jason Dixson
Academic Affairs Vice President, ASUC

Robert Schectman
Academic Affairs Vice President, GA

(Election Manager referral of Complaint #2 to the Student Fee Referendum Committee is attached as Appendix 4 to Election Manager Report.)
On February 23, 2006, the ASUC and Graduate Assembly submitted a formal complaint to the Election Manager with respect to the Career Center Fee Referendum election underway from February 21 – 23, 2006. The complaint letter is attached as Appendix 1.

Students did not approve the Career Center Fee in the referendum election. The ASUC and GA do not seek to overturn this result, but have elected to pursue the complaint for the purpose of clarifying the procedures governing student fee referenda elections as articulated in the *Campus Guidelines for Establishing, Increasing, Reducing or Eliminating Campus-Based Fees* (the “Campus Guidelines”).

According to the *Campus Guidelines*, the Election Manager has the discretion to resolve complaints or to refer them to the SFRC for resolution. Because no specific remedy has been requested in the aftermath of the election (such as reversal of the election outcome), and because the complaint focuses on questions of policy, I am referring the complaint and its attendant procedural issues to the SFRC for consideration.

This memo will address each of the three specific complaints made in the February 23 letter, and will offer analysis and recommendations for evaluation by the SFRC of potential updates to, or clarifications of, the *Campus Guidelines*.

1. **Inappropriate use of Career Center funds and full time employees.**

The ASUC and Graduate Assembly state in their February 23 letter:

> As we outlined in a letter to the Chancellor on February 16, the Career Center has allocated resources intended for student services, including full
time employees and funds, toward payment and distribution of extravagant campaign literature.

The February 16 letter addressed to the Chancellor, referred to above, noted the following:

[T]he Career Center appears to have financed their campaign with resources that should be going towards helping students, especially in a time of decreasing services.

Rather than being used toward student services, these resources are being used to pay for extravagant campaign literature and several full-page, colored, advertisement space in the Daily Cal. What is worse is that full-time employees of the career center are being used to campaign on Sproul, in the Dining Commons, and in Residence Halls. FTE are also being used to deliver partisan classroom presentations and visit with student groups.

**Analysis:** Section IV. B of the *Campus Guidelines* states that “[t]he department or organization sponsoring the fee initiative may be involved in determining the language of the ballot, and in organizing and implementing the campaign in favor of a referendum, but should not be involved in leading or running the election.” No provision of the *Campus Guidelines* prohibits the use of department funds or professional staff to promote a referendum that it is sponsoring, and this has been the standard practice in each of the three fee referenda since spring 2005. Departmental staff time and resources were used to promote the 2005 “Safeguard Student Health Care” Fee Referendum (sponsored by University Health Services) and the 2006 Class Pass Renewal Referendum (sponsored by Parking & Transportation), in addition to the 2006 Career Center Referendum.

According to the UC Office of the President’s Student Affairs Office and its General Counsel, the use of a department or organization's funds and staff time to promote a campus-based fee initiative sponsored by that department or organization is neither proscribed by any policy of the Office of the President nor by any law or legal principle.

The *Campus Guidelines* do seem to contemplate the balancing of publicity expenditures between sponsoring departments and students who may oppose fee referenda, by stating that the Election Manager “may negotiate additional costs, such as reasonable funding for opposition marketing.” During the 2006 fee referenda, the official election Web site contained several prominent notifications to students who might have opposed either fee referendum that funds were available to them to support opposition marketing and publicity efforts. One student requested, and was granted, funding to print and distribute informational flyers detailing opposition arguments to the Class Pass Renewal Referendum.

**Recommendation:** It would seem untenable to forbid the use of departmental funds or, especially, staff time in the implementation of a fee referendum that is in
fact sponsored by the department. However, it does seem advisable to create more specific guidelines around the scope of departmental resources that may be brought to bear in support of a referendum. One solution would be to designate a specific cap on the amount of funds that a department may spend on its campaign efforts in support of a referendum, and to allocate the same amount of funds for student groups and the student government to use, as they may wish, in opposition to the referendum. These student funds could be administered and distributed by either the student government or by the Election Manager. A specified cap would not only equalize the funds available to both sides of a potential fee debate, but would also free the Election Manager from the difficult position of trying to interpret and “negotiate” the appropriate amount of money that should fund an opposition campaign, if one emerges. I would not recommend limiting the staff time that a department may dedicate to a fee referendum.

Another possibility, perhaps in addition to the foregoing, would be to limit the scope of publicity efforts by sponsoring departments to specific activities. For example, departments (through their student advisory committees) could be permitted only to post flyers on campus, meet with student groups, send informational emails, and table on Sproul Plaza – and forbidden to advertise in the Daily Cal, print multicolor posters, or distribute various forms of advertising collateral (such as glossy postcards, buttons, stickers, bookmarks, or other knickknacks). Common sense requires that these specific guidelines be simple and easy to enforce, so it might be best to decide what forms of publicity should be specifically permitted, rather than trying to formulate a laundry list of activities that are not permitted, so that any activity not on the “permitted” list is disallowed. To ensure fairness, these limitations, if enacted, would need to apply to the department sponsoring a referendum, its student advisory committee, and the student groups (including student government) that might oppose the referendum. A genuine concern here, however, would be the potential restriction of a department or students’ free expression, as well as the ambiguity inherent in attempting to describe and interpret “permitted” or “prohibited” activities.

2. Unequal access to university spaces and to the voting community for election materials.

The ASUC and Graduate Assembly state in their February 23 letter:

As we alerted you last week, large partisan Career Center Referendum signs have been placed free standing in the entrances of Moffit and Doe Libraries, as well as the Student Learning Center, creating the perception that this measure is endorsed by the University. The Student Code of Conduct prohibits any student group, or the student government, from using University property for advertisement unless otherwise authorized (section III.102.06). This obviously infringes on our right of access to the voting community as stated in section II.D on Democratic and Fair Elections in the Campus Guidelines for Establishing, Increasing, Reducing or Eliminating Campus-Based Fees.
Analysis: While the Campus Guidelines contemplate that the department sponsoring a fee referendum “may be involved in determining the language of the ballot, and in organizing and implementing the campaign in favor of a referendum,” the issue of equal access for opposition to a referendum is an important one to consider. The section of the Code of Student Conduct cited by the ASUC in its letter (presumably Section V.102.06, and not III.102.06, which does not exist) is not on point: it prohibits “unauthorized entry to, possession of, receipt of, or use of any University services; equipment; resources; or properties, including the University’s name, insignia, or seal.” The Berkeley Campus Regulations do not articulate any difference in treatment between registered campus organizations and campus departments in the posting of materials on campus, whether in libraries or departments. For non-public bulletin boards and areas, the Campus Regulations indicate in Section 366 that registered campus organizations may post announcements on departmental bulletin boards or in display cases “in accordance with the rules of the department.”

To the best of my knowledge, the Career Center carefully followed campus regulations and departmental/building guidelines in seeking approval to place campaign materials in various locations on campus (including Doe, Moffitt, and the Student Learning Center), and its actions merit no censure.

A registered campus organization is permitted to request the posting of materials at any building on campus by contacting the building manager, obtaining approval, and observing building or department guidelines, which may vary slightly across campus. If in practice, however, campus departments are subject to different rules than student groups in the distribution or posting of publicity materials, then this difference in treatment should be addressed – and equalized – in the context of a student fee referendum.

(It should be noted that the ASUC and the GA raised its concern about equal access five days prior to the election, and were offered whatever assistance was needed from both the Election Manager and the Office of Student Life to contact building managers (including those at the Doe and Moffitt Libraries and the Student Learning Center) for assistance with requesting their own postings, and a commitment to seek the removal of the Career Center posters if the students were not allowed equal access. No assistance was sought after the offer was made.)

Recommendation: Although there do not seem to be grounds for a claim of unequal access to University spaces, to address the potential for any difference in treatment between campus departments and student groups or student government in this regard, I recommend that the campaigning and publicity efforts undertaken by sponsoring departments be considered subject to the identical policies and procedures imposed upon registered campus organizations for such activities. Perhaps the simplest means of assuring this is to place responsibility for coordination of publicity efforts upon the department’s student advisory committee, which typically follows the necessary steps at the Office of Student Life to become a
registered campus organization. If all publicity efforts are funneled through the student representatives of the sponsoring department, acting on behalf of their student group, then their access as a registered campus organization will necessarily be equal to that of the student government or any other registered campus organization involved in any side of a referendum campaigning process.

3. Biased referendum ballot language.

The ASUC and Graduate Assembly state in their February 23 letter:

[T]he on-line ballot for the Career Center referendum this week contained clearly biased language. Rather than consistently referring to the referendum by its official name, the Career Center Fee Referendum, the ballot contained the advertising slogan promoted by the Career Center staff, the “Bring the Career Center Back Home referendum. This violates the principles of democracy and fairness, among others, which are vital for a proper election to take place.

Analysis: The Campus Guidelines do not articulate a standard of neutrality for referendum ballots, but the SFRC has nonetheless worked to help sponsoring departments draft referendum language that is unbiased. At its January 11, 2006 meeting, the SFRC reviewed the language of the Career Center Fee Referendum and made several recommendations. Among them was the revision of the ballot language to make it as neutral as possible. In line with this recommendation, the official title of the referendum was designated as “Career Center Referendum,” in place of the initial title proposed by the Career Center’s student advisory committee, the “Bring the Career Center Back Home” Referendum.

These steps were an intentional effort to distinguish the 2006 fee referenda from the University Health Services referendum, which – although in compliance with the Campus Guidelines – had the pro-fee name “Safeguard Student Health Care Referendum” and included language in the question for approval by students that was viewed by some as potentially pro-fee: “To protect and improve student access to high quality, on-campus medical and mental health care, do you approve a mandatory fee to support Berkeley’s student health and counseling services?” (Emphasis added.)

As part of that discussion on January 11, the SFRC counseled the Career Center that ballot language included below the question for approval (which was contained under a heading titled “About the Referendum”) need not be completely neutral, although the information in that section was predominantly factual in nature.

In the final referendum ballot, the initial paragraph under the heading “About the Referendum” did, in fact, refer to the Career Center Referendum as the “Bring the Career Center Back Home Referendum.” This was an unintentional oversight, and could have easily been changed, even during the election, had it been noted; unfortunately, the ASUC and GA did not notify the Election Manager of its concern
about this point until the evening of the last day of the election. Although this reference to the referendum title was an oversight and should ideally have been revised before the election began, it was neither a violation of the Campus Guidelines nor inconsistent with the guidance provided to the Career Center by the SFRC on January 11.

**Recommendation:** Although ballot neutrality is not specifically articulated as a requirement in the Campus Guidelines, every effort should be made to ensure that the language of a fee referendum is neutral and free of any perceptible advocacy slant. I recommend that this principle be added to the Campus Guidelines. Because “neutrality” is not a quality that can easily be codified, I would suggest that the review process by the SFRC is the most effective means for ensuring adherence to the spirit of such a guideline, and that any referendum language approved by the SFRC in the future be presumed to meet the standard of neutrality recommended by this guideline.

I would also suggest that for purposes of simplicity and clarity in following such a guideline, the SFRC consider adding a guideline that the language of a referendum ballot be limited to the basic neutral information, a description of the costs and conditions attached to the fee referendum (including any anticipated fee escalations), and a neutral question for approval. Information that has been included in each of the past three referendum ballots, under a heading titled “About the Referendum,” can be well covered by the official election Web site – which can be easily linked to from within the online ballot itself.
Introduction

In 1999, 88.8% of the student body voted to institute the Class Pass program on the UC Berkeley campus. In 2001, 88.5% of the student body voted to renew the program for another four years. In order to provide students with control over costs of their mandatory, student-imposed fees, there is a third renewal and a referendum to continue the Class Pass program, scheduled for February 21, February 22, and February 23, 2006. The purpose of this student fee referendum is to give students a yes or no option of continuing the current Class Pass program by voting on an increase over the current $37.20 per semester fee to a fee of $58.50 per semester, to maintain and enhance both the AC Transit and Bear Transit services. The Class Pass Advisory Committee, an independent committee composed of representatives from both the undergraduate and graduate student bodies, is proposing a $21.30 per semester increase of the mandatory “Class Pass” fee to the total fee amount of $58.50. Over the course of the seven-year mandatory fee, it will be indexed in the third year and the seventh year to address increased operational costs.

The Committee on Student Fees (CSF) is the non-partisan student voice on student fees and policy at UC Berkeley. To educate the campus community, we have created a Voter’s Guide to help teach students about the referendum process and the details of this fee increase. We encourage you to visit our website at http://www.berkeleycsf.org or to stop by our office at 210 Eshleman Hall.

Class Pass Program Renewal Summary

Purpose:

To provide the following services to registered UC Berkeley students:

- Unlimited ride program that currently includes rides all year long (including the summer) on:
  - Any AC Transit bus
  - Transbay service to San Francisco
  - The connector from the Fremont BART Station to Stanford University
  - Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding Richmond Field Station line)
- New direct all night Service from San Francisco after midnight to downtown Berkeley
- Access to new “Rapid Bus” line down Telegraph Avenue terminating at the West Crescent on the Berkeley campus
- Funding to install technology at bus shelters (that may also be accessible online and via cell phone) to let riders know when the next bus will arrive at their preferred bus stop

Requested Fee Amount:

2006-2007 through 2008-2009 → $58.50 per semester
2009-2010 through 2011-2012 → $69.50 per semester
2012-2013 → $80.00 per semester

Voter’s Guide

Why Vote Yes:

The proposed Class Pass program fee increase over the current $37.20 per semester fee is necessary to support increased costs for AC Transit, and additional funding required for campus Bear Transit operational costs. It also covers improvement and expansion costs to the current Class Pass program, making it more accessible and useful to students. For example, students at UC Santa Cruz pay $138, and
students at UCLA pay $86 per semester for transit programs. The following are the top reasons why you should vote in favor of this fee increase to continue the program:

- The Class Pass program has proven to be an integral part of the campus access program. Over 3.5 million rides on AC Transit and 650,000 rides on campus Bear Transit are taken by students every year.

- The Class Pass program provides students with greater mobility. It offers rides around the campus and throughout the Bay Area. Unlimited use of all AC Transit bus lines makes regional transit cost effective, provides more housing options, and comfortable, dry travel during inclement weather.

- The Class Pass ensures that Berkeley students have access to affordable, reliable bus transit services as the cost of public transportation continues to rise. The Class Pass has an annual value of nearly $1400 but will be offered to students at an annual value of less than $150.
  - AC Transit currently charges $1.75 per local ride and $3.50 per Transbay ride. It offers local monthly passes for $70.00 and Transbay monthly passes for $116.00.
  - Bear Transit currently charges $0.50 per campus shuttle ride and $1.00 per hill shuttle ride.
  - Cal students will have paid for the value of their Class Pass after taking 34 local trips and 17 Transbay trips in a semester.

- The Class Pass program improves student safety; both AC Transit and Bear Transit offer night service to preferred destinations.

- This program offers equity. It offers all registered students access to low-cost transportation.

- This program is environmentally friendly. It reduces automobile congestion in and around campus. It decreases the demand for parking and minimizes pollution.

- Renewal of this program will offer numerous enhancements that are pertinent to student needs such as service from San Francisco after midnight directly to downtown Berkeley, a possible new service from Emeryville to the Berkeley campus, expansion of campus shuttles with four perimeter routes, and new “next bus” technology. “Next bus” technology is a GPS-based technology which predicts when the next bus connected to that system will arrive at that particular bus stop.

- Purchase of single tickets or monthly passes do not have a financial aid component and will most likely come directly from students’ personal budgets.

Voter’s Guide

Why Vote No:

Renewal of “Class Pass” will force students to further subsidize other students’ transportation needs. Students should only pay fees for the transportation they use. This fee is one of many other mandatory campus fees, which will inevitably increase with inflation. The following are the top reasons why you should vote against this fee:
In the past four years, students’ fees have risen more than 55% for resident undergraduates. If it is approved, the new Class Pass fee, at $58.50, will be the highest campus-based fee.

Three-fourths of the UCB student population do not use AC Transit services as their primary mode of transportation, and should not be required to pay for or subsidize the transportation needs of students who primarily depend on it. Unless a student takes 34 local trips or 17 Transbay trips per semester, the Class Pass does not pay for itself.

Students should not be required to pay for or subsidize transportation to nearby cities, such as San Francisco or Emeryville, if they will not use the services to these specific destinations.

The campus should be responsible for subsidizing student transit use, such as the Class Pass program, to meet obligations under the long-range development plan (a framework of policies and guidelines provided to shape future decisions on land use, enrollment, housing, parking, and transit) and to provide safe and convenient access for students.

With the proliferation of mandatory student fees for different purposes, it is difficult to know from year to year which fees students should be supporting. With the high turnover of the student population, voting to implement mandatory student fees such as the Class Pass program is problematic.

Students should be provided a more refined option for subsidized transit passes, where individual students can pay only for the transit services they use instead of paying a potentially higher amount that includes services they do not need.

The time frame for this Class Pass fee is 7 years, meaning it will impact students who never had a chance to vote on it. Future students should not be required to pay fees for which they had no opportunity of review or comment.

Frequently Asked Questions

1. What is the Class Pass program?

The Class Pass program makes it possible for registered students ride the following, free of charge:
- Any AC Transit bus
- Transbay service to San Francisco
- The connector from the Fremont BART Station to Stanford University
- Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding Richmond Field Station line)

2. What is a student fee referendum and how much will the fee be?

A student fee referendum is an election in which students determine whether to approve a mandatory student fee, payable by all registered students, which will fund specific student-related services or programs. Student fee referenda may be proposed by campus departments to pay for these services and programs, and the referenda must be developed with the input of student representatives. If a referendum passes, student representation is also required in overseeing the use of the fee, for as long as the fee is in effect.
If the referendum passes, the Class Pass Fee will be $58.50 per semester, and will be imposed beginning in the Fall 2006 semester, essentially continuing the existing Class Pass fee.

3. How many students must vote in the referendum?

Twenty percent (20%) of all currently registered students must vote in the Class Pass election for it to be valid. Students who select “Abstain” on their Class Pass ballot will not be counted towards this 20% requirement.

4. How many votes are required to pass the referendum?

A simple majority of all students who vote “Yes” or “No” (i.e., not including those who select “Abstain”) in the Class Pass election (50%+1) must approve the referendum for it to pass.

5. How will student fees from this referendum be used?

Fees from this referendum will maintain the unlimited ride program that currently includes rides all year long (including the summer) on:
- Any AC Transit bus
- Transbay service to San Francisco
- The connector from the Fremont BART Station to Stanford University
- Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding Richmond Field Station line)

The fees will also support the following enhancements:
- New direct all night Service from San Francisco after midnight to downtown Berkeley
- Access to new “Rapid Bus” line down Telegraph Avenue terminating at the West Crescent on the Berkeley campus
- Funding to install technology at bus shelters (that may also be accessible online and via cell phone) to let riders know when the next bus will arrive at their preferred bus stop

6. How often would I have to use AC Transit services to break even?

An individual local trip on AC Transit costs $1.75, and an individual Transbay trip costs $3.50. If you took 34 local trips or 17 Transbay trips on AC Transit per semester, the cost of the Class Pass would be covered by fares you would otherwise be required to pay for those individual trips. Also, the cost of the Class Pass for a full semester is less than a one-month AC Transit Pass, which costs $70.00 for local trips and $116.00 for Transbay trips.

7. What are examples of other student referendum fees?

One example is the “Safeguard Student Health” fee, which was passed by students in March 2005. There is also a Class Pass fee currently in effect that will expire after Spring 2006 unless renewed by student approval of this fee referendum election.

8. How are student referenda fees different from registration fees?
Student referendum fees are specifically approved by students in campus wide elections, and are paid in addition to University registration and educational fees. The Registrar maintains a current line-item list of student fees, including those approved via student fee referendum elections.

9. **One-third of the fees from the referendum are described as “Return to Financial Aid.” What is this?**

“Return to Financial Aid” is a campus-based program that allows the Financial Aid Office to help financial aid recipient students offset the increased costs associated with new mandatory campus-based fees.

According to UC Berkeley rules governing student fee referenda, and in keeping with Berkeley campus practice, one-third of the proposed fee revenue will be directed to the Financial Aid Office to help offset the cost of this fee for the neediest students who are eligible for campus-based financial aid so that those students can cover the increase in fees. Financial aid will also cover the fee increase for graduate students on fellowships, GSI-ships, GSR-ships for whom the cost of the Class Pass fee is waived.

10. **Who oversees the student fee referendum process?**

Student fee referendum elections are overseen by the Student Fee Referendum Committee (SFRC), composed of students and campus staff members, and the campus Election Manager, who is appointed by the SFRC to conduct, monitor, and verify the election.

11. **If the referendum passes, but I did not vote for it, do I still have to pay the fee?**

Yes. The class pass is a 100% participation measure enabling the cost of the program to be spread over a larger population, thereby reducing the cost per person significantly. If the referendum is approved, the student class pass fee will be imposed on every registered student. Individual students, regardless of whether they use student the transit services, will be unable to opt out of the fee.

12. **What happens if this referendum fails?**

If the Class Pass referendum is not approved, Bear Transit services will be severely reduced. In addition, students will no longer have unlimited access to AC Transit services, and would instead be required to purchase single tickets or monthly rider passes.

13. **How do the two student body governments feel about this referendum?**

The Associated Students of University of California (ASUC) and the Graduate Assembly (GA) both support the Class Pass program renewal referendum.
Introduction
In 1993, the Career Center moved from its on-campus location to 2111 Bancroft Way, approximately 100 feet from Shattuck Avenue in downtown Berkeley. Earlier this academic year, the Career Center was notified of a vacancy in a commercial building closer to campus (the second and third floors of 2440 Bancroft Way, across from Lower Sproul, adjacent to Wells Fargo) and inquired about acquiring the building. Although purchasing the building would be financially unfeasible, the Career Center has decided to pursue a student referendum that would exclusively pay for a 10 year lease of the building. In order to provide students with control over the costs of their mandatory, student-imposed fees, there is an online referendum to relocate the Career Center, scheduled for February 21 – 23, 2006. The purpose of this student fee referendum is to give students a yes or no option of moving the Career Center closer to campus by creating a new campus fee beginning at $12.00 per semester, and increasing to $16.00 per semester in the 2015-2016 academic year. Details of the fee are as follows:

Proposed Fee Schedule:

- 2006-2007 through 2007-2008 → $12 per semester
- 2008-2009 through 2010-2011 → $13 per semester
- 2011-2012 through 2012-2013 → $14 per semester
- 2013-2014 through 2014-2015 → $15 per semester
- 2015-2016 → $16 per semester

The Committee on Student Fees (CSF) is the non-partisan student voice on student fees and policy at UC Berkeley. To educate the campus community, we have created a Voter’s Guide to inform students about the referendum process and the details of this fee increase. We encourage you to visit our website at http://www.berkeleycsf.org or to stop by our office at 210 Eshleman Hall.

Voter’s Guide

Why Vote Yes:

If passed by students, the Career Center will move from its current off-campus location to a newly renovated building by August 2006. The newly refurbished Career Center will increase accessibility to career services. The new Career Center will also include larger interview rooms, dressing rooms for students, and two large workshop rooms. The following are the primary reasons to vote YES:

- The move will substantially reduce commute times to the Career Center from campus and enable more efficient use of students’ time.
- Among UC schools, the Berkeley Career Center is the only one not located near the main hub of student activity. The number of Berkeley students that visit the career center per day averages 50-75. Comparable UC schools average 200-400 students per day.
- In the last ten years, UCLA, UCSD, UCSC as well as Stanford and University of Arizona have significantly invested in career services through the building of new centers or renovation of current facilities.
- A closer Career Center will also enable easier access to career services including, but not limited to, job and internship advising, employer seminars and presentations, and graduate school advising and counseling.
• A Career Center move to 2440 Bancroft Way will result in an increased staffing level of 2.5 persons for the next three years to accommodate demand.

• Investments by the building owner totaling $1,600,000 will provide first-class accommodations that will enable the Career Center to best serve the needs of the students. Additions to the Career Center facility will facilitate more interaction between and within employers, students, and Career Center staff.

• If this fee is not adopted, the Career Center will remain at 2111 Bancroft Way. There are no available alternate locations to move the Career Center closer to campus.

**Why Vote No:**

Relocation of the Career Center will impose an additional fee on students. Here are the top reasons to vote NO:

• Many Career Center services such as Cal Jobs, career fairs, and satellite offices are online or on campus.

• The building will be rented and not owned by the University. After 10 years there will be another referendum if the building is not purchased and the Career Center may be forced to move again.

• The current location is a 10-15 minute walk from the center of campus and is accessible by a number of the bus lines.

• Many students believe that the campus should pay for integral services such as the Career Center.

• With the proliferation of mandatory student fees for different purposes, it is difficult to know from year to year which fees they should be supporting. With the high turnover of the student population, voting to implement mandatory student fees such as this one is problematic.

• Students who may not have a need for the Career Center’s services should not be required to pay for or subsidize these services for other students.

• The time frame for the Career Center fee is 10 years, meaning it will impact students who never had a chance to vote on it. Future students should not be required to pay fees for which they had no opportunity of review or comment.
Published and distributed by a graduate student in opposition to the Class Pass Fee:

Dear Fellow Students,

Please take time to review the issues and cast an informed vote on the Class Pass Referendum. As a long-time Class Pass and AC Transit supporter, after great reflection, I recommend a NO vote on the Class Pass referendum. There is still time to renegotiate the Class Pass contract before the current Class Pass expires to protect the Class Pass at a reasonable rate.

Thanks,
Sarah Syed
MCP/MS Candidate, December 2006
City Planning and Transportation Engineering
University of California, Berkeley

For Immediate Release, February 21, 2006

Students Oppose Class Pass Referendum, Urge Renegotiation of Contract

Students should vote NO on the Class Pass referendum to force the University and AC Transit staff back to the negotiating table with students. Class pass fees should be raised to support legitimate cost escalation such as fare increases, fuel costs, and service improvements. However, the University and AC Transit actions are causing student fees to go up more than necessary.

Last summer and fall, the ASUC Senate opposed these increases and urged the University to support an equitable proposal. In July 2005, the Berkeley City Council passed a resolution to support an equitable Class Pass program, expressing its concern over the proposed Class Pass Referendum. The City sent a letter to the Chancellor urging delay in approval of the referendum language until the concerns of the students are incorporated into the proposal. The process of the Class Pass Referendum development has been anything but transparent.

Class Pass Fee Increase Consequence of Faculty Parking Construction Agenda

Some faculty members compelled the administration last year to rescind the use of parking permit fees from transit operations. The faculty has lobbied for using parking funds for only parking construction and operation, a significant departure from past programs to promote staff and faculty trip reduction through alternative transportation programs. The lack of parking permit revenue has forced students to bear an unnecessary burden to support transit on campus. The University has alternate funding sources to pay for these costs, but prefers to pass the buck to students in the proposed Class Pass Fee increase dedicated to UC Parking & Transportation. Both students and University faculty and employees benefit from Bear Transit shuttles, and to place the responsibility so heavily on students is inequitable.

Class Pass Fee Increase Exceeds Reasonable Cost Increase for AC Transit

In past Class Pass negotiations, AC Transit and students agreed that a reasonable cost per ride for student Class Pass holders was $0.65 per ride, equivalent to the prevailing Senior/Youth discount fare. This cost per ride was then multiplied by estimated student ridership to calculate the AC Transit proportion of the Class Pass student fee. AC Transit recently raised the Senior/Youth fare to $0.85 and the Class Pass fee should be raised accordingly. However, the current proposed fee increase requires students to pay a much higher rate per ride, departing from the previous nexus linking student Class Pass calculations to the Senior/Youth discount fare. AC Transit will benefit substantially from the proposed increase, and at the same time is planning to cut transit service on the #43 bus route. Many students rely upon the #43 for access from Solano Avenue/North Berkeley and South Shattuck neighborhoods. AC
Transit’s proposed cuts will degrade service significantly, making a bad situation worse. The AC Transit Board will vote on this proposed service cut soon, which would cut service from 15 to 20 minute headways. The 43 is a trunk line, and AC Transit has previously committed itself to a strategy of focusing service on its trunk lines. If cuts must be made, they should come first on lines with low ridership and not in the cities of Berkeley and Albany, which have consistently voted for parcel tax and fee increases to support AC Transit and maintain high quality transit service.

**Class Pass Referendum Violates Adopted Election Guidelines**

As students voting on this proposal, we have been encouraged to make an informed decision regarding the class pass fee increase. However, there is no information available regarding the breakdown of the fee increase between AC Transit and Parking & Transportation on the Official Election Website or other fee referendum sites. The non-partisan Committee on Student Fees analysis sheds no further light on this question. This information was provided for previous Class Pass Referenda, and should be made available to students before they vote. The Campus Guidelines for Establishing, Increasing, Reducing or Eliminating Campus-Based Fees require the provision of full and complete information. NOTE: In response to this complaint, the Official Election Website has been revised to provide full and complete information. Thank you. S. Syed, 2/21/06.

Students should vote NO on the Class Pass increase to force the University and AC Transit staff back to the negotiating table with students. Protect the Class Pass at a reasonable rate. Don’t lock in student fee increases for seven years without full information. There is still time to renegotiate the contract before the current Class Pass expires.

Sarah Syed is a graduate student in City Planning and Transportation Engineering and Chair of the Berkeley Transportation Commission. Give a shout out to Sarah on the bus or at ssyed@berkeley.edu
Vote NO on CLASS PASS

- Force negotiation of better contract without hurting Class Pass future
- Fee increase > Rising transit costs
- Faculty parking prioritization = 211% increase in Bear Transit fee cost

Campaign by Students for a Fair Class Pass
Email syced@berkeley.edu for more information
Published on the ASUC Web site at http://www.asuc.org/Careercenter/:

What is the Career Center Student Fee Referendum about?
If this referendum passes, it will levy an initial mandatory student fee of $16 to pay for the lease of a building located on Bancroft Way which would be used to relocate the Career Center.
- It is stated that the student fee will only be $12, but it will rapidly rise to $16 and after the initial lease agreement is over the fee has the potential to be raised to an uncontrollable amount.

History of the Career Center
Since 1993 the Career Center has been located at 2111 Bancroft Way and for the past 7 years the director of the Career Center has been trying to relocate the career center to a more accessible location from campus without the support of the University. In the last 5 years, the Committee on Student Fees, which is an independent student organization that audits university units, has done two studies on the Career Center. In both studies, the number one recommendation is to move the Career Center closer to campus. It is obvious that the Career Center is not operating efficiently and not reaching its maximum potential because of its location off-campus. The Career Center gets about 60 visitors per day compared to career centers on other UC campuses, which receive about 200 visitors per day. However, a mandatory student fee is not the answer. The Career Center is a core student service that provides many vital opportunities that help approximately 31,000 students every year and the University should be committed to funding its relocation and not the students.

Why should you vote “no?”

A Bad Investment
- Students’ money will go to a building in terrible condition
  - The current site for relocation is also in poor condition so the students would not only be paying rent for the building but also its renovation.
  - The previous tenant was the University’s Development office and they relocated because of the condition of this building. However, despite this fact, the Career Center is pushing to relocate to this location and make the students pay for all the renovations.
- Higher fees do not mean expanded services
  - The Career Center has NO plan for increased career services despite the expected increase in student usage.
  - Therefore, expect longer lines, extended wait times, and less personal attention
- An additional $1.6 million in student fees is needed to bring the building to acceptable standards

Take Control of Your Fees
- Your money won’t go to a student-owned building. It goes directly to a private landlord instead of being housed by the University
- Student fees have never been used to pay for the leasing of a building before in the history of the University
  - At the end of the lease agreement, the students have nothing to show for all of their investments. The building will not belong to the campus and instead the students’ investments will be given to private individual.
- Allowing private individuals to collect YOUR student fees is poor financial planning, and will set a dangerous precedent for the future
  - In a time of decreasing funding for the University, this student fee will allow further exploitation of the students to relieve the financial burdens
If the university makes students pay for the lease of a building for a core student service, what is next?

- When the lease comes up for renewal, students will most likely be put in the difficult situation of paying whatever the private land owner demands since there is no alternative solution
  - Thus, this will lead to higher student fees in which the students have no say or no control over how costly it gets
  - The University has no financial incentive to eventually move out of that building. Rather, they have an incentive to stay in that building because students would be paying for the lease, occupation, and repairs of that building indefinitely.

**Support the Long Term Success of the Career Center**

- Serving a world-class student body means supporting world-class service – not settling for a quick fix
- Demand that the University offer a viable long-term solution to improving services as important as the Career Center

**What Can You Do?**

Don’t lease your right away! VOTE NO on the Career Center Referendum Feb. 21, 22, and 23

**Sample ASUC advertisement in the Daily Cal:**

![Sample ASUC advertisement in the Daily Cal](image-url)
Text of email sent by ASUC to all registered students (2/21/06):
Sender: The ASUC
Subject: Vote in Student Fee Referendum Election!

Students,

February 21, 22, and 23 are crucial elections that will determine potential new fees for students. To view non-partisan voter literature go to: http://students.berkeley.edu/osl/referendum.asp

The ASUC and Graduate Assembly have taken a strong stance:
1) VOTE NO on the Career Center Fee Referendum

2) VOTE YES on the Class Pass Fee Renewal

More details are as follows:
-------
Both the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly strongly OPPOSE the Career Center Fee Referendum. This referendum will spend YOUR student fees on a lease with a private land owner! This is a bad investment and an abuse of your student fees.

It is important that students understand the negative consequences of this referendum, visit www.asuc.org/careercenter/ to find out more.

The top reasons to VOTE NO are:
1) This is a bad investment of your money as none of this fee money will go towards expanding services. The building will be moved only 2 blocks, still OFF CAMPUS.

2) Student fees have NEVER been used toward a lease in the history of the UC System. It is not the students' responsibility to house a University unit.

3) This referendum will harm any chance of actually having the Career Center moved on campus, since students will be paying the bill to keep it off campus.
-------
The ASUC and Graduate Assembly are in strong SUPPORT of the Class Pass Fee Referendum. VOTE YES on Class Pass Renewal!

Every year, Cal students take 3.7 million rides on AC Transit busses all throughout the Bay Area. On February 21, 22, and 23, you have the opportunity to extend the hugely popular Class Pass program into 2013! The new Class Pass program allows students to take advantage of:

- UNLIMITED rides on AC Transit lines
- NEW direct San Francisco-Berkeley Transbay service
- Continued service to Stanford University from Fremont BART
- NEW AC Transit Rapid line down Telegraph
- NEW NextBus technology to track Bear Transit bus schedules from your cell phone and the internet!

VOTE YES on Class Pass Renewal!

**Message brought to you by the ASUC and Graduate Assembly**
Sample pages from Election Web site:

Main Home Page

Class Pass Home Page
Career Center Home Page

Sample FAQ Page
Banner for Sproul Tabling:

Banner for Election Information Booths:

Daily Cal Voting Reminder Advertisement:
Daily Cal CSF Voter’s Guide Advertisement:

**Voter's Guide For The 2006 FEE REFERENDUM**

**VOTE ON YOUR REGISTRATION FEES**

**THE CLASS PASS REFERENDUM**

This is a mandatory student fee beginning at $58.50 / semester, and ending in 2012-13 at $30 per semester for the purpose of continuing providing students with the Class Pass program along with new services, including "Rapid Bus" line down Telegraph.

2006-07 through 2008-09 -- $58.50 / semester
2009-10 -- $60.50 / semester
2010-11 -- $95.20 / semester
2012-13 -- $95.20 / semester

**REASONS TO VOTE YES**

- The Class Pass program has proven to be an integral part of the campus access program. Over 3.5 million rides on AC Transit and 650,000 rides on BART. The program is taken by students every year.
- The Class Pass program provides students with greater mobility, makes regional transit cost effective, and provides more housing options.
- The Class Pass has an annual cost of nearly $1400 but will be offered to students at an annual cost of less than $130.
- The Class Pass program improves student safety, both AC Transit and BART offer nightly service.
- This program offers equity. It offers all registered students access to low-cost transportation.
- This program is environmentally friendly. It reduces traffic congestion around campus. It decreases demand for parking and minimizes pollution.
- Renewal of this program will offer numerous enhancements that are pertinent to student needs, such as all night service from San Francisco.
- Purchase of single tickets or monthly passes do not have a financial aid component and will most likely come from students' personal budgets.

**REASONS TO VOTE NO**

- At $58.50, the Class Pass fee will be the highest campus-based fee.
- 3/4 of the UC Berkeley student population does not use AC Transit services as their primary mode of transportation, and should not have to subsidize the transportation needs of other students. Unless a student takes 34 local trips a semester, the Class Pass does not pay for itself.
- The campus should be responsible for subsidizing student transit needs under the long-range development plan and provide safe and convenient access for students.
- With the proliferation of mandatory fees for different purposes, it is difficult to prioritize which fees students should support. With the high turnover of the student population, voting to implement a mandatory fee such as the Class Pass is problematic.
- Students should have a more refined option for subsidized transit passes, where individual students pay only for the transit services they use instead of paying a potentially higher amount that includes services they don't need.
- The time frame for this fee is 7 years; it will impact students who never had a chance to vote on it. Future students should not be required to pay fees for which they had no opportunity of review or comment.

Please visit http://www.berkeleysfs.org for the complete voter's guide

The Committee on Student Fees [CSF] is the non-partisan student voice on student fees and policy at UC Berkeley. 210 Eshleman Hall.
Posting in Berkeley Events Calendar:

Event Information

Start Date: Tuesday, February 21, 2006
End Date: Thursday, February 23, 2006
Time: All Day
Title: Student Fee Referenda Election
Location: Online
Type: Special Event/Other
Sponsor: Office of Student Life
Open to: Students
Contact Phone: 643-5010
Contact Email: miucia@berkeley.edu
Description:

Starting at 12:00 midnight on the morning of February 21, and until 11:59 p.m. on February 23, all currently registered Berkeley students will have the opportunity to vote online to decide whether to approve two separate mandatory student fees.

The Class Pass fee would renew a mandatory fee to allow registered students to take unlimited rides on AC Transit buses (including Transbay lines to San Francisco and the Peninsula) and Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding the Richmond Field Station lines).

The Career Center Fee would enable Berkeley’s Career Center to move from its current off-campus location to a newly renovated building across the street from Lower Sproul Plaza, by paying exclusively for a ten-year lease at the building.

After voting, students will have the option to enter a drawing, from which 8 students will be selected to win a 30GB iPod.

Nonpartisan information about the fee election can be found at the official campus election Web site Student Fee Referenda Election.
Email #1:
From: Chancellor Birgeneau [mailto:mailsupport@ccsmail.berkeley.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2006 6:25 PM
Subject: Student Fee Election

Dear Student,

On February 21 - 23, you will have the opportunity to vote on two potential student fees. During this election, you will decide whether or not to approve two separate mandatory campus fees that would fund the following:

- The Class Pass Fee, starting at $58.50 per semester, would continue a fee to allow students to take unlimited rides on AC Transit buses (including Transbay lines to San Francisco and the Peninsula) and Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding the Richmond Field Station lines).
- The Career Center Fee, starting at $12.00 per semester, would enable the Career Center to move from its current off-campus location to a newly renovated building across the street from Lower Sproul by August 2006, by paying exclusively for a ten-year lease of the building.

I encourage you to learn more about these potential fees and to vote in the upcoming election. For more information, please consult the official (nonpartisan) campus election Web site at:
http://students.berkeley.edu/referendum.htm

The Web site of the student campaign committee supporting the Class Pass Fee is located at:
http://pt.berkeley.edu/classpass/referendum.html

The Web site of the student campaign committee supporting the Career Center Fee is located at:
http://career.berkeley.edu/Referendum/referendum.stm

Students who vote will have the option to enter a drawing to win one of eight (8) 30 GB Apple iPods being provided as incentives to get out the vote. The campus encourages you to vote.

Robert J. Birgeneau
Chancellor

Email #2:
From: Chancellor Birgeneau [mailto:mailsupport@ccsmail.berkeley.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2006 6:10 PM
Subject: Please Vote: Student Fee Election Underway

Dear Student,

An important student fee referendum election is currently underway online. I encourage you to go to http://sis.berkeley.edu/vote and vote on whether or not to approve two separate mandatory campus fees, one for the Class Pass program and one for the Career Center. The voting period ends at 11:59 p.m. on Thursday, February 23.

For more information:
- Campus (nonpartisan) election Web site: http://students.berkeley.edu/referendum.htm
- Class Pass Voter's Guide by the non-partisan Committee on Student Fees (CSF):
  http://students.berkeley.edu/osl/referendum.asp?id=1229

To vote, log on to http://sis.berkeley.edu/vote with your CalNet ID and passphrase. After you have voted, you will have the option to enter a drawing to win one of eight (8) 30 GB Apple iPods.

If you do not have a passphrase, you can obtain one by going to https://net-auth.berkeley.edu/cgi-bin/krbcpw and using your Tele-BEARS PIN as your current passphrase. Follow the instructions carefully to choose a new passphrase. If, for any reason, you are unable to obtain a new passphrase or are unable to log on with your current passphrase, you must go in person to User and Accounts Services, (2195 Hearst Avenue, Room 111) between 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to obtain a new passphrase.

Robert J. Birgeneau
Chancellor
Welcome Page:

Welcome to the Official Ballot for the Class Pass and Career Center Fee Referenda

To start voting, click “Begin Voting” at the end of the page.

What You’re Voting On
You are about to vote on two different fee referenda. Each fee, if approved, would create a new mandatory fee paid by all registered Cal students:

- The Class Pass Fee would renew a mandatory fee to allow registered students to take unlimited rides on AC Transit buses (including Transbay lines to San Francisco and the Peninsula) and Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding the Richmond Field Station line).
- The Career Center Fee would enable Berkeley’s Career Center to move from its current off-campus location to a newly-renovated building across the street from Lower Sproul by playing for a 15-year lease at the building.

How to Vote, and How Your Votes are Counted
The two fee ballots will be presented to you in random order. You will be required to make a selection of “Yes,” “No,” or “Abstain” on both ballots before you can submit your votes. You do not have to make the same selection on both ballots.

For either of the individual fee referenda to pass, two things must happen:

1. At least 20% of all registered students must vote on the fee. A selection of “Abstain” on a referendum will not count towards this 20% requirement.
2. At least 50%+1 (a simple majority) of all students who vote “Yes” or “No” on the fee must vote “Yes.” A selection of “Abstain” on a referendum will not count in any part of this 50%+1 calculation.

To begin voting, click the “Begin Voting” link at the bottom of the page.

Confirming and Casting Your Votes
After you have made your selections on both ballots, you will reach a summary page that indicates your choice on each ballot. This is your last opportunity to change your votes before they are final. If the selections are correct, click the “Cast Ballot” button.

Entry into Drawing for one of eight 3G iPods
After submitting your final selections, you will have the option to enter a random drawing, from which eight (8) students will be selected to win a 3G iPod. Your vote in the election remains anonymous, regardless of participation in the drawing. Click the “Enter iPod Drawing” button after submitting your final votes to participate in the drawing.

More Election and Fee Information
For nonpartisan information and analysis of the fee referenda, consult the following sites (clicking on a site will launch a separate browser window):

- Class Pass Fee: Official Campus election Web site
- Career Center Fee: Official campus election Web site
- Committee on Student Fees: A student-staffed committee that advocates on behalf of students with respect to all programmatic issues relating to student fees

To Vote
Voting is open from February 21, 2006 12:00 AM to February 23, 2006 11:59 PM.

Begin Voting

Class Pass Ballot (partial page):

Class Pass Renewal Referendum
To allow students to take unlimited rides on AC Transit buses (including Transbay lines to San Francisco and the Peninsula) and Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding the Richmond Field Station line), do you approve the continuation of a mandatory fee to support the Class Pass program?

- Any AC Transit bus
- Transbay service to San Francisco
- The connector from the Fruitland BART Station to Stanford University
- Bear Transit campus shuttles (excluding the Richmond Field Station line)
- Local shuttle buses

Among the enhancements students will see during the term of the program are:

- Direct AC Transit service from San Francisco to downtown Berkeley, 7 a.m. and 5 p.m.
- New AC Transit Rapid Bus service from downtown Oakland to Telegraph Avenue, terminating at the campus West Kensington on Oxford Street.
- UC funding to install technology at campus bus stops to let riders know when the next bus will arrive (may also be available online and via cell phone).

This fee is subject to the following costs and conditions:

- Collection of the fee will begin in the Fall 2006 semester. It will be a $55.00 charge per semester and will replace the current Class Pass Fee of $37.20 per semester. The increase in the Class Pass Fee over this current amount is due to inflationary and other cost increases (including fuel costs), and reflects partly with the increased fares paid by regular patrons of AC Transit.
- The Class Pass Fee will remain in effect for seven (7) years, through Summer 2013, at the following rates:
  - 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 (Years 1-3): $55.00 per semester
  - 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 (Years 4-6): $69.00 per semester
  - 2012-13 (Year 7): $80.00 per semester
- Students not enrolled at U.C. Berkeley in the Spring semester during the period covered by the referendum, who attend the Summer Session and want a Class Pass, are required to pay a fee equal to 50% of the fee for the following fall semester.
- The Class Pass Program Advisory Committee, an independent committee consisting of representatives from both the undergraduate and graduate student bodies, the administration, and AC Transit, will periodically evaluate the program and ensure that the fees are allocated appropriately.
- In accordance with campus policy, one-third of the fee will be returned to financial aid to help offset the cost of the Class Fee for students who are eligible for financial aid.
- The fee is nonrefundable due to contractual obligations with AC Transit, and applies to all registered graduate and undergraduate students.

Do you approve this mandatory fee to continue the Class Pass program?
- Yes
- No
- Abstain

Next
Career Center Ballot (partial page):

In order to move the Career Center from its current off-campus location to a newly renovated building across the street from Lower Sproul by August 2006, do you approve of a mandatory fee to be exclusively used to lease the building for ten years? This fee will ensure the wide range of face-to-face services that the Career Center offers are available to Cal's undergraduate and graduate students in a more central location. These services are:

- Career assessment
- Academic and non-academic career advising for graduate students
- Career planning and internship workshops
- Practice interviews and resume critiques with employers
- Career information library
- Career computer lab
- Resume appointments
- Individual career counseling
- Law and medical school advising
- On-campus recruiting and interviewing
- Employer seminars
- Alumni panels and job search seminars
- Graduate and professional school advising
- Job and internship advising

The fee will be exclusively used for a ten-year lease for the newly renovated building at 2440 Bancroft Way, across from Lower Sproul Plaza. The Career Center will move to 2440 Bancroft Way by August 2006. The Career Center's current off-campus location is at 2111 Bancroft Way in downtown Berkeley.

The fee is intended to supplement the portion of UC Berkeley's Registration Fee currently allocated to provide services to students by the Career Center.

The fee is subject to the following costs and conditions:

- In accordance with campus policy, one-third of the fee will be returned to financial aid to help offset the cost of this fee for the neediest undergraduate and graduate students who are eligible for campus-based financial aid.
- Collection of the fee will begin in fall semester 2006 and will be assessed each fall and spring semester through spring 2019. No fee will be collected during the summer term. The fee schedule is shown below and accounts for adjustments due to wage increases. The schedule reflects the maximum amount to be collected each semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee per semester</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting Summary/Ballot Submission Page:
Drawing Entry Page:

Drawing Entry

Thank you for voting.

You are eligible to enter a drawing to win one of eight (8) 30GB iPods. Click below if you would like to be entered into the drawing.

Please note: Your votes in the election remain anonymous, regardless of participation in the drawing.

Enter iPod Drawing

Logout without entering iPod drawing

Confirmation of Drawing Entry:

Drawing Entry Confirmation

You have been entered into the drawing to win one of eight (8) 30GB iPods. Winners will be notified within three weeks of the end of the election.

Logout
Class Pass Approved, Relocation Fee Nixed
February 27, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=21283

Class Pass Referendum Shows Marked Improvement (Opinion)
February 24, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=21268

In Election, Students Consider Class Pass
February 22, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=21223

Career Center: No (Editorial)
February 21, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=21206

Class Pass: Yes (Editorial)
February 21, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=21207

Class Pass Referendum Offers Savings For Students (Opinion)
February 21, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=21208

It’s Your Career Center And It’s Your Vote (Opinion)
February 21, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=21209

Attempt to Change Referenda Ballot Denied
February 21, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=21211

Career Center Referendum a Bad Investment (Opinion)
February 17, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=21174

Clean Up Before Moving (Editorial)
February 7, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=21029

Fee Increase To Relocate Career Center Worries ASUC
February 3, 2006
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=20985

Too Picky Over Perks (Editorial)
December 2, 2005
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=20633

Class Pass Vote Gets Postponed
November 29, 2005
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=20585

Career Center May Move Nearer Campus
November 21, 2005
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=20504

UC Heaping Class Pass Fees on Students (Opinion)
August 22, 2005
http://dailycal.org/sharticle.php?id=19169
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email/Web Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting Web Site, Vote Tracking, Prize Drawing</td>
<td>Helen Lee, Associate Director, Student Information Systems</td>
<td>642-9507</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hlee@berkeley.edu">hlee@berkeley.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Mail Distribution</td>
<td>Claudia Bayless, Programmer Analyst II, Student Information Systems</td>
<td>642-9886</td>
<td><a href="mailto:claudiab@berkeley.edu">claudiab@berkeley.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Count of Registered Students Workstation Support Services (campus computing center advertising)</td>
<td>Walter Wong, Associate Registrar Sian Shumway, Staff Supervisor, WMF</td>
<td>643-1640</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oua2wong@berkeley.edu">oua2wong@berkeley.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Life Residential Life (Flyers and Academic Centers)</td>
<td>Troy Gilbert, Associate Director, Academic Services, RSSP</td>
<td>643-9843</td>
<td><a href="mailto:troyg@berkeley.edu">troyg@berkeley.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpartisan Voter's Guide</td>
<td>Current chairperson(s) of Committee on Student Fees</td>
<td>642-1639</td>
<td><a href="http://berkeleycsf.org/">http://berkeleycsf.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Events Calendar, Berkeley.edu Web site</td>
<td>Web site submission and Bonnie Powell (highlight request), Web Editor, Public Affairs</td>
<td>642-2520</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bpowell@berkeley.edu">bpowell@berkeley.edu</a> <a href="http://www.berkeley.edu/">http://www.berkeley.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt and Doe Library Computer Rooms</td>
<td>Amy Kautzman, Head of Research and Collections, Doe and Moffitt Libraries</td>
<td>643-0398</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akautzma@library.berkeley.edu">akautzma@library.berkeley.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Bulletin Board Service</td>
<td>Emily Brown, Supervisor, Mail Services</td>
<td>643-6245</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robinh@berkeley.edu">robinh@berkeley.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopies/Election Booths</td>
<td>Tamera Garlock, Moving and Special Events Coordinator Advertising account representatives vary each year</td>
<td>643-6262</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tgarlock@berkeley.edu">tgarlock@berkeley.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Cal Advertising</td>
<td>Online submission</td>
<td>548-8300 x216</td>
<td><a href="mailto:uc.ads@dailycal.org">uc.ads@dailycal.org</a> <a href="http://dailycal.org/advertising.php">http://dailycal.org/advertising.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.facebook.com/announce.php">http://www.facebook.com/announce.php</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Learning Center (Caesar Chavez)
Life Sciences Microcomputer Facility (2105 VLSB)
Moffitt Microcomputer Facility (1st Floor Moffitt)
3rd Floor Moffitt
Calculus Microcomputer Facility (Evans Basement)
Evans Microcomputer Facility (Evans Basement)
Chemistry Microcomputer Facility (106 Latimer Hall)
Etcheverry Microcomputer Facility (1109 Etcheverry)
Tolman Microcomputer Facility (1535 Tolman Hall)
Tan Microcomputer Facility (175 Tan Hall)
1st and 2nd floors of Doe
Humanities Microcomputer Facility (212 Wheeler Hall)
Wheeler Microcomputer Facility (211 Wheeler Hall)
Dwinelle Microcomputer Facility (B-3 Dwinelle Hall)
Chemistry Microcomputer Facility (106 Latimer Hall)
## Class Pass/Career Center Referenda: Costs/Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Resp. Party</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>P&amp;T</th>
<th>Career Center</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Election Administration: Staff Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS Voting Site Set-up</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$3,708</td>
<td>$1,854</td>
<td>$1,854</td>
<td>SIS Programmers (51.5 hours, $72/hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Web Site/Tech Support</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$20/hour (Computer Resource Specialist (45 hours, $72/hour))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL Administrative Support</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$25/hour (Admin Specialist (24 hours, $25/hour))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSL Senior Analyst</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$17,784</td>
<td>$8,892</td>
<td>$8,892</td>
<td>Election Manager (494 hours, $36/hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,992</td>
<td>$11,496</td>
<td>$11,496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Election Publicity/Prizes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter's Guide Ad 1 week before election</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>Full page Daily Cal ad 2/15/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter's Guide Ad 1st day of election</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>Full page DC ad 2/21/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder Ad on 1st day of election</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$497</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>1/4 page DC ad (24 column inches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder Ad on 2nd day of election</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$497</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>1/4 page DC ad (24 column inches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder Ad on 3rd day of election</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$497</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>1/4 page DC ad (24 column inches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter's Guides (CSF)</td>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>600 Voter's Guide pamphlets (Zee Zee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Advertisements</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>10 days at $18/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner for Sproul Tabling</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>One 4x2 banner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banners for info booths</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$607</td>
<td>$304</td>
<td>$304</td>
<td>Three 6x2.5 banners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Informational Stations</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$1,076</td>
<td>$538</td>
<td>$538</td>
<td>Rental Fee for all 3 days (3 canopies, 3 tables, 6 chairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Bulletin Board Service</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$25 Re-charge from Mail Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Mails</td>
<td>EM/SIS</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$72 Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition Campaigning - Class Pass</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>300 color flyers ($225.11) + cost of local distribution and posting service ($450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes for Drawing</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$2,340</td>
<td>$1,170</td>
<td>$1,170</td>
<td>Eight 30GB iPods - Scholar's Workstation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,996</td>
<td>$5,286</td>
<td>$4,611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OfficeMax 1/20</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>Flyer and tabling supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OfficeMax 2/2</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>Flyer and tabling supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 2/5/06</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>Info booth/tabling supplies, candy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies - 102 Sproul</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>60 Approx. 2,400 copies - flyers, handbills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabling Supplies</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>Election booth supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you gifts</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td>Campus partners and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$764</td>
<td>$382</td>
<td>$382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Election Staff ($12.00/hr)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Albright</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudio Meneses</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Luna</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$129</td>
<td>$129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Fleming</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$168</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Student Fees (tabling hours only)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$1,020</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,782</td>
<td>$891</td>
<td>$891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,435</td>
<td>$18,055</td>
<td>$17,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>