
Absent: Brooklynn Ackerman, Free Moini, Alma Sifuentes

1. Review of Orientation Packet/Discussion and questions from committee
   a. Carl asks for clarification on how the chair and vice chair are elected. Lucy responds by plurality vote.
   b. Rachel asks for clarification on how much information in the orientation packet needs to be known in advance. Erik explains that much of the information will be reviewed as the committee operates throughout the year.
   c. Erik asks committee members if there are any questions about the committee charge or the by-laws. A question is raised regarding how closely the attendance standards are monitored. Lucy explains that attendance has been tracked consistently and the advisor/vice-chair have checked in regularly regarding attendance. Tardies have not been tracked as closely, Lucy explains, especially since sometimes members will attend late or need to leave early due to class. Erik explains that his general approach is regarding accountability and we will continue using accountability as a theme.
   d. Carl explains that he would like more accountability regarding the report back requirement. Erik says that he can check in periodically with college chairs regarding accountability. Lucy will get chair list from SUA chair. Tony asks for clarification on what to do if you have a conflict with your college government meeting; response is that by-laws say that you can provide a written report.
   e. Faye asks about whether our minutes are posted with names? Lucy responds that some minutes were reacted related to funding proposal discussions, however, the general practice has been to include names of committee members in the minutes.
   f. Campus Based fees – Lucy to share research that was conducted at the end of 2013-2014.
   g. Carl asks about the college government fee. Lucy explains that the college government fee is a referendum that is collected and distributed among the college governments. There are also student services fees that part of the college programming permanent budgets.

2. Review of committee activities
   a. Erik explains that this year the committee will be engaged in the funding review process, review of proposed campus based fees, and other adhoc projects on behalf of the EVC.

3. Review of website, office hours, fall quarter meetings.
a. Lucy encourages committee members to review the SFAC website to review past reports and committee resources. A sign-up sheet is passed around for fall quarter office hours.

4. Quarry Amphitheatre Project – Tour and Presentation
   a. Dean Fitch explains that the campus has been working on the Quarry project for about 10 years. In 2003 a feasibility study was conducted regarding building in the general area of the Quarry Amphitheatre, Student Union, Quarry Plaza and Hahn.
   b. There are three major sections to the Quarry in the proposed renovation plan, including: Entry sequence, stage and seating/upper terrace.
   c. Phase 1 of the project would address life safety and lighting issues, including ADA compliance issues, night lighting and wi-fi access. Phase 1 would open up the facility for general use.
   d. Phase 2 includes a number of upgrades, including an area for concessions, a green room, a “smart stage”, a new building that would be referred to as the “Redwood Lobby” (two story building with a kitchen, green room, deck, and seating). There would also be a bridge installed between McLaughlin and the entrance to the Quarry Amphitheater.
      i. Carl suggests that an additional bus stop be considered at McLaughlin and Hagar.
   e. The process for Phase 1 includes: feasibility study, preliminary planning, project planning and construction.
   f. The total cost for Phase 1 and Phase 2 is approximately $18 million.
   g. Seating capacity for the Quarry Amphitheatre when Phase 1 is complete is 2,000. One tree would be removed to achieve 2,000 seats. If the tree is not removed, 240 less seats would be achieved.
   h. The goal is to keep the park like quality of Quarry Amphitheatre in tact.
   i. Dean explains that the Library special collections area has many photos and resources related to the history of the Amphitheater.
   j. The project planning committee has already deemed that the project could appropriately be funded by the Seismic Life Safety Fee reserves and the SSF reserves.
   k. What is SFAC being asked to consider?
      i. Recommendation to EVC Galloway to use $4 million in SSF and Seismic Life Safety reserves for Phase 1 of the project. The total cost of Phase 1 is estimated at $7.4 million. The remaining $3.4 million could either be funded by donors, or SFAC could recommend to borrow against future reserves in SSF and Seismic Life Safety fee. If the entire project if funded by student fees, the project could be realized much sooner.
      ii. Dean and team will return on October 28th for further discussion.
      iii. SFAC members – please consult your constituents and be ready to debrief at October 21st SFAC meeting.

5. Meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.