Student Fee Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
October 28, 2014

Present: Erik Green, Faye Crosby, John Steele, Serene Jneid, Grace Schefcik, Carolyn Chuong, Alexandra Kasper, Rachel Kirkwood, Aykezar Adil, Carl Adil, Free Moini, Lucy Rojas

Absent: Miten Jain, Tony Tsujisaka, Noora Almajid, Brooklyn Ackerman, Alma Sifuentes

Guests: Linda Navone, Linda Flaherty, Erin Fitzgibbons, Andrea Hilderman, Denise Onitsuka, Jose Reyes-Olivas

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes
2. Announcements
   a. No College/SUA/GSA/SAB/Provost/Dean of Students Announcements
   b. Lucy explains that there were 27 proposals submitted and provides a summary of the presentations.
3. Capital Space Planning Presentation
   a. Upper Quarry Amphitheatre Phase 1 & 2
      i. Design/Construction Status
         i. Feasibility study completed in June 2014
         ii. Phase 1 – Re-Open Amphitheatre
            a. Programming workshops conducted October 22-23
            b. Full design anticipated to be completed in January 2016
            c. Proposed construction (pending full project funding)
      ii. Budget Status
         i. Preliminary total project budget forecast $7,388,000.
         ii. Amount related to Student Seismic/Life Safety Fee $1,888,000 for life safety improvements, code requirements, and ADA upgrades.
         iii. Amount related to Student Services Fees - $1,500,000 to cover seating upgrades, stage improvements, and installation of wi-fi.
         iv. Amount proposed for gift funding - $4,000,000.
      v. Phase 2
         a. Full Project Budget Placeholder in Capital Financial Plan for $10,629,000 (proposed 95% gift-funded)
         b. $586K (Student Services Fees) to cover preliminary design services
      iii. Phase 1 Projects include seating, ADA compliance, terrace reinforcement, lighting, signage, site clean-up, storm water management, installation of wi-fi
      iv. Phase 2 Projects include “smart stage”, lawn seating, accessible ramp near the stage, supporting building, bridge, MPR, kitchen/concessions, outdoor “redwood lobby”
   b. Budget Status
      i. Preliminary total project budget forecast $7,388,000
      ii. Amount related to Student Seismic/Life Safety Fee $1,888,000 for life safety improvements, code requirements, and ADA upgrades
   c. Student Life Seismic Corrections Phase 2A & 2B
      i. Design/Construction Status
         i. Phase 2A – Student Union, Redwood, and Cardiff House
            a. Schematic design and design development drawings complete.
b. Construction drawings scheduled to complete in January

c. Moves to be scheduled March – June 2015

d. Construction
   i. Cardiff – April 2015 – September 2015

dii. Phase 2B – KZSC and Cantu Center
   a. Request for consulting services proposal under development
   b. Moves to be scheduled June 2016. Construction varies

dii. Budget Status
   i. Phase 2A
      a. Full project budget approved by Chancellor on August 19, 2014 for $4.283 million (SSF $660K, Seismic 648K; Loan $2.975 million to be paid with Seismic fees)
      b. Revised total project budget forecast Phase 2A could be up to $4,895,000
   
   ii. Phase 2B
      a. Full budget placeholder in Capital Financial Plan for $3,550,000 (SSF $200K; Seismic 1 million; 2 million loan to be paid with Seismic fees)
      b. Preliminary plans budget approval anticipated January 2015

dd. Telecommunications Infrastructure Improvements
   i. Design/Construction
      i. Phase B – Cowell Student Health Center
         a. Schematic design and design development drawings complete
         b. Construction drawings scheduled to complete May 2015
         c. Construction performed after hours September 2015 – Winter 2016
      
   ii. Phase C – OPERS & Quarry Plaza Buildings
      a. Design scheduled to start in October 2015
      b. Phased construction performed after hours August 2016 – Winter 2018

dii. Budget Status
   i. Phase B
      a. Full budget project planning guide approved by Chancellor on August 13, 2006 for $14,600,000
      b. Amount related to Cowell Student Health Center - $150K Health Center Expansion Fees

   ii. Phase C
      a. Full budget placeholder in Capital Financial Plan for $10.463 million
      b. Amount related to Student Life facilities $1,007,000 (Student Services Fees)

e. Questions and Discussion
   i. How much for annual maintenance? At Phase 1 it will be approximately $40,000 per year. At Phase 2, it will be approximately $90,000. Denise explains that the hope is that rental income will cover maintenance costs.
   
   ii. Linda Navone explains that $2.5 million are factored in as escalation costs so it’s possible that these costs will not be realized.

   iii. Faye explains that she was recently at a meeting with EVC Galloway and some potential donors; the impression that she received was that the phased approach is smart. It is
smart to have Phase 1 at a point where there is revenue coming in, before going to Phase 2. Faye explains that the primary use of the Quarry Plaza during the school year would be with students. In summer, use would go to Conference Services to bring in outside, revenue generating groups.

iv. Jose explains that years ago, the Quarry Amphitheatre would be used for concerts. He encourages the long term plan to include a “smart stage” because it will reduce many costs that are included in setting up a venue infrastructure.

v. Faye asks whether there will be a pause between Phase 1 and 2. Linda Navone responds that it depends on how quickly the funds are raised.

vi. Faye says that alumni are happy that students will have priority to use the space during the school year.

vii. Linda N. explains that phase 2 includes a multi-purpose building which would include a kitchen which Alison has heard is a priority for students.

viii. Erik asks about the buildings that are to be removed. Erin responds.

ix. Erik asks about parking for large events that may take place in the Quarry Amphitheatre. Erin explains that for ADA parking, we would look at bringing closer to the Quarry Plaza. Erin explains that parking would be similar to the Edge of Eden Concert.

x. Erik asks about the parking lot work behind Cowell and Stevenson College. Erik makes a point about siloed projects would like to see coordination

xi. Rachel explains that when Edge of Eden happened, students who were not allowed to park in East Remote for the day were not happy and ongoing events that would impact student access to parking would not go over very well.

xii. Carl explains that there was a lot of discontent from students about Edge of Eden.

xiii. Andrea says that this space will be a student space primarily, so students would be driving the type of programming that would take place during the school year. Other larger events that may take place would probably be in the summer, with less impact on students.

xiv. Carl asks about how students can be involved in design aspect of Quarry.

xv. Erik asks about how students can be involved with Phase 2B of seismic upgrades to KZSC and Cantu Center. Linda Flaherty says that consultation will begin in January 2015.

xvi. Erik asks why the Quarry will make money if Edge of Eden did not make money? Jose responds that there is interest for this kind of venue.

xvii. Carl asks who is the target for summer performances? Jose says that hasn’t been discussed yet.

xviii. Serene says that the last time we met, it was mentioned that we could have graduation at Quarry Amphitheatre, but her CPC said it’s not possible. Jose says that many departments are having celebrations and looking for space.

xix. Serene says she wasn’t here last year, she asks about the seismic life safety fee. Free explains that the fee was implemented in 2006 to cover seismic and safety upgrades to student fee funded buildings. Erik asks what does the seismic fee generate annually? Free says that the fee generates about $2 million per year, with 33% going to return-to-aid.

xx. Current balances:

   i. $4.5 million in Seismic Life Safety. Reserve balance went down about $500K last year (some of the seismic project study expenses were charged).
xxi. Faye reminds the group that during the tour of the Quarry someone mentioned the idea of adding a bus stop.

xxii. Serene asks how much did the Phase 1 planning cost for the Quarry project. The response is $150K from campus money, and there was a gift of $35K to help with the preliminary Phase 2 planning.

xxiii. Carl asks if the power point presentation is available. Erin says she will send to Lucy.

xxiv. Erik asks for a reminder of what is being asked of SFAC. Free responds:
   i. Consultation from students is key to the planning of these projects.
   ii. Quarry Amphitheatre project: Free says that the fundraisers believe that they will be more successful in fundraising if the SFAC provides a vote of support of the program.

xxv. Free reviews the balances in the Seismic Life Safety Fee and the Student Services Fee Reserves. Free explains that his projections, in terms of a campus loan against these fees, is 2.5% the interest rate for planning purposes, and 1.5% is the current interest rate.

xxvi. Carl mentions that his constituents were concerns regarding the ongoing maintenance of the Quarry space.

xxvii. College 9 loves the idea of the Quarry Amphitheater. Phase 2 is too extravagant and costs too much.

xxviii. Crown loves the idea of the Quarry. There are lots of Freshman interested in this project. Phase 2 seems to extravagant, such as the “smart stage.” Everyone loved the idea of the bus stop.

xxix. Porter college was not very interested in the project overall.

xxx. Kresge college was generally in favor of Phase 1; too many bells and whistles in Phase 2.

xxxi. Erik says that graduate students and the Graduate Student Commons board will not be happy in the summer, given impacts to parking, traffic around their study and meeting space.

xxxi. Carl says that we do need additional kitchen space.

xxxiii. Faye says that she is influenced by side conversations regarding the capacity of donors to support this project. For Phase 2 she would like the performers do a benefit concert as a test, a pilot program, to get input on the use of the space. Faye explains that all of the provosts have certified kitchens in their homes. Erik adds that the Cantu Center gets tons of requests to use the kitchen.

xxxiv. Alexandra says that students want to see Phase 1 move forward but Phase 2 will need more input from students.

xxxv. Erik summarizes and says the SFAC recommendation can say that we enthusiastically support Phase 2, and we are cautious/mixed response about Phase 2, but Phase 2 should include a bus stop and a kitchen, but that location may not be the best location.

xxxvi. Aykezar reports that at Crown, the students see the Quarry as an extension of the student union, they are not opposed to the additional building proposed in Phase 2. It’s not OK to say that students don’t support Phase 2.

xxxvii. Grace reports that she is not sure about Phase 1; there is a concern about so much money being allocated for the project. Grace asks how did this project become a priority? Who sets the priorities?
xxxviii. Carolyn says that Stevenson students are think that Phase 1 is a great idea. They are cautious about Phase 2. We should see how Phase 1 goes, then determine what’s needed.

xxxix. Alexandra says that Phase 2 is not an awful idea, there needs to be more planning and thinking about it. Students do need more spaces to go to, to student.

xl. Rachel says why does this project take precedence over the other buildings like the Redwood Building, the Cantu. We should be thinking about expanding those spaces and making them safe.

xli. Faye says that everything is interconnected. If other year end ceremonies can happen at the Quarry it would alleviate pressure and impact on the college commencements.

xlii. Alexandra makes a proposal, that SFAC support all but $1 million of the cost of Phase 1, to encourage donors but also to keep the project moving. Aykezar says that she likes this idea.

xliii. Carolyn says that she works at the TOP program and she knows about the capital campaign and the other priorities that are being fundraised for. She says it will be impossible to raise this kind of money. It’s difficult to make the Quarry a priority given the other proposed campaign initiatives.

xliv. Faye asks about the $2.5 million savings from escalation costs. Free explains that is related to Phase 2.

xlv. Faye says that she likes Alexandra’s idea. Making a higher commitment from student fees will allow the development officers to go out and make the ask. They will be positioned well to ask. In summary, Faye says that there is enthusiasm for Phase 1, so let’s get the job done, and not so enthusiastic about Phase 2.

xlvi. Erik mentions that the $586K in SSF for Phase 2 planning is questionable.

xlvii. Faye suggests that our recommendation be drafted, including the fund sources and we vote next week. Erik will draft.

4. Over-Enrollment Dollars – Free
   a. Tabled to next week.

5. Discussion Regarding Meeting Minutes
   a. Tabled to next week.

6. Sub-Committees
   a. Erik explains that he would like to form four sub committees that would do work during the regular scheduled SFAC meeting in Winter and Spring quarters. These sub committees are: Internal, External, Review of Units, Visioning of Fees.
   b. Erik would like to pair up the committees: Internal/External and Review of Units/Visioning for Views. Each person would select one committee from each pair.
   c. General ideas and reactions? Erik asks folks to think about this during the week and we can revisit next week.

7. Adjournment