

Student Fee Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
June 2, 2017

---

Present: Alice Malmberg, Aaron Manzano, Ashley John, Gina Tu, Regina Gomez, John Steele, Lucy Rojas, Sabina Wildman, Karen Duek, Amanda Kazden, Kiryl Karpiuk, Ben Leeds Carson, Cathy Thomas, Lisa Bishop, Sylvia Grape

1. Approval of Agenda, Minutes, Announcements

- a. Ashley motions to approve the agenda, Karen seconds the motion. Motion carries.
- b. Sylvia approves. Aaron seconds. Motion carries.
- c. Announcements
  - i. Kiryl shares that next week we have dinner scheduled at Olita's on June 9<sup>th</sup>. How many can attend? About 6-7 people confirm they can attend. Alice suggests "fancy dress optional." There are nods.
  - ii. Lucy invites everyone to tonight's year end celebration for the Dean of Students Office
  - iii. Extra "M" avaganza is tonight at 8pm. This is one of the events that we funded.
  - iv. Tonight is the AAPIRC Cultural Celebration. Dinner will be provided.

2. Elections of Chair and Vice Chair

- a. Alice asks if there are any additional nominations for Chair or Vice Chair? There are no additional nominations.
- b. Vice Chair Speeches
  - i. Amanda shares that last year she has served as the Chair of Porter Senate. Next year, she has the time and passion required to commit to this committee. Last year, she served as Porter Rep to SUA and she is also an officer with College Democrats. She would like to reform office hours to evolve into tabling and she will help chair with whatever they need. Any questions:
    1. Favorite Ice cream? Cookie dough.
    2. Favorite fruit? Strawberry.
    3. What are your thoughts on sub-committee structure? Coordination between the two sub-committees, more outreach events.
    4. What kind of outreach could we do to reach out to populations where we go to spaces. Amanda responds that we could extend an invitation to groups and then go and visit and share information about SFAC and student fees.
  - ii. Result of Vote: 12 – Amanda. 1- No Confidence. 0-Abstentions. Amanda is elected as Vice-Chair.

c. Chair Speeches

- i. Kiryl introduces himself as the College 9 Rep. Ever since he started at UCSC, he has been active in student government. He has served in SUA this entire year and participated in the Lobby Corp. He was involved in putting on an information event which included Mike Rotkin and VPSS Jaye Padgett about the rising costs of education. Aside from Student Government, he has been involved off campus as well; for instance in canvased for Bernie Sanders last fall. He is an officer for College Democrats. He would like to pursue the idea of creating a space for the public to give comment to funding proposals. External sub-committee has many ideas about education campaigns for elections. Our members need to be more education and then we need to be out helping other students understand the fee process, etc. He would expand member orientation to include more education. This year he served as co-chair of Internal Sub Committee. For next year, his vision is to listen to SFAC members, concerns, to set the agenda. We can hit the ground running next year given that we have so many people returning. Kiryl explains that he went to CSF this year so he won't be a complete "newbie" in the space
- ii. Any questions:

1. Ice cream flavor: mint chocolate chip
2. Shortening timeline for proposals while including time for public comment – how do you do that? Kiryl explains that he would open the public comment period when we receive the proposals so that public comment and our review happens simultaneously.
3. What do you see as the relationship between SFAC and other student spaces on campus? We could do presentations to student governments, college governments, ethnic organizations, etc. We can outreach and educate students on how to ask for funding.
4. Efficiency: how do we build efficiency when we will likely have more requests that available funding. Kiryl responds that his comment about efficiency was about getting members up to speed more quickly in fall. He agrees with question.
5. Public comment – how do we get people who are not familiar with SFAC or SUA, or other spaces, to make comments? Response – external committee can strategize about this process and do more education.

iii. Suini explains that this quarter she served as Vice Chair of SFAC; it has been an important learning experience for her; she has new insights about the body. Leadership experience that Suini has – involved in SUA for two years, worked for the Organizing Director as historian and media coordinator. This year, she has been involved with the Greek community and has volunteered with SHOP. She was a first year experience coordinator, putting on events for first year students. This experience has given her insight about what we should be prioritizing. As Oakes rep to SFAC, she has unique insights about where our funding should be invested. She has learned about student fees and what appropriate uses are of student fees. In external committee, we've talked about a large social media campaign to inform students about SFAC. Next year, she plans to work toward transparency so students know what SFAC is. We can program and use our operational budget. We are a resource for students and different departments. We should diversify who is asking for funding. We should re-evaluate what we do during member orientation.

1. Questions: Ice cream flavor: chocolate chip
2. How do we best manage our time and energy? Suini responds that a good model is SUA elections where commissioners will put on a big event that lures in students, an event with food for instance.
3. Question for both candidates: Have you looked at other UCs to determine if there are best practices at other campuses around outreach? Are there other ways of modeling SFAC so we are moving forward? Kiryl responds no; CSF is the best place for the exchange of ideas. Suini responds that this is something that could be brought up at CSF.

iv. Result of Vote: 9-Suini. 4-Kiryl. 1-Abstention. Suini is elected as Chair.

### 3. Visit with Gary Dunn, Director of CAPS

- a. Gary thanks the group for the funding issued in 2015-2016 that funded the Peer program this year. There were 27 workshops put on by the Peer Educators this year with about 150 students participating. The Peer program also put on 18 tabling events; approximately 150 student reached. Some of the Peers were trained to be coaches with the Well Track program.
- b. Gary shares some quotes from the Peer Educators highlighting the positive impact of the program.
- c. Gary explains that he met with the Peer Educators last week to debrief the year.
- d. Gary apologizes that he didn't share the data sooner and acknowledges that the program will not be funded next year.

e. Questions

- i. Sabina asks about the workshops at the ERCs. She explains that student's identities will inform how students approach mental health. How does CAPS review feedback from students? Gary responds that there is some content. We have liaisons to communities, we have hired staff with particular expertise in working with diverse populations. The training cohort for the post doc program represent a diverse group of people who are serving students. Working with transgender community is a value of CAPS. Gary explains that across the Health Services, students can select their preferred pronouns and how they want to be addressed. There have been several trainings on working with transgender students. Gary explains that one method of assessing student satisfaction is through a survey that students are invited to participate in after they see a provider. Gary follows up with students who report any issues.
- ii. Karen explains that the surveys may not provide a representative sample of students.
- iii. Lucy will provide Gary's contact information so members can follow up to continue discussion.  
[gmdunn@ucsc.edu](mailto:gmdunn@ucsc.edu) or 831-459-1942

4. Seismic 2B Presentation

- a. Guests: Travis Becker, Sloan Campi, Jose Sanchez, Keith Rozendal, Pablo Reguerin.
- b. Sloan explains that he is here today to present on the Seismic 2B program. He has been here for about four months; he is taking over the project from Linda Flaherty who has previously visited with the committee about the project. We are currently in the P phase, working with the building occupants and architects to determine what the programmatic needs.
- c. Seeking input and recommendation on one of two schemes. Seismic Life Safety Fee would pay for the majority of this project. Some SSF reserves will be requested for some of the expansion projects.
  - i. Option 1: renovate the buildings as they are.
  - ii. Option 2: demolish and rebuild
    1. Only the KZSC building would be demolished. Cantu would be maintained and could be used in future with Seismic/Life Safety upgrades.
    2. New building – there are various options.
- d. Renovation of Existing Buildings
  - i. Buildings were built prior to ADA, therefore many ADA updates are required.
- e. Only one option can be taken through the design development phase.
- f. Cost Estimates – inclusive of construction, decanting, campus soft costs
  - i. Total cost difference between renovation option and new building option is \$1.4 million - \$1.5 million
- g. New building option is more expensive, however, renovation option has many variables. Once the renovation begins there could be additional costs that are identified
  - i. Question: does new construction also have possible unforeseen expenses? Jose responds that this is possible, especially at the sub-soil/foundation phase. There is also the uncertainty of attracting a contractor to campus that can do this project.
- h. Pablo suggests looking at the analysis from a value perspective, using the total cost to assignable square footage ratio.
- i. Question: what is the comparison of maintenance costs between renovation and new building? Sloan and Jose provide responses.
- j. Sloan reviews the drawings of the two options – renovation/new building – see presentation.
- k. Next steps: SFAC recommendation will go to Committee on Planning & Stewardship, CPEVC, Chancellor for approval.
- l. Questions

- i. Why does SSF take greater hit in new building option on the increase in costs? Sloan responds that the new building renders opportunities for great square footage, which would be programmatic.
- ii. Is there a contingency for project costs going above budget? Response is yes, about 7%.
- iii. Aaron asks for feedback from the those who will work in the space.
  - 1. Morgan explains that it is challenging to work in a space that was not built to be a radio station. It can be difficult to operate in the space which is not always conducive for collaborative work. Morgan explains that the advantages of a new building for KZSC operations are looked at positively by students engaged at the station.
  - 2. Travis explains that the Cantu Center has outgrown the current space. There are two staff members who do not have private space. His office has become a shared space. Travis explains that he has made the plans available to students and has been receiving comments. Cantu would have its own entrance, but there is still anonymity for students who come into a shared space. You don't know why a student is coming into the building. Travis explains that the constituents from the ERCs are in a shared space and they wouldn't say that they lose
  - 3. Keith explains that there was a staff member at KZSC who uses a wheel chair and the only space that was accessible for them was in the large, open space in the lobby.
- iv. Lisa shares that the financial augmentation to the Seismic 1B project was \$3 million after the project began.
- v. Karen says that she is not convinced that we should minimize the higher costs for the new building.
- vi. Pablo explains that he works with students who in the lowest income brackets and he sees students make poor decisions sometimes, for instance, they won't take a loan but they will use a credit card. Pablo suggests looking at the value of a new building.
- vii. Sloan suggests thinking about the long term and the long term benefits of a new building.
- viii. What is the decanting plan? And how long will decant last? Sloan provides some options. Travis explains that he has been very clear that any decanting would need to have a kitchen and space for the library.
- ix. Aaron explains that when he was at KZSC, security was a big issue. KZSC brings a lot of "off campus guests" including bands, etc. How will Cantu Center be protected in that scenario? There will be separate entrances, improved lighting, etc. Travis explains that security is a non-negotiable.
- x. June 20<sup>th</sup> is the next CPS meeting; Sloan explains that it would be helpful to hear back before this meeting.
- m. Alice explains that she proposes that you take the next week to bring this discussion to Colleges spaces and GSA to ask for feedback, and then report back to Alice by Friday, June 9<sup>th</sup>.

#### 5. By-Laws

- a. Alice explains that there were some suggested edits on the by-laws that relate to formatting, primarily.
- b. Motion to approve by-law changes passes. 7-Yes. 0-No. 1-Abstention.

#### 6. Adjournment

- a. Alice motions to adjourn the meeting. Suini seconds. Motion carries.