 

**MEETING MINUTES**

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Date: 03/14/22**

**Topic: Public Meeting/Deliberations**

**Present:**

**- Voting members:** Warren Sipe, Noah Robertson, Sean Terrey, Najee Rodriguez, Claire Kelling, Xiaoru Shi, Latisha Franklin, Megan Minnich, Jake Snyder, Nora Van Horn, Erin Boas

**- Nonvoting members:** Yidi Wang, Alexa Clayton, Barry Bram, Jolinda Wilson,

**Absent:** Schönn Franklin (excused), Latisha Franklin (excused, 7-8:30pm)

**Agenda:**

1. **Call to Order and Opening Roll Call**

*Meeting called to order at 6:04 p.m.*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (February 25, 2022)**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Public Comment**

*No public comment.*

1. **Old Business:**

*No old business.*

1. **New Business**

*No new business.*

1. **Topics of Discussion:**
   1. **Deliberations**

C. Kelling: Start with Facilities discussion, then go into standing allocations later.

**Facilities Allocation**

C. Kelling: $150M-165M capacity this year for the Wellbeing Building. 8 scenarios. With or without Fisher Hall, Natatorium, one-time 2% fee increase.

**Fisher Hall**

L. Franklin: Not support funding

W. Sipe: Agree, seems like administrative reshuffling rather than serving students’ needs.

N. Rodriguez: Space is an issue. Could inquire about space utilization? Probably too late for MOU considerations but space is something to consider.

X. Shi: Should fund if we can find long-term use?

C. Kelling: Renovating for permanent space.

W. Sipe: Agree that we could make space for specific offices, but it might be out of our purview. Future boards might not be able to exercise this authority.

S. Terrey: $10M could be better spent on other projects.

X. Shi: Offices we pay for should directly serve the students, do not support this.

C. Kelling: Not funding Fisher Hall increases capacity for other projects. Consensus seems to be not to fund Fisher Hall in favor of student-facing offices.

N. Robertson: Add concern about location for upper-year and graduate/professional students.

**Natatorium**

C. Kelling: Last time we agreed on $10M maximum, but that might only be sufficient to renovate the existing facility. Could make clear in recommendation to fund new natatorium, if possible, in case not $10M could go to renovations of existing facility.

N. Rodriguez: I see the benefit of renovating the natatorium. Given other requests this year, I don’t think this is worth it. Especially because our consensus of $10M can’t guarantee a new facility.

N. Robertson: Agree with the need to prioritize other allocations.

W. Sipe: Compared to Wellbeing Building, we’re allocating significantly less for the natatorium. Natatorium has more pressing need that has student impact than the Wellbeing Building.

N. Rodriguez: Nervous about funding even $10M. Wellbeing Building serves a more diverse student need. Internal renovations should suffice if necessary.

S. Terrey: Agree, not funding natatorium.

X. Shi: Agree with not funding. Location of Wellbeing Building serves more students than the recreational pool. Not that much utilization even with the recreational pool.

C. Kelling: Need to decide if we want to fund $10M to new facility. If not enough for new facility, are we okay with that $10M going to renovations. Important to note I think renovations will happen either way with or without fee funds. Can support a new natatorium down the line with the renovations.

E. Boas: Agree with that.

L. Franklin: Should not fund.

C. Kelling: Any funds not spent come back to the fee board.

E. Boas: Do we know timeline of feasibility study. (Completed this spring)

C. Kelling: Consensus is we don’t want to fund renovations if not a full facility. Can proceed with two scenarios based on if $10M can fund the new natatorium?

N. Robertson: Not supporting natatorium, uncertainty of project and there are better things to fund this year.

One-time 2% fee increase

C. Kelling: Adds about $5M for capacity of Wellbeing Building.

N. Rodriguez: Support for this, fee board should invest in future students with this. Needing MOU considerations approved? Inflation should be considered too.

X. Shi: Timeline of feasibility study? (Next year)

C. Kelling: Main benefit of 2% increase is giving more capacity to Wellbeing Building. Will revisit 2% increase later. On Wellbeing Building, feasibility study is $350K. Could consider splitting this with the university.

W. Sipe: Anything we can get through the feasibility study would help us more forward towards that decision.

(Agreement on splitting feasibility study)

N. Rodriguez: Could publicize that the university is doing this and encourage splitting.

N. Van Horn: Would the feasibility study happen regardless of funding separately? (Wellbeing Building cannot happen without feasibility study)

**Constants in Facilities**

C. Kelling: In all scenarios, HUB Affinity Space is funded, Wellbeing Building is somewhat funded.

**CAPS**

L. Franklin: The two new positions are specifically for University Park, so the two positions would not be split with the CFB.

C. Kelling: Cost-sharing was only remaining concern. Everyone in consensus with CAPS.

**CSGD**

J. Snyder: 2021-22 Allocation was $147,838.00. 2022-23 Request is $163,091.94. Increases in student wages and educational engagement/programming. Recommend full funding. CSGD fully utilized allocation and serves many student needs. There was an increased use of the Clothing Transit. CSGD wants to bring in intersectional speakers for anti-racism programming.

N. Rodriguez: Full funding entirely appropriate. We’re a top-rated queer-friendly campus but there is work to do. Increased allocations can supplement many new programs.

W. Sipe: Agree. Question on graduate wage increase of almost a 50%, why is it such a high increase? (Check in with CSGD)

S. Terrey: How is collaborative funding used/can social justice funding be collaborative funding? (Yes).

C. Kelling: Consensus for increases in all the categories?

**Campus Recreation**

W. Sipe: Recommending full, flat funding of $4,937,809. Did not change from last year. Regaining revenue from people coming back to gyms, should offset cost increases.

C. Kelling: Campus rec has been controversial. Campus Rec thought inflation was granted like GI.

N. Rodriguez: Widely utilized by students. Support full funding.

N. Van Horn: Should clarify what type of cost controlling fee board asks for. Can Campus Rec create a plan to keep funding flat for three years?

Warren: I don’t want to pigeonhole Campus Rec into a budget

Tony: If there is a potential expansion how will they bring the expense and additional funding under control.

Claire: I want to bring up last year’s fees recommendation. We said that the funding year is the final year of the funding commitment. In the past, that might’ve been possible but there was attention drawn to it last year. The fee recommendation is consistently read so changes should be done through here, not minutes.

Warren: If they were looking for an increase, I would have to update the recommendation. They are going to cover an increase in operational costs. They have open staff positions available.

Claire: So they lost 3 million in revenue?

Warren: Yes. They are expecting a change in that and an extra source in funding.

**HUB Cultural Center**

Najee: Allocation request is $206,000. The rest of the costs fluctuate, and a lot can be attributed to other funding done throughout the year. Covid causes an insufficient number of speakers, but we hope this will change with Covid receding casually. The PRCC provides an important institutional meaning.

Claire: One thing we should consider is putting in a note is that we value the program and encourage them to use it and ask for more funding if they need it. Talking more about flat funding and seeing them full size the funding for the programs will be helpful for them.

**Student Activities**

Tony: The request is $1,866,411.67 decrease from around $1,870,534. Campus programming is requesting an increase, but we only see 70% utilization. We want to see why they discontinue 4 of the environmental funds. Last year, given the fee recommendation, we won’t put an increase on engagement. 90% or above would be more justified for ticket subsidies.

Claire: Start with campus programming. (No comment from group) On the topic of service and leadership, overall the decrease was driven by the decrease of fresh start and development program. This was an internal moving around of leadership

Tony: We haven’t seen a representative spending history due to the pandemic. If we give them full or near what they want to see, next year will be a more representative year of spending

Claire: Student organization support. Start about the sustainability program which was a pilot program last year. We should say if we want it to continue at this lower level

Warren: What is the sustainability program?

Tony: It is more classroom round tables but there is also speakers

Claire: They asked for $20,000 last year and are now asking for $5,000.

For homecoming, the main thing we want to talk about it the athletic contribution. We don’t have a line-item kind of thing. Last year the fee board wasn’t for the athletic engagement and now they are asking for an increase for it this year.

Nora: I would vote against because the justification isn’t there and it isn’t benefitting all students.

Sean T: We are funding opportunities/retreats in other allocations. Can we feasibly tell them we can’t fund that?

Claire: We have say over this.

Erin: They have one captain, if not two, their whole position is to plan this event. After sitting in the committee, the purpose of the event is that golf goes alongside a lot of business encounters which opens up the expensive opportunity to all students.

Claire: I am not a fan of the CCSU retreat either, but I think that is something to consider. Retreat vs. this golf event.

Sean T: I personally don’\t think it should be funded by us.

Erin: Alumni could maybe fund the event since there a lot of alumni that come back.

Tony: The general consent is not to fund the increase for this event? And that they should find alternate funding. Golf is a long-term investment, I think.

Claire: The consensus is to find alternate funding for the golf event but will fund the increase for the other events. We would suggest they buy fewer tickets for existing games and then buy tickets for events they want in the future,

Sean T: What is offsetting that increase?

Claire: This is for the summer. I love the games in the summer, but it is better to buy less tickets

Megan: Is they buy 100 tickets to every game?

Claire: I am saying buy fewer tickets to cover all the games and have a larger redemption rate.

**HUB Reserve**

Warren: They are funding the same $200,000 request. These are to maintain and improve the facility. This is the same funding every year.

**Child Care Subsidy**

Yidi: The recommendation sis reduced from $206,302 to $154,726.50. This subsidy is important. It allows for students to attend their classes.

Claire: This was proposed to the provost. We want to support students to the 25% mark.

Megan: Continuing at 25% is appropriate and I support the timeline of it.

Claire: The transition claim sounds good

**UPAC**

Nora: They are requesting the same amount as last year and it is also being utilized for technology funding. We are hoping to go back to in-person events even with masks. I saw we move forward with this request

Claire: We said, last year, that there was a 50,000 increase for equipment and that the technology needs were unknown. I don’t know how well we can rally these increase this year

Alexa: Organizations were trying to figure out how to configure their meeting spaces and that’s why there is a lot for equipment. For program allocations, last year was mainly virtual so a lot of our allocations were virtual events and travel expenses. I think there was money spent on paper-based things but there were also virtual versions. Program and travel is half toward programming, half toward travel.

**Student Farm**

Nora**:** Requesting an increase of $15,000. The farm has had responsible use of the student allocation. There is an increase in cover costs initially covered by insecure short-term funds. It seems like there was conversations with health and food services and they didn’t revisit them until now and they are unwilling to make that commitment. They have been able to start up those conversations due to Covid. There was no initial contribution, but the conversations were going well enough to put them on the proposal pre-Covid.

Claire: I personally wouldn’t want to do this increase this year to motivate health and food services to get involved.

Warren: Is there changes that make this year important for the increase?

Claire: They want to have secure funding.

Megan: I really see both sides so that’s where I am conflicted right now.

Nora: The student was more hopeful about the hearing with HSF. There is more continuous oversight over the proposal now with the staff position.

Warren: The odds that HFS replaces the SFB funding is pretty low. I think that it is important we stick to the 200,000 this year. I’m not against funding a position but I think that’s the strong side in terms of funding.

Claire: Is it possible for them to reach out to HFS to see their current attitudes?

Nora: Yes. The ask is greater than 15,000 at this point for HFS but they can ask and see.

1. **Subcommittee Reports**
   1. **Facilities**

*L. Franklin: No report*

* 1. **Environmental Sustainability**

*N. Van Horn: We are creating a survey to get student input*

* 1. **Standardization**

*S. Franklin: No update*

* 1. **Communication**

*N. Robertson: No update*

* 1. **Zero-Waste**

*Nora: No report*

* 1. **Equity Fund**

*Najee: No report*

1. **Chair Report**

*C. Kelling: Next meeting is Friday morning at normal time starting with the center of performing arts and finish up with BJC. We will talk about new fee requests and ESF proposals, and it will take a meeting or two. We will see if we can hold a vote. Saturday meeting from 2-4 in 229 HUB. If you have any edits for the governing documents, please let me know that ASAP.*

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

*Alexa: No report.*

1. **Communications Intern Report**

*Kate: No report.*

1. **Comments for Good of the Order**
2. **Closing Roll Call**

*Meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m*