

**Student Activities Center Board of Governors Meeting Minutes**  
**May 29, 2015**  
**Plaza View Conference Room**

Attendees: Luis Sanchez, Angelique Taloyo, Mary Coleman for Ablai Khan Akhazhanov, Stacey Meeker, Monica Ly for Maria de la Luz Patino, Lila Reyes, Miriam Rodriguez

Absent: Paolo Velasco Victoria Sanelli, Valerie Shepard,

Guests: Raja Bhattar, Dion Veloz, Rudy Figueroa, Mary Coleman

**Agenda:**

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Budget Review
4. Tenant Requests

The meeting was called to order at 11:08am by LS.

**Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was emailed to the Board in advance of this meeting. LS reviewed the agenda and requested a motion to approve. SM motioned to approve the agenda and AT seconds the motion. The agenda was approved by consensus.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the prior meeting were emailed to the Board in advance of this meeting. There were no corrections or modifications noted. LS requested a motion to approve. MR motioned to approve the minutes and SM seconds the motion. The minutes were approved by consensus.

**Budget Review**

- DV noted the change in format of the proposed budget in that requests such as carpeting and painting would be removed from tenant requests and included under general building projects. Also not on the budget are the three one-time big ticket items of gender neutral restroom conversion project estimated at \$300,000; the acoustic panel project estimated at \$135,000, and the basement furniture project estimated at \$65,000. DV will update the Board regarding the status of these projects. Regarding carpeting and painting, these requests were removed from tenant requests. Carpeting and painting will now be put on a schedule and handled as general maintenance of the SAC. DV and RF will walk the building with Facilities to develop a schedule based on when last purchased, tenant needs and wear patterns. For this year, carpeting will be replaced as requested by units.
- Regarding the LGBT request, DV confirmed with Maureen Wadleigh, Campus Life & Recreation CAO, that SPARC funds may not be used for unit technology purchases, i.e. iPads, computers, etc. but may be used for installation of furniture that would hold these items. SPARC fees may only be used for technology purchases if the purchase benefits the building as a whole such as SAC conference rooms or digital displays for the building.
- The removal of these items brings the total down to around \$903,000 which is much closer to the target figure.
- RB inquired regarding the non-technology components of the LGBT request such as printing costs/toner and paper. It was DV's understanding that these could not be included in the request. The check-in kiosk is included as well as the refrigerator. MC was under the impression that MW did state that printing costs and paper for unit use would not be included. There was brief discussion regarding how other departments fund printing for students. SM suggested evaluation of a centralized printing service at the SAC since some units offer printing services. Additionally, SM suggested that information be provided regarding what are available funding sources for printing. DV & MC will check with MW to clarify. DV inquired if the Board could still vote on the budget, stipulating that something may or may not be included in a tenant request. MC affirmed that this can be done.

## **Tenant Requests**

### **LGBT – Raja Bhattar**

- Operating budget is \$13,000 down from \$25,000 however amount of people served has tripled. Printing is critical to their constituents. Looking to track use data which is in line with Student Affairs guidelines. The refrigerator is needed to put on events.
- SM inquired if the kiosks requested are similar to those found on campus, in Student Affairs. Per RB they are.
- DV noted that with the elimination of the technology component of the LGBT request, the Board is looking at the kiosk base frame and security holder. This reduces the cost of the request to \$4,875.00.
- MC noted that the Board could vote to approve the entire amount requested with the stipulation that the discussed items may or may not be included. It was agreed that a vote could be taken with the stipulation.
- LS motioned to vote on the LGBT request with the aforementioned stipulation. The LGBT request with the stipulation was approved unanimously with the stipulation.

### **CPO – Luis Sanchez**

- Requesting to refurbish, remodel the reception desk and reception area in 105, replace furniture and purchase new task chairs.
- SM inquired if the chairs were the conference room chairs. Per LS they are not. DV noted that he had done an assessment of the unit and the chairs are in poor shape and some of them very old.
- AT inquired regarding the test bank, if that was a technology request. Per LS the test bank is funded by the CRC.
- LS inquired if the amount on the proposed budget reflects removal of carpeting from the request. Per DV it does.

### **GSRC – Monica Ly**

- Couches are worn out. The space is also used as a lounge for grad students. Need shelving in the closet space to improve use.
- DV noted that he has been working with Tangram for an estimate. The number in the budget is a projected number based on past purchases.
- Clarification was requested regarding their 3<sup>rd</sup> floor storage space. Per DV it is basically a closet and shelving would improve functionality.

EAOP, Bruin Corp and BRC did not send a representative to review their requests however it was decided to proceed with review of their respective requests and that DV would answer any questions based on the knowledge he had on each unit.

### **EAOP – LS provided information on the request.**

- Requesting signage with logo outside of their office, a vertical cabinet and 4 chairs for their Directors office, and reconfiguration of their reception area.
- DV noted no major concerns with the exception of purchasing signage with a logo and questioned if each unit should design their own signage or have a global look. SM inquired what the CPO did, per DV they designed their own sign but SAC money was used for installation. There was a general discussion regarding individual units designing signs and funding of design services vs. only funding installation. DV noted that MW will continue to provide greater clarity regarding University guidelines. MW will also need to clarify if purchase of the sign is appropriate. LS suggested to move forward with over all approval of the request with the stipulation that there would be no funding of design services and there may not be funding for the sign. DV suggested that down the line, some sort of uniformity and oversight be established regarding unit signage so that there is a uniform look to the SAC.

### **Bruin Corp - DV**

- SM requested clarification regarding the overhead bins. Per DV there is a need to create a more inviting space and improve functionality. The overhead bins currently are positioned so that one could bump one's head into them. The consensus was that this was a reasonable request.

### **Bruin Resource Center- DV**

- DV reminded that carpeting and painting had been removed from the request so the remaining request is conversion of room B44 into a small conference room and work stations. The estimated cost is \$17,100. Additionally this request does not include any technology purchases only work stations. Electric signage is in the request, however DV estimates that the BRC will purchase this themselves as there is no quote for purchase of electric signage

There was general discussion regarding whether to vote on the budget at this meeting or hold voting until the next meeting with the requested clarifications provided. The Board could vote on the entire budget at this meeting with the discussed stipulations.

DV, who rechecked the numbers during the meeting, advised that the total of the proposed budget is \$913,936.01.

LS inquired if anyone wanted to motion to vote on the proposed budget with the discussed stipulations. AT motioned to vote on the proposed budget with the discussed stipulations and this was second by MR. A vote was taken: 6 approve, 0 reject, 0 abstain. MC voted as the proxy for AA who had emailed his intentions and reasons to support the GSRC request, to her prior to the meeting. MC read AA's email so that all present would be aware of AA's intentions.

MC reminded LS of the need to craft an annual report noting the business accomplished by the Board during the year. This report would be submitted to Mick who would share with VC Montero.

MC inquired if anyone on the Board felt a need to meet further for this academic year. No one felt any further meetings were necessary. MC noted that an email would be sent out to the Board with requested clarifications.

The meeting was adjourned by LS at 12:05m.