

CAMPUS FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 11, 2009

MINUTES

ATTENDEES

Members:	Kimberlee Reilly Natalie Colli Laura Schofield Caleb McCanne Valerie Renegar	Ignacio Prado Alyssa Bruni Isaac Castro Eric Rivera David Ely
----------	--	---

Non-Voting Member: Ray Rainer

Faculty/Staff Alternates: Andrea Bauer

Guests: Dan Cornthwaite

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 P.M. by Ms. Kimberlee Reilly, CFAC Committee Chair

Information Item

a. Minutes from November 20, 2009 CFAC Meeting (Attachment 1)

The minutes were reviewed and there was a correction to reflect that the upcoming election will be the first solely online election. The subcommittee members listed on the minutes should also include Ignacio Prado. Dr. Renegar made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Castro; the minutes were approved unanimously.

Action Item

a. Revised Associated Students Modern Space 2010 Spring Referendum – Student Fee Proposal

Mr. Cornthwaite announced that the AS Council met on December 2nd to discuss the modern space proposal. The AS Council met again on December 9th and voted unanimously to approve the recommendation to support the project.

Below are some highlights from the Student Fee Proposal presented by Mr. Cornthwaite:

- The compelling need for new facilities.
- All the projections have been updated to reflect the current enrollment decline.
- The enrollment estimate for academic year 2010/2011 is 30,220 for fall and 27,344 for spring – these estimates remain constant through 2011/2012.
- Enrollment is estimated to start increasing by 2% per year in 2012/2013
- The approved 2006 referendum with fees increased by \$11/semester beginning fall 2006, and additional increase of \$45/semester in spring 2010.

The original fee increases will not be enough due to the economic downturn, higher bond interest rates, increased construction costs and significantly lower student enrollment. Also, the forensic studies and analysis conducted for what was originally a renovation and expansion project revealed that the cost to renovate the current facilities very closely approximated the cost to replace the entire structure (within \$200,000). A renovated building has less flexibility to fit the program.

The AS Council voted to replace the entire structure and seek LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) platinum certification. This would be the first student union in the world to be LEED platinum certified. LEED is a series of building criteria that is now commonly used within the architect, building and construction industry to include sustainable design elements in the building that are environmentally sensitive. The project team includes an elite consultant, who will help ensure that the building design itself contains sustainable design elements to garner a series of points to reach the desired level of certification. There are four levels of certification: LEED Certified, Gold, Silver and Platinum (highest).

Dr. Ely asked about the cost for LEED certification. The board set a premium not to exceed 5% of the project cost toward LEED certification and the project is within budget for this. The voter pamphlet will include LEED certification as part of the project.

The cost to replace the building includes demolition. The seismic zone requirements to upgrade the building are severe and very costly. One of the LEED points is that a good amount of the non-hazardous building materials will be reconstituted and used in the building site.

Mr. Cornthwaite distributed two copies from the December 2nd PowerPoint presentation to the AS Council.

Below are some major elements for the new project:

- Sustainable design seeking LEED certification
- Facilities center as the commuter lounge
- New leadership center
- More gathering spaces
- LGBT resource center
- Expanded cross-cultural center
- Greater quality in meeting spaces
- Multipurpose theater with collapsible seating
- About 70% increase in usable space (from 70,000 to 120,000 Sq. feet)

Most of the operations, with the exception of food and retail, will be relocated off campus or with Aztec Shops. The retail space will decrease due to the boutique style design for food and retail. There will be room for only one financial institution – the university's banking partner.

The current level for the tentative student body center fee is \$98/semester. The Student Fee Proposal shows how this fee breaks down to support different operations.

The proposed \$94/semester increase is to be implemented the semester that the facility opens, but the financial plan shows that the fee will be implemented in fall 2013, even though the building complex is tentatively scheduled to be ready for occupancy in March 2013 (spring 2013).

The Student Fee Proposal includes a 3-year revenue projection (2013/2014 - 2015/2016) and a tentative timeline.

There is currently an option to begin construction sooner, as early as October 2010, but no commitments will be made until the fee has passed.

Information Item

Associated Students Modern Space 2010 Spring Referendum - Voter Pamphlet

Mr. Cornthwaite presented the voter pamphlet, which closely resembles the 2006 version. The fee box illustrates the student body center fees from 2009/10 through 2013/14. It starts with the current fee of \$98 in the fall and \$143 in the spring and subsequent semesters through spring 2013 to include the \$45 increase previously approved. The \$94 increase starts in fall 2013 and thereafter for a total of \$237 per semester.

The summer fees will be implemented in 2013; the rule of thumb is to use 10% per unit, not to exceed 11 units, to calculate summer fees. Ms. Reilly suggested implementing a flat fee for summer.

Dr. Ely asked if it was proper for this committee to review the financial plan or have some information presented to the committee explaining the numbers and ensure that the increases will be sufficient to complete the project. Mr. Cornthwaite said that this information can be provided, but he doesn't see the nexus between the review and avoiding the problems that resulted in the demise of the original project, which were totally unforeseen.

Mr. Cornthwaite added that the difference between the previous project and this project is that in the previous project no architects were retained and there was no actual program designed. This time a project team has been hired and is working; this project is considered a construction management at risk. This project is supported by very detailed cost estimates. A second independent cost estimator was hired to ensure the estimates are accurate.

A program and facilities, yet to be identified, will be provided during the 20-month construction process. There will be a semblance to the student union.

Mr. Rainer will send the electronic voter pamphlet to the subcommittee. The subcommittee will be meeting on January 11th.

Dr. Ely made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Mr. McCanne. The meeting adjourned at 2:49 PM.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 14 at 2:00 PM in SS-1608.