**AGENDA**

Meeting begun at 2:01 PM with introductions and agenda items. Agenda items:

- Proposed HDH Housing plan
- OSD presentation

### Proposed HDH Housing plan

Hemlata gave a presentation on housing future proposed plans for the new members.

- Some points:
  - Housing took a step back and looked at what had happened in the past 5 years.
  - Overly densified undergraduate housing.
  - There is no longer space in the colleges.
  - Students are overflowing to the village.
  - Explained the potential of having overflow be sent to a college near them.

- Proposed Housing Plan:
  - In 2020, HDH will open two new graduate housing residential areas, Nuevo West (800 beds) and Nuevo East (1,380 beds), and undergraduate housing, North Torrey Pines Living and Learning Neighborhood (2,000 beds).
  - Undergrad existing conditions:
    - Housing 11,620 UG students
      - 9,300 in college
- 2,320 in non-college housing
  - Facilities designed to house 9,270
- 2,350 beds over capacity
  - UG long term (2028)
    - 4,000 per college
    - Increase on campus housing from 39% to 62% by 2028
    - 7th and 8th college would be added
  - Warren:
    - Fall18, Bates was converted to UG
    - Fall19, Brown converts to UG
  - Step 1 Fall 2020
    - Rita converts to transfer housing
    - Transfer students relocate to Rita or Pepper Canyon East
    - The village begins conversion to home of Seventh College
  - Step 2 Fall 2022
    - Pepper Canyon West becomes an additional option for transfer/upper division students
  - Step 3 Fall 2023
    - Eight college opens South of Revelle
- Projects for students
  - Identified 21 projects for outdoor activation at Residential colleges.
    - Shaded sitting
    - Outdoor fire pits
    - Tables and chairs
  - Funded by UCOP (office of president). Housing will not need to pay for these.

Questions:
- Anindita shared they are losing affordable housing by losing Rita and SGA. She asked if it was a permanent change.
  - Hemlata confirmed it would a permanent change as they need to increase housing on both graduate and undergraduate housing.
- Anupam asked what the plan was for graduate students in 2020.
  - Hemlata responded they would look at Mesa once Nuevo West and Nuevo East are completed. Goal is to add 1,500 beds in Mesa. It would have amenities that are not typical for UG facilities. It will have a park like setting. She added it’s important to think at families. She shared 500 beds will be low density.
- Anupam shared it’s not to the advantage of graduate students to give up property they have been paying on.
  - Hemlata shared the director of business would be attending the following meeting to explain. She explained they've only paid interests on Rita for the last 10 years. She added interests don’t count for the principle and with principle payments the debt will double.
- Valerie thanked Hemlata for trying to solve the housing problem. She shared her and Burgundy have spoken to many students. She feels infrastructure needs to be created before graduate students are displaced, as graduate students are TA’s for undergrads.
  - Hemlata responded Rita displacement doesn’t happen until Nuevo West and Nuevo East are completed. She added it’s a net gain not net loss. HDH’s job is to help find a home for all students. They are trying to build as fast as possible. The long-range development goes to 2028 to create infrastructure. As HDH builds pricing will go up, but they will still be lower than the san Diego market. She can’t speak on behalf of enrollment.
- Erica shared she would like to voice on behalf of the GSA counsel. She expressed the proposal is being pitched as net gain, but it’s a net loss from what they were told before.
  - Hemlata responded the goal is to be as transparent as possible. They started the presentation last year in October to be transparent and give the same message to everyone. She added the finances (by the director of business) he following week would be very telling. HDH will play a major role in order to keep rates below market. Seeing the big picture would be helpful.
• Anupam shared by 2035 the undergraduate population isn’t supposed to increase as much. He gave some statistics. Felt they should be building for graduate students.
  o Hemlata responded percentage wise it would make sense but not base wise. There are around 32 thousand undergraduate students and 6 thousand students. Undergraduate quantity is more. Need to look at the growth model. The undergraduate population has been growing and they need to catch up.
    ▪ Anupam shared he is concern with having to catch up for graduate students later on.
• Anupam asked how it would affect cost and if they should expect a 7% increase.
  o Hemlata responded they needed to look at the numbers and at what is reasonable. Given that both undergraduate and graduate is building, the entire debt is going up as a whole. Paying debt is not a choice. Housing does keep it separated for both undergraduate and graduate. She added the committee would see numbers the following meeting. They will look at what HDH can pay to help without going into a deficit. They are not expecting graduate student to pick up the debt.
• Anupam shared he didn’t see anything formal on the 1500 beds.
  o Hemlata responded it wouldn’t be there yet as it still needs to be taken to UCOP.
    ▪ Anupam responded it would be good to have it in writing like the undergraduate plan to show housing has a plan.
      • Hem responded it was a reasonable ask. They will work for it.
        o Anupam responded a timeline would help graduate students see that they won’t be losing housing down the line.
• Anindita asked how many beds were needed to confirm 3-4 years of guaranteed housing.
  o Hemlata shared they need to look at doctoral student that would qualify for a 3rd year. She stated master students graduate in 2 years. She added they need to run numbers before it’s a public statement.

**OSD Presentation**

• Jana gave OSD representatives an overview of appeals that go to OSD.
• OSD staff introduced themselves:
  o OSD composed of 5 specialist and a director.
• Joana, Director of OSD, shared the interactive process:
  o Looking at it through an access and disability lenses.
    ▪ Does it rise to the level of a disability under the law?
    ▪ Does the accommodation mitigate it in a way that living in a non-university housing could not mitigate it?
      • She provide an example of commuting. Living across the bridge vs. at Costa Verde. Is that profoundly affecting the person’s disability and ability to get to campus, research etc.
  o Often while they are having the interactive process they hear other issues such as:
    ▪ Financial
    ▪ Roommate issues
    ▪ Specific living location
  o They look at medical documents provided to accommodate that request. May ask that a 3rd party to corroborate.
  o OSD staff meet twice a week to discuss and review cases and determine what accommodations will be reasonable for each student.
Joana shared she is aware of some students who have been bounced back and forth between OSD and housing. She asked if there was a way OSD could work simultaneously with the committee.

**Questions:**

- Valerie shared she was puzzled by some decisions from OSD. She provided an example of someone who was blind.
  - An OSD specialist responded and gave an example of a blind person who lives at El Cajon and doesn’t want to live on campus.
- Valerie asked what they look at.
  - Joana responded they are looking at the limitation that the disability imposes. She gave an example of a person on a wheelchair. A person who has been in a wheelchair their whole life might be comfortable. On the other hand, a student who end up in a wheelchair after an accident will have physical limitations getting used to the chair.
- Anindita asked if students needed to specify how a housing accommodation would be beneficial.
  - An OSD specialist responded they explain the process to the students.
  - Joana added they try their best to provide education and answer questions. They create accommodations appropriate to the individual.
- Anindita shared she felt there should be certain parameters to assure the process is bias free.
  - Joana responded they review it as a team twice a week to determine the appropriate accommodations for that individual. She added all specialists have different background and knowledge. They use the same forms and ask the same questions.
    - Anindita shared she felt it imposes subjectivity.
    - Joana asked what she would propose.
      - Anindita responded having more flexibility.
- Erica shared she felt there was miscommunication as their intention was not to be antagonistic. The committee would really like to learn more about the process.
  - Joana proposed bringing documentation and case studies redacted so they could review a case and the decisions taken. She added there has to be subjectivity, as they are not running it as a machine. They are human beings. There are certain set scores, but also human aspects. She explained other offices have one person making all the decisions. They have five (5) people to allow conversation and team approach. They try to bring knowledge and experience. Lastly, she added students can return to OSD at any time and they would review their case.
    - Erica shared it would be a great thing to get together and review a case.
- An OSD specialist shared it would be helpful for them to know how OSD’s decision affects the committee’s decision.
  - Ramona explained the process:
    - If one has a medical issue, they refer the student to OSD.
    - They indicate that on the appeal.
    - If the appeal comes to the committee, 9/10 times they wait for OSD decisions.
  - Gautam added they are looking for unique and extenuating circumstances. OSD perspective helps them understand. When referred, it’s to see if they can make necessary adjustments.
  - Jana explained there were two scenarios:
    - Someone who has two years and gets an accommodation
    - Someone who’s time is ending and they need an extension
  - Jana added the Committee typically only see those cases that are denied by OSD, but they have data for approved accommodations.
- Hana asked what happened if a student didn’t have time to submit their paperwork by the deadline.
  - Joana responded they continue the interactive process. It’s only when the student hasn’t continued the process.
- Hana asked if OSD is limited on resources and if that had an influence on their decision.
  - Joana responded the accommodation always comes first. They are proactive.
- Gautam asked to elaborate on the students bouncing back and forth.
An OSD specialist explained.
  ▪ Ramona provided a possible example.
  ▪ Joana added some students would go to housing after being “denied” from OSD. She clarified they don’t deny and the doors remain open. She added the committee might only be getting the information from the student’s lenses.
• Ivonne shared 35% of housing students have a type of accommodation.
• Gautam thanked them for coming. He added they weren’t trying to be antagonistic. Hoping they could do a walk thorough.
  ▪ Joana responded it would be helpful for both ARCHAC and OSD.
• Anindita asked if it was possible to building more graduate housing with the money from UCOP.
  ▪ Hemlata responded UCSD received 3 million for housing insecurity. She shared where the money went.
• Anupam asked for clarification on the 3 year guaranteed.
  ▪ Hemlata responded they might recommend 2020 depending on the number of beds.
  ▪ Jana added they are still working on an estimate based on percentages and historical data.
  ▪ Hemlata added they would continue to look at numbers to determine if they are ready for 2020.
  ▪ Anupam asked if it would apply to the current residents.
• Valerie asked about donors.
  ▪ Hemlata responded there are more funds for academic buildings. Housing is always looking for donors. She added the Advancement Office works on that.
    ▪ Valerie asked if the Advancement Office ask for HDH.
      ▪ Hemlata responded the Advancement office looks for all the projects. It would be great to have a donor at some point.
• Anindita asked if it would be outside the rules to ask for loans.
  ▪ Hemlata responded they take out bond loans.
  ▪ Jana added all communities are built from bonds.
• Anupam asked if there’s no funds from the university.
  ▪ Hemlata responded an auxiliary must make payments on their own. As an auxiliary, they have to operate on their own.
  ▪ Anupam asked if the committee could talk to the chancellor.
    ▪ Hemlata confirmed. She added the committee would see not everything is coming from graduate students.
• Gautam shared students are concerned about affordability especially as Rita is going away.
  ▪ Anupam added Rita is the cheapest considering it’s on campus.
    ▪ Hemlata responded Rita wouldn’t be the same price because the debt is doubling. They would have Irvin explain.

Meeting adjourned around 3:33pm. Next meeting will be on 2/19/2019 from 3-4:30pm at the Barrett room.