

Associated Residential Community Housing (ARCH) Advisory Committee | MINUTES

Meeting date | time 5/20/2019 9:00 AM

Meeting location: Board Room

Type of meeting: ARCH Advisory Committee	Attendees: Valerie Saiag Burgundy Fletcher Anindita Bhattacharya Anupam K Garg Petia Yanchulova Marybeth Ward Hana Haddad Jenna Bastear Erica Ferrer Joshua Stacy (by proxy - Burgundy) Holly Godden (by proxy - Jenna) Ramona Ferreira Hemlata Jhaveri
Co-Chairs: Jana Severson Michael Metke (interim)	
Note taker: Tricia McKenzie (Secretary)	

AGENDA

Quorum met. Meeting began at 9:05 AM with Mike going over the agenda and asking for comments/adjustments to meeting agenda.

Agenda Items:

1. Voting on pending appeals
2. Approve outstanding minutes from 1/22/19-5/8/19
3. HDH comments on future housing projects and involvement of ARCHAC, GSA and Grad Division. (5 minutes)
4. Open comment period: 2018-19 Budget Process and Suggestions for Improvement. (1 minute per person)
5. Current Pet Policy review/ discussion (15 minutes)

Comments:

- Anindita moved to add discussion about the present waitlist and its length, requesting 3-5 minutes.
- Seconded by Hana with no objections.
- Added to agenda after Pet Policy at conclusion of meeting, time permitting.

Agenda Item 1: Appeals

Appeal # 1424

- Marybeth motioned to vote.
 - Hana seconded the motion.
 - Approve: 1, Denied: 6, Abstained: 1
 - Decision: Denied

Appeal # 1428

- Hana motioned to vote.
 - Anindita seconded the motion.
 - Approve: 1, Denied: 8, Abstained: 0
 - Decision: Denied

Appeal # 1444

- Hana motioned to vote.
 - Marybeth seconded the motion.
 - Approve: 6, Denied: 3, Abstained: 0
 - Decision: Approved

**Anupam joined the meeting at 9:16AM*

Question:

- Hana asked if the Test Appeal could be removed from the portal.
 - Mike responded that this would be addressed.

Appeal # 1446

- Marybeth motioned to vote.
 - Hana seconded the motion.
 - Approve: 10, Denied: 0, Abstained: 0
 - Decision: Approved

Appeal # 1452

- Marybeth motioned to vote.
 - Hana seconded the motion.
 - Approve: 7, Denied: 3, Abstained: 0
 - Decision: Approved

Appeal # 1480

- MB motioned to amend the move out date from end of August to 7/15/19 with 30-day notice
 - Hana seconded the motion.
 - Anupam objected to the motion.
 - Marybeth revoked her motion to amend current move out date.
 - Anupam motioned to vote for end of August 2019.
 - Marybeth seconded the motion.
 - Approve: 10, Denied: 0, Abstained: 0
 - Decision: Approved with a move out of 8/31/2019, with 30-day notice.

Question:

- Hana asked if we would be voting on by law change to expedite voting process online.
 - Mike confirmed this is underway

Agenda Item 2: Approval of Minutes

- Burgundy submitted corrections through comment online, received by Ramona and secretary. Burgundy confirmed corrections were for grammar only, no substantive corrections.
- Ramona confirmed these corrections would be made.
- Burgundy motioned to approval all minutes from 1/22/19-5/8/19 as a slate.
 - Marybeth seconded the motion.
 - Votes to approve meeting minutes from 1/22-5/8/19:
 - 9 approved, 0 denied, 1 abstention
- Meeting minutes approved.

Agenda Item 3: HDH Comment on Future Housing Projects (Jana + Hemlata)

Jana shared that current plans/projects at Coast, South, and Central Mesa are included in the long range development plan (LRDP). She shared that HDH's intention is to make sure that new projects that are going to the UC Regents for approval are also socialized to ARCHAC/GSA/Grad Division first.

Jana provided an overview of the timeline for approval from the Regents and shared that it can take up to 2 years. Jana confirmed that at least that much notification of new projects would be given to any students living in housing in the future.

- Petia asked about documents on UCOP regarding capital financing of projects and whether they are approved at this point.
 - Jana responded that they are about halfway through approval process. Hemlata asked Jana to review the 4 steps for approval. Jana shared the following:
 - Step 1 – Campus leadership presents proposal to regents for info/discussion
 - Step 2 – If initially approved, the project goes back to campus for preliminary funding. There can be anywhere from 6 mos-1yr between steps in the process.
 - Step 3 – Full financing – projected cost, given to regents along with overview of scope of project
 - Step 4 – Design and Planning
 - Hemlata clarified that the request for preliminary funding to full funding can take approximately 2 years.
- Petia asked about the significance of adding projects to capital financing.
 - Hemlata responded they are added for long range planning and development plan purposes, and that they project to request what the division thinks it will need by 2028. HDH's last LRDP was approved in Fall 2018, which includes the broad goal for 4-year housing for students.
- Burgundy asked about the status of 7th college.
 - Hemlata responded that 7th college is not new construction so the discussions are different. Hemlata shared that the most recent discussion items for Regents were for Future (8th) College and Pepper Canyon West.
 - Jana added that Future College is set to open 2023.
- Erica asked why are there projects slated for faculty housing rather than student housing.
 - Hemlata answered there are no serious moves/discussions at this time for faculty housing projects.
- Erica asked if HDH knows the final number of students in which housing will “cap out”.
 - Hemlata responded that this is unknown at this point, as there are a variety of factors making this impossible to predict (i.e. enrollment rates). Hemlata added that for this reason it is important to continue working closely with Graduate Division to understand projections of enrollment.
- Anupam asked if the process described was the same for P-3 (public-private partnership) projects.
 - Hemlata responded that she was unsure as our campus has not done the P-3 process. She explained that the P-3 process functions with a private funder/developer partnering with UCSD, whereby UCSD would pay rent to that developer for a long-term contract of 50-100 years.
- Anupam asked if P-3 would be used in the future
 - Hemlata responded that P-3 funding would be potentially be used on Regents Road for faculty housing.
- Anupam asked if that would include Coast.
 - Helmata responded that there were no conversations happening currently regarding Coast.
- Marybeth asked about long-range planning and asked to clarify comments from the Chancellor regarding the East project, she asked about the justification for taking away housing from Graduate students.
 - Hemlata clarified that the current LRDP identifies “housing” only, with no distinction between undergraduate and graduate housing.
- Anindita asked in which communities grad housing would be transferred to undergrad or faculty and asked that if building more grad housing, can it be a rule that debts are investigated, rent increases proposed, etc. before the project is underway.
 - Hemlata expressed that HDH has learned a lot from this year, adding that with new construction HDH needs to have open and honest discussion regarding cost of construction, which will change. Hemlata added that currently they are operating with a very low interest rate, but does not expect this to last. She shared that HDH learned the importance of looking to GSA and everyone to inform all parties.
- Petia asked for clarification on whether they perceive any change to the next 2 years' plan.

- Hemlata responded that HDH would not break ground on anything for the next 2 years, because of the length of the process for Regent approval.
- Petia further asked for clarification if there were projects already underway. Petia referenced an email sent from 2015 to residents regarding approval of Mesa Nueva, which was 5 days after regents approved. Petia expressed concern for students being notified.
 - Hemlata clarified that notice went out at the end of the 2 year process for Mesa Nueva. Hemlata reiterated that there are no current conversations about any new development at this time.
- Hemlata suggested having someone present on P-3 process may be helpful to the committee.
 - Valerie seconded the idea to bring in a presenter on p-3 and the capital funding document to clarify these processes.
- Hemlata agreed to have more info presented to ARCHAC.
- Jana clarified that planning documents are guidelines for 10 years. The plans can shift during the process depending on all variables involved with building projects.
- Hemlata reiterated that she would bring in someone from Capital Planning to present.
- Hana asked to confirm that if any new project did come up, they would know about it at least two years in advance.
 - Hemlata confirmed.
- Marybeth asked if when voting for giving up spaces at Rita/SGA, did grads receive extra spaces in La Jolla Del Sol.
 - Jana responded that will happen later in 2026 when La Jolla del Sol is slated to convert to graduate student housing.
- Marybeth and Petia expressed an understanding that SGA would be swapped with spaces for grad students at La Jolla Del Sol.
- Mike asked if there was an approximate date so that they could check records for details of discussion.
 - Jana confirmed that last year's budget discussion included this topic.
 - Anindita added that they believed the time to be in Fall 2018.
- Mike motioned to look up past records regarding this topic and offered adding to future agenda.

Agenda Item 4: Open Comment Period - Suggestions for Improvement (1 minute per person)

Mike transitioned the discussion to focus on a recent lull in meetings with the ARCHAC group; and opened the floor for discussion/comment on the 2018-2019 budget process discussions and how to improve upon moving forward. Mike set a time limit of 1 minute per person on the issue.

- Anindita: commented that last year went awry when data was inaccurately presented and not seen as transparent. Anindita noted that it was difficult to get data. She also noted the importance of being respectful during conversations to maintain productive relationships.
- Anupam affirmed Anindita's comments. Anupam added that students were emailed in fall that grad housing was transitioning and that they would have opportunity for comment/input. Anupam noted the importance of being honest and upfront. They felt it was pitched as a proposal with room for feedback, rather than a plan that was already happening with little room for input from students. Anupam felt this added to a great deal of time spent unnecessarily debating when there was no room for debate. He would prefer that if a plan is happening, it be proposed as a firm plan rather than a proposal so that expectations are clear.
- Petia: thanked the group for the opportunity to serve on ARCHAC. Petia shared the benefits of being involved in the committee discussions and acknowledged genuine concern from HDH. Petia expressed that it can be difficult to ask the tough questions and shared that based on how she has spoken, GSA and HDH are trying to remove her from the committee. Petia reiterated the difficulty of serving on the committee, and the struggle to maintain authentic relationships among committee members. She expressed apologies to anyone if offended by her in the past and expressed her desire to remain on ARCHAC moving forward.

Agenda Item 5: Current Pet Policy Review (Ramona presented in Malia's absence)

Mike transitioned the discussion to Agenda Item #5 as there had been some request to examine the current pet policy as there are inconsistencies between communities.

- Hana asked for clarification that service animals are allowed on campus.
 - HDH confirmed that all support/service animals are approved in any community within GFH.
- Hemlata clarified that indoor cats are allowed at Mesa/OMS and Coast and asked the question of consistency between other communities where cats are not allowed.
- Anupam added an additional question of inconsistency regarding staff procedures for pet policy violations among different communities/staff members.

Ramona explained that a couple years ago ARCHAC looked at allowing pets, charging costs, and adjusting the housing policy. Cats are allowed with \$250 deposit, allowed in all communities except on campus communities. SGA and Rita never allowed pets as they are on campus.

- Anupam asked why cats are not allowed at Mesa Nueva

Ramona responded that when planning for Mesa Nueva they were facing the following factors

- Higher density population than other communities
- Smaller ratio of bed space to land area,
- Larger financial investment when considering damage caused by cats.
- Ramona offered to gather more info on specifics on Mesa Nueva reasoning.

General Pet Policy: OMS, Mesa, LJDS, Coast allow for up to 2 indoor cats, caged birds, 30 gallon tanks with fish/snakes/hamsters are allowed. \$250 Pet deposit required for cats. Dogs have never been allowed at any community as they are messier and cannot be kept indoors.

HDH Process for Policy Violations: If resident has an animal, typically office becomes aware by way of neighbor complaint or during an inspection of the unit. If complaint received, the office will:

- 1) First complaint - reach out to resident, phone call, email or memo to be respectful of neighbors – this is if the animal is authorized.
 - 2) If a violation occurs a second time the resident is served a notice/letter reminding them of policy, typically no 3-day notice. The resident may be asked to come into the office.
 - 3) Typically on a third violation, a 3-day notice would be served to the resident.
- Mike asked if there was a difference in charges for damages if the animal was approved or unapproved
 - Ramona responded that there is no difference. Residents are charged for repairs if caused by the pet. Residents with approved pets are required to fill out a pet addendum, but there is no penalty for not having in place. Most often unauthorized animals are discovered when office receives calls from neighbors or staff sees evidence of animals during inspections – but there is no penalty fee for an unauthorized animal.
 - Jana added that she recalled when Mesa Nueva was opening there were discussions about having a housing community where there have never been pets with regard to residents' allergies. Jana added that she can follow up to confirm this info.
 - Anupam added that there are animals at Mesa Nueva because service animals are allowed. Anupam expressed his support of having animals banned altogether or having animals allowed for consistency.
 - Jana clarified that legally they cannot prohibit service animals
 - Anupam shared their personal experience with difficulty navigating the approval process as OSD/HDH require that you have documentation prior to having your animal, but most medical professionals require that you have the animal first before they will issue you the paperwork. Anupam is proposing to clarify the process with OSD as well as to keep the procedures consistent between properties. They expressed that they'd like to see policies written out for violation. Anupam shared personal experience they had an animal in their unit while they were in process of having documents for animal. During recent EH&S inspections, they were served 3-day notice to remove the animal. Anupam expressed the stress of this situation for himself and other residents.

- Jana suggested that this topic be continued in the next meeting's agenda to allow for more members to have time to review and discuss process/suggestions/enforcement at the next meeting.
- Hemlata confirmed the need for clarification on the process.

Final remarks:

Mike asked for agenda items for next meeting in addition to returning to the pet policy discussion.

- Petia requested to add an agenda item for the housing/grad student experience survey. Petia met with chancellor on 5/7 and was tasked with creating a more diverse survey for Grad Housing. Petia offered to send what she has drafted for feedback.
 - Mike asked Petia to send the drafted survey to include when next agenda is sent out.

Meeting adjourned around 10:40 AM. Next meeting will be on 6/5/2019 at 11:30 AM with location to be determined and sent out.