

**ARSFAB  
February 10, 2011  
ICA Conference Room  
Meeting Minutes**

**In Attendance:**

Anish Bhayani, Associated Students  
Jason Karavidas, Alumni Representative  
Don Chadwick, Sports Facilities  
Dave Koch, Recreation  
Donald Zelaya—Co-Chair, Thurgood Marshall College  
Jesse Vargas, Graduate Student  
Cliff Kubiak, Faculty Representative FAR  
Marcia Strong, Staff Representative (Official Proxy)  
Wendy Taylor, Intercollegiate Athletics  
Nathan Wieneke, ERC  
Ron Campnell, Staff Representative  
Garo Bournoutian, Graduate Student (GSA official Proxy)  
Janessa Werhane, Triton Athletic Council  
Rebecca Horwitz, Sixth College  
Judy Yu, Muir College  
Kate Joy, Revelle College  
Adrian Tamas, Warren College  
Michele Palmer, Executive Secretary

Meeting Called to order with Quorum at 3:07pm

**INFORMATION**

1. Update on RIMAC Touchplate Lighting System: the automated lighting system in the RIMAC building is in need of replacing. Our IT person was able to temporarily fix the computer problems, but as it is Windows 95 it isn't a permanent solution. The board previously supported the idea of replacing the system, but asked for competitive bids. We have received a bid from Johnson Controls, which is higher than the Touchplate bid, and are waiting on a 3<sup>rd</sup> bid to come in. We are in the process of having a monitoring based commissioning in RIMAC and we may choose to wait and include this as part of the energy audit. The survey will usually make recommendations as to what repairs and changes would save money in utilities, as this is our largest area of expense it will be good to identify savings. This should be ready by the budget update for the new year.
2. ReRev Installation: We are looking for interested students about where to place the ReRev machines. Anish volunteered to be the student to discuss this with.
3. Mesa Housing Weight Room: We have been looking at having a weight room to serve the graduate students; ARSFAB approved the idea, but stipulated that RIMAC funds could not be used. It would be run more like a hotel weight room, not staffed, but have some key or card swipe entry required. We are looking at transferring some equipment over there. Lack of power is going to be a challenge, as well as who will be doing the maintenance.

## ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes – February 3, 2011 (see attached)  
Anish Bhayani motioned to approve February 3rd minutes, seconded by Rebecca Horwitz. The minutes were approved with no objections.
2. Anish Bhayani wanted to discuss ARSFAB Charter updates regarding AS: When the charter was presented to AS Anish also presented his contentions he had with the ARSFAB approved Charter, and he proposed his amendments to AS to have them add those to the ARSFAB approved charter. AS approved the amendments and the newly amended charter. Now that AS has sent this version back to ARSFAB the board must decide if they will approve this version as AS won't approve the previously ARSFAB approved Charter. Anish also challenged the board to point out any of their contentions with the charter, as the UC Riverside Rec Facility board is an all student board, with much more power than stated in the charter before us, and that charter passed through OP. The amendments added at last night's AS meeting were:
  - a. Advisory removed from title: Sports Facilities Board.
  - b. In the Purpose: As representatives of UCSD students, has maximum feasible operating and decision making authority, as constrained by sound business practices, over self-assessed student Recreation Facility fees and facilities funded in majority by these fees.
  - c. With respect to Sports Facilities, SFAB has the responsibility to review, evaluate and decide on:
  - d. Policies governing the general use of facilities. The SFAB shall review and approve the annual operating budget, space allocation, rent assessments, custodial standards, capital improvements, maintenance and renovation, purchase of equipment, and hours of operation, as required by Section 18.14.20 of the *UCSD Policies and Procedures Applying to Student Activities*.
  - e. With respect to facility users and tenants, SFAB may review, evaluate, and decide on program policies, scope and proposed program changes, Athletic conference affiliations, and fiscal policies.
  - f. Actions of the Board which will grossly affect the long term financial solvency of the Board or that are inconsistent with the terms of this document may be vetoed by the Vice-Chancellor-Student Affairs, not by delegation. Any such veto shall be in writing, shall be delivered to the Board Chair, and shall be accompanied by a written statement on the basis of such action. If the Board is unsatisfied with the veto, they may appeal the decision directly to the Chancellor.
3. **Don:** Our Board had a deliberative committee process that took many weeks and the document that was approved by ARSFAB was made as a combined effort by this boards members. He would like to know how this Board's interests were represented at the AS meeting. **Anish:** As the AS representative he sees his job as to represent AS's position to

the board and not the other way around. These are the points that AS would like to see happen in the charter, and as ARSFAB didn't approve them, AS decided to re-amend the Charter to add them back in. **Don:** The Vice Chancellor's Office has pointed out that student boards at UCSD are advisory and although other campuses, such as UCR, may adopt other practices, we are not UCR. As the charter stands prior to AS's amendments we had 2 of the 4 necessary approvals (ARSFAB and GSA), not to mention that the VC is closer to siding with the Board than AS, as she would like to maintain boards as advisory. The method of bringing about these changes was very backhanded, and the language is not something I can agree with. It doesn't appear as if our board's interests were properly represented. **Dave:** does not like that in Article 2 section 6 the word "decide" is used in reference to facility users and tenants and their program policies, scope and proposed program changes, Athletic conference affiliations, and fiscal policies. Since Facility users and tenants refers to the Recreation and ICA departments, that decision making power very much oversteps the bounds of a facility board. **Jesse:** in AS's haste to make changes to the document, it got sloppy and it created a problematic document, which is why the committee spent so much time going over the details of the document in the first place. **Ron:** Last week this board reviewed these types of changes and specifically voted to keep this an advisory board. Not to mention that having "maximum feasible power" in the charter leaves it a bit open for the board to have power over staff, which this board should not have. **Anish:** The Board should be advisory to the VC and AVC, not to the facility policies, that is what the director is there for. The Board is supposed to make decisions on policy. **Janessa:** Feels that the people making decisions on policies need to be very educated on the policies and results, this Board is not qualified to make those kinds of decisions. **Anish:** That is why the student councils will have to appoint the right kind of representatives. Since there is a 2 year recommendation for all appointments, hopefully there will always be "experienced" members on the Board, with a year's worth of experience. **Dave:** The point is that for this Charter to pass our Board must first approve it, and as is very clear our board does not approve. Will AS accept no other charter than this one? If that is true then the issue is, why won't AS support what this board wants for itself. **Marcia:** As our Board is educated on the topic at hand, and has put forth our decision on the Charter, wouldn't it have been better to come to the Board with recommendations rather than ignoring our decision and giving us an AS mandated version of our own charter? Now, because of the process, the relationship between our two groups is not functioning properly. **Kate:** The legality of giving students too much power, with eye towards necessary trainings etc... it isn't reasonable that students can fulfill all that. **Anish:** Training shouldn't be necessary as this won't be a management board, but just creating and approving policy. **Kate:** If it isn't Anish's job to take our opinions back to AS, then how will they ever know what our reasoning behind our suggestions is? **Garro:** Proposes a motion.

4. Garro moved to amend the ARSFAB approved charter to Article 2 section 1 1.a and 7:
  1. With respect to Sports Facilities, SFAB has the responsibility to review, evaluate and decide on:
    - a. Policies governing the general use of facilities. The SFAB shall review and approve the annual operating budget, space allocation, rent assessments, custodial standards, capital improvements, maintenance and renovation, purchase of

equipment, and hours of operation, as required by Section 18.14.20 of the *UCSD Policies and Procedures Applying to Student Activities*.

7. Actions of the Board which will grossly affect the long term financial solvency of the Board or that are inconsistent with the terms of this document may be vetoed by the Vice-Chancellor-Student Affairs, not by delegation. Any such veto shall be in writing, shall be delivered to the Board Chair, and shall be accompanied by a written statement on the basis of such action. If the Board is unsatisfied with the veto, they may appeal the decision directly to the Chancellor.

Seconded by Rebecca and opened for discussion.

5. **Anish:** This might be able to get by as it sort of embodies the core wishes of AS. **Don:** Almost 3 years ago VC Penny Rue sent GSA an email about her concerns over their constitution as she believes facility boards should be advisory. There is a chance that if we continue down this path VC won't approve the charter. **Anish:** The Reg fee board does make decisions and they handle much more money than this board ever will. The Vote on Garo's amendment goes to vote; Jason-Y, Jesse-Y, Garo-Y, Anish-Y, Nathan-Y, Kate-Y, Rebecca-Y, Donald-Y, Adrian-Y, Cliff-N, Marcia-A, Ron-N. Amendment passes.
6. **Anish:** Motion to approve charter, seconded by Jesse; Jason-A, Jesse-Y, Garo-Y, Anish-Y, Nathan-Y, Kate-Y, Rebecca-Y, Donald-Y, Adrian-Y, Cliff-N, Marcia-A/N, Ron-N. Motion fails to have a 2/3vote, does not pass.
7. **Jesse:** In section 7 there is a typo it should read " solvency of the facility" not "solvency of the board", not to mention it isn't clear who takes the written complaints to the VC. **Anish:** It is up to this Board to come up with a solution that AS will pass. **Jesse:** You are saying it is up to this Board to acquiesce to AS's wishes, you should just go ahead and say it. The problem is GSA meets again on the 21<sup>st</sup>, and AS on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, and we have to have everything in line by then for the referendum, or we will have to wait until next year. VC Rue doesn't want to take a stance on the document until the Board, GSA, and AS have reached an agreement. Some of the students admit they are only really voting yes because of the urgency regarding the referendum. There is concern about handcuffing the director to having to consult the VC in cases of disagreement. **Garo:** The changes allow the board a way of finding out why their recommendations were ignored. The Director can still go against the Board, but it must be in writing and the VC can veto any decisions still.
8. **Jesse:** Motion to change "Board" to "facility" in A2.S7, seconded by Rebecca. No objections.
9. **Jesse:** Motion to approve the charter as it now is, seconded by Rebecca; Jason-Y, Jesse-Y, Garo-Y, Anish-Y, Nathan-Y, Kate-Y, Rebecca-Y, Donald-Y, Marcia-Y, Ron-Y. Charter passes with 10 yes votes.

Next meeting at February 24, 2011

Meeting adjourned at 4:51 pm