Pet Survey
- Mark shared that a total of 1211 pet survey responses were collected.
- Cory asked if he could review the raw data and break it down into further detail.

Agenda Items for Winter 2014
- Mark shared twelve topics that he wanted the committee to review and provide direction on this quarter.
  - (1) Adding one more RSO to security staffing.
    - Shana asked if the current RSO travels to all the ARCH communities.
      - Mark said yes.
    - Rafael asked if HDH has considered hiring CSO’s (student).
      - Mark said this could be discussed too.
  - (2) Adding one more community assistant to Rita Atkinson.
    - Emily explained that the community assistants do event planning and take care of packages after hours.
    - Rebecca shared that these students live on site.
  - (3) Discuss and consider adding card access control gates to the OMS structure to limit access to just ARCH residents and their guests.
    - Rafael stated that his only concern is rush hour or peak times. The traffic could get congested in those areas.
      - Mark stated that the use of card access could be restricted to after hours. It would be up to the committee.
    - Emily asked about the cost of adding a card access gate.
      - Mark said he would research this and present it to the committee if they decide that they are interested in pursuing this.
  - (4) Re-direct other visitors and guests from OMS to the parking spaces adjacent to the South Mesa 9180 units.
    - Mark said that this would reduce the number of non-residents who park in the parking structure.
    - Lisa asked where guests currently park their cars.
      - Rebecca said that guests are given a sticker and can park in any of the parking spots.
(5) Revision of waitlist policy/procedure.
- Mark shared that he’s received feedback regarding the waitlist and how some don’t understand how it works. The waitlist allows you to indicate many choices and multiple dates. He’d like the committee to review the waitlist procedure.
  - Rafael asked if students can change their waitlist preferences after it has been submitted.
    - Mark said yes.

(6) Revision of “need date” to “first available date they are able to accept the space offered.”
- Mark explained that he believes the wording of the phrase isn’t right. He wants to make sure that the right message is being sent to students and that they understand that this is the “soonest that I am available.”
- Emily suggested giving the option to not have an end date.
- Ruichen suggested creating a website or resource where students could find out what number they are on the waitlist.
  - Rebecca said this is not possible the way the system is set up now. Currently, each student is given three options. But, if the number of choices is limited, this might be possible.

(7) 3 year Phased Painting of South Mesa Apartments.
- Mark said that if the committee is interested, he could find out how much this would cost.

(8) Office management having discussions with garden coordinators at Mesa and Coast regarding duties and tasks the coordinator will perform.

(9) Having discussions with parent groups and/or parents in the Mesa community to develop a student directed child care coop.

(10) Consider having an annual $10 activity fee.
- Mark said that this would provide funding for programming.

(11) Pet Policy Revision.

(12) Town halls.
- Mark said that if the committee wants to have more, then dates and times need to be determined.
- Mark said that if the committee wants to discuss anything else, they can send him or Emily an email.

ARCH Updates from Rebecca
- Rebecca posted the ARCH updates on the drop box.
  - Coast
    - The walking path is currently being worked on. The planned completion date is end of this quarter.
    - Two outdoor showers will be installed by the end of winter quarter.
  - Mesa/OMS
    - The community room at 9126 has been converted into a game room. An electronic lock will be installed on it. The same key card will provide access to Café Vita and the fitness room.
      - Cory asked how many community rooms were left.
        - Rebecca said 3.
  - Shuttle Stickers
    - Enforcement will begin on January 27.
• Lisa asked enforcement can’t wait until Spring Quarter.
  o Mark said that parking wants this to be a “soft opening” to ease everyone into the program. Over 600 stickers have been given out.
• Lisa asked where students can get stickers.
  o Rebecca said the parking office.

Meeting adjourned. Next meeting is Friday, January 31, 2014 from 2pm to 3pm in Rita Atkinson 3rd Floor Conference Room.
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Meeting with Parking and Transportation
- Mark shared that Transportation is going to give the leasing office some shuttle stickers so residents can go there to get one. In response to the concern regarding ID Cards (and spouses/family/guests not being able to obtain one), he announced that HDH could print cards and customize them to say “ARCH guest,” etc.
- Rafael asked who is regulating and enforcing the stickers.
  - Mark said Transportation.
  - Emily asked if the sticker policy is unique to this shuttle alone.
    - Mark said yes because the goal is to limit access to the community and eliminate those who should not be riding the shuttles.
- Cory heard that Parking and Transportation was looking into license plate readers. He believes this would be very useful. Residents could even notify Parking if a guest is staying for a few days and will be parking their car in the lot.
- Don is concerned about the level of policing in the enforcement of the stickers. The community should feel like a community and policing may deter from that. He believes residents would not want to live in a community where they feel policed.
- Brandon talked to his department and got mixed feelings about the stickers. Most preferred to allow everyone to ride the shuttle without restriction. He suggested reaching out to the community to find out how they feel and to do as the majority wishes.

Appeal 266
- Taneshia motioned to vote.
  - Rafael seconded the motion.
    - Appeal denied with 0-9-0 vote.

Appeal 267
- Cory motioned to vote.
  - Taneshia seconded the motion.
    - Appeal denied with 0-8-1 vote.

Appeal 270
- Kim motioned to vote.
  - Taneshia seconded the motion.
    - Appeal denied with 0-8-1 vote.

Appeal 271
- Cory motioned to include in the appeal decision letter, a recommendation from the committee to seek aide from Student Legal Services regarding their current living situation.
  - Brandon seconded the motion.
    - Motion approved with 10-0-0 vote.
- Rafael motioned to vote.
  - Taneshia seconded the motion.
    - Appeal denied with 0-9-1 vote.

Appeal 275
- Cory motioned to vote.
  - Taneshia seconded the motion.
    - Appeal denied with 0-6-4 vote.

Appeal 277
- Cory motioned to vote.
  - Rafael seconded the motion.
    - Appeal denied with 0-10-0 vote.

Appeal 281
- Kim motioned to vote.
  - Taneshia seconded the motion.
    - Appeal denied with 0-10-0 vote.

Mark shared the “Presentation to the Grad Life Steering Committee”
- Mark shared HDH’s goals:
  - To support you, your department, and your students.
  - To increase housing stock for graduate and professional students.
  - To provide 2 year front end guarantee to all incoming single grad/prof students.
  - To continue to look at opportunities to improve overall experience for students
- Future Housing Project
  - HDH has secured support from the committee and the Chancellor.
  - The proposal is a combination of studio, 1 bedroom, and 3 bedroom apartments.
    - Parking will be included.
- Areas of improvement
  - Communication at every level.
  - Improve waitlist/space management process.
  - Resolve student concerns and problems in a timely manner.
  - UG students, residing in ARCH communities, who feel disconnected.
  - Lack of a sense of place or community among residents in ARCH.
  - Increased safety and security for all residents.
  - Students with children and how to identify and serve their unmet needs.
  - Students with spouses and how to identify they unmet needs.
Meeting adjourned at 5:05pm. The next meeting will be on Tuesday, February 18, at 4pm, in the Rita Atkinson 3rd Floor Conference Room.
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Appeal 283
- Lisa motioned to vote.
  ○ Taneshia seconded the motion.
    ▪ Appeal denied with 1-6-3 vote.

Off Campus Housing
- Mark shared that with budget cuts, the Off Campus Housing Office has drastically reduced their hours and staffing. Students are primarily directed to the website for information.
  ○ Emily reviewed the Off Campus Housing website and pointed out that the areas list is missing a lot of locations.
  ○ Mark shared that HDH is proposing to take it over. Graduate students have a 2 year limit. Afterwards, they have to find housing off campus. On the undergraduate side, the guarantee is being reduced to 2 years. They will also have to look for housing off campus afterwards. With the limited staffing and office hours, the only resource available to students is the Off Campus Housing website.
  ○ Rafael asked what HDH is proposing.
    ▪ Mark said that HDH would manage the website and there would be a physical office where students could come and get information.
    ▪ Rafael asked why students would use this instead of craigslist.
      • Mark shared that the listings available through the website would be screened.
      • Emily added that this office would be a valuable resource for students and give them a place to find out more about what to look for in a listing, their rental rights, red flags, etc. The office could also provide tips and tricks on how to find the right one.
  ○ Emily suggested adding landlord reviews to the website (similar to yelp). Students could look up rental properties, read reviews about them (left by previous tenants), and know who to rent or not to rent from.
  ○ Mark agrees. He added that the office would be able to help International students understand the process (signing a contract, putting down a deposit, etc).
• Rochelle thinks this is a necessary program. Having someone there to talk to and answer your questions is very valuable.

Topics of Discussion and possible 2014-15 Budget Items
- Mark said that the budget is being worked on. He referred to the list of future agenda items that he presented at the January 24, 2014 meeting. He asked the committee to vote on whether or not they wanted to keep the items on the list or delete them.
  ○ (12) Town halls.
    ▪ Brandon asked if all the concerns brought up at the previous town halls, were addressed.
      • Mark said that a list was created with all the items and HDH has been addressing them one by one. The Town Halls are a venue for the residents to express their concerns and for HDH to create lists so the items can be addressed. The ones that are incomplete are still being looked into.
    ▪ Committee voted 10-0-0, in favor of keeping item 12 on the list.
    ▪ Emily asked the committee for a date.
      • Rebecca said that she would advertise the Town Halls in the newsletter as soon as a date was selected.
        ○ Emily suggested the third week in April.
        ▪ Committee vote: 10-0-0, approving to have the Town Halls during third week of April.
  ○ (11) Pet Policy Revision.
    ▪ Mark pointed out that if the pet policy is revised, the residents need to be noticed by end of April.
      • By consensus, this item was tabled. Discussion will continue in another meeting.
  ○ (10) Consider having an annual $10 activity fee.
    ▪ Mark explained that since this would be a raise in fee, it would have to be referendum.
    ▪ Rochelle asked if this activity fee would be used for events.
      • Mark said yes.
    ▪ Taneshia asked if this would be an annual fee.
      • Mark said yes.
      • Taneshia asked if it would be per person or per apartment.
        ○ Mark said this would be per contract holder.
    ▪ Lisa believes that staff should organize the events for the residents.
      • Mark said that both staff and residents would be able to request funds for an event.
    ▪ Committee voted 11-0-0, in favor of keeping item 10 on the list.
  ○ (9) Having discussions with parent groups and/or parents in the Mesa community to develop a student directed child care coop.
    ▪ Committee voted 11-0-0, in favor of keeping item 9 on the list.
  ○ (8) Office management having discussions with garden coordinators at Mesa and Coast regarding duties and tasks the coordinator will perform.
    ▪ Committee voted 11-0-0, in favor of keeping item 8 on the list.
  ○ (7) 3 year Phased Painting of South Mesa Apartments.
    ▪ Committee voted 11-0-0, in favor of keeping item 7 on the list.
(6) Revision of "need date" to "first available date they are able to accept the space offered."

(5) Revision of waitlist policy/procedure.
   - Committee voted 11-0-0, in favor of keeping both 5 and 6 on the list.

(4) Re-direct other visitors and guests from OMS to the parking spaces adjacent to the South Mesa 9180 units.

(3) Discuss and consider adding card access control gates to the OMS structure to limit access to just ARCH residents and their guests.
   - Committee voted 11-0-0, in favor of keeping both 3 and 4 on the list.

(2) Adding one more community assistant to Rita Atkinson.
   - Committee voted 11-0-0, in favor of keeping 2 on the list.

(1) Adding one more RSO to security staffing.
   - Committee voted 11-0-0, in favor of keeping 2 on the list.

Cory suggested adding: (13) To revisit and discuss the Shore program.
   - Committee voted 10-0-1, in favor of adding 13 to the list.

Brandon suggested adding: (14) Speeding at Mesa. He suggested getting speed tables.
   - Committee voted 10-0-1, in favor of adding 14 to the list.

Cory added that he would also like to revisit the sound and noise policy.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm. The next meeting will be on Tuesday, February 25, at 4pm, in the Rita Atkinson 3rd Floor Conference Room.
Cory shared that GSA passed a resolution about the Mesa Shuttle. With regard to the shuttle sticker, GSA supports enforcement between the hours of 7:30am to 12pm, Monday through Friday. The resolution also suggests the Transportation Office come up with a guest policy.

- Rebecca shared that her office is working with HDH Marketing to design an affiliate ID card. All those listed on the lease will get an affiliate card and be able to show that they are part of the ARCH community.
- Michael asked about caregivers and giving them access.
  - Rebecca said that caregivers are given keys so they would be able to get a card as well.
  - Mark said that both caregivers and guests can get cards. The guest policy should be discussed.

Appeal 283
- Michael motioned to vote.
  - Rafael seconded the motion.
    - Appeal denied with 4-5-1 vote.

Budget
- Mark asked the members for direction regarding the two year rate concept.
  - Rebecca explained that after further exploration of the idea of a flat two year rate, the new proposal is to determine budgets two years at a time (i.e. the committee would determine both the 2014-15 and 2015-16 budgets this year).
    - Rafael asked how HDH will predict the 2015-16 increases.
      - Rebecca said that the prediction tools would be similar to those used for 2014-15.
      - Mark said that some projections could be high and some will be low but the committee will still be able to review both budgets, line by line. By doing this, each resident will know ahead of time, what their rent increase will be.
  - Rochelle asked how this will apply to families.
    - Rebecca said that families would know their budgets, two years at a time.
If the budgets are determined two years at a time, Kim asked what would happen if there was a need to change the budget to include a large line item afterwards.

- Mark said that it would have to wait until the following year, when the next set of two are determined.

Michael asked if the main idea was to help students prepare for the increase and plan for it.

- Mark said yes. He said that a student coming off the waitlist would know their rental rate for the two years that they would be living on campus. The goal is to be transparent. Doing the budget two years at a time would also free up some meetings for the committee to discuss other items like community building and the new graduate housing project.
  - Michael suggested posting a history of the past rent increases to show residents how much it has gone up and to help them prepare for an increase in rent.

Taneshia asked what the most increase has been in the past few years.

- Rebecca said that it is typically 2%.

Cory thinks it’s a good idea to look at future budgets and possible projections to give residents an idea of what the worst case scenario could be, but believes that determining the budget two years at a time is not feasible. The committee would have to wait until the next time budgets are determined to make a change, even if something is needed right away. He said that students only live in the facilities for two years so if they want to put items on the budget, they would never get to see it.

Lisa said that if this process is helpful, she’d be up for it.

- Mark reiterated that this would be for the benefit of the resident. They could plan in advance and know how much their housing would cost for the entire two years they would be living on campus.

Rochelle thinks it’s a good idea because raising rent always throws residents off. This is beneficial on both ends. She said that she would be able to balance her budget and so would HDH. She likes the idea and supports it.

Emily liked Michael’s idea (to post the history of rent increases for the residents to review). She thinks it is a way to be transparent and will help residents determine how much their rent could go up.

Taneshia said that she’s been a member of this committee for many years and each year, the passion and personality of the committee changes. She doesn’t think doing this would be flexible because it would force the committee to wait two years to make a change. If this is done, she suggested adding money in the budget for wiggle room and emergencies.

Michael suggested seeing what the proposed budget for 2015-16 would look like in detail.

Kim asked the student committee members, from their perspective, if they would like to know their housing rate in advance so they could prepare their budgets.

- Cory said it wouldn’t really make a difference to him.

Michael asked if the committee could see the history (rent increases from the past to present).

- Mark said that this would be possible but he said that it still might not be enough to avoid residents feeling “caught off guard” when their rent is increased.
  - Cory shared that when the rent was increased two years ago, he did receive some questions from the residents in his building. After he shared the budget,
they understood and had no more questions. He suggested being up front with the residents and letting them know that rent may increase by a certain percentage and then explain why.

- Mark asked the members to think this over and discuss it further next week.

Meeting adjourned at 5:03pm. The next meeting will be on Tuesday, March 4, at 4pm, in the Rita Atkinson 3rd Floor Conference Room.
HDH ARCH Advisory Committee meeting minutes
March 4, 2014
Rita Atkinson Residences

Attendees: Mary Beth Ward, Taneshia Higgins, Mark Cunningham, Michael Rivera, Shana Sloboda, Kim Ciero (proxy), Rochelle Lorkovic (Proxy) Lisa Dieu, Ruichen Sun, Brandon Stephens, Rafael Acevedo Russell King, Emily Goodman.

Absent: Don Johnson, Pa Chia Vue;

Call to order: 4:03pm.

Appeal 268: Motion to table indefinitely to hear from OSD: 9, 0, 1; motion passes. Housing will follow-up with OSD.

Appeal 284: PRIME students are granted three years of housing. It is unclear why this is coming to the committee. Motion to table for one week. This appeal should be handled by HDH Leasing office: 6, 3, 1 Motion to table passes.

Appeal 285: Motion to vote 0, 11, 0; denied.

Appeal 287: Discussion regarding extensions and timing access for students that are travelling from other areas of the country/world. Motion to vote: 0, 10, 1; denied.

Affiliate Cards. Mark showed some wonderful designs for affiliate cards at Mesa, OMS, Coast, Rita, SGA, and La Jolla del Sol. Cards will be available to anyone on the contract. Students, spouse, child, partner, caregivers, guests, etc. Cards give you access to community rooms and apartments. These would be a good place to hold the sticker from transportation. 11;0;0 Passes.

Suggested dates for town hall meetings. April 15 Mesa/OMS and April 16 Coast are bad days. 4/22 Rita, and SGA on 4/24 are good. Dates for Mesa/OMS and Coast need to be rescheduled.

ARCHAC meeting dates for the rest of the quarter:

3/11 -yes
3/18 (finals week) -yes
3/25 no meeting-spring break -yes

Spring Quarter we need to doodle for a new day/time. Yes.

Looking ahead: We need to determine levels of service and rates concept. Discussion about concepts. Consider looking longer term cost agreements which include estimated costs for a two year period. This is about improving transparency with the students. Suggestion: describe a maximum % increase for the second year of the lease. Housing will present a line item budget models for FY14-15 and FY15-16. Motion: Housing bring forward 2 year budget. Vote: 9, 0, 2. Motion passes.

Adjourn. 5:04pm
Appeals and PRIME Program
- Mark asked for clarification on the PRIME program.
  - Lisa explained that it is a dual degree program. Students in this program leave UCSD after their third year to pursue a Masters degree.
  - Rochelle asked when the program started.
    - Lisa said that the program is about 4-5 years old.
- Taneshia was confused about why the committee was reviewing PRIME appeals.
  - Rebecca explained that two years ago, the committee decided that they would look at PRIME appeals on a case by case basis to determine whether or not they would grant an extension. There hasn’t been a PRIME appeal since then.
  - Mark asked for direction from the committee regarding appeals to extend from PRIME students.
- Rochelle asked how long the program is.
  - Lisa said 5 years.
  - Emily pointed out that the population of students in this program is very small.
  - Taneshia said that these students travel to underprivileged locations to help.
- Lisa motioned to change the policy and allow PRIME students three years of housing.
  - Taneshia seconded the motion.
    - Motion approved with 9-0-0 vote.

Pet Survey and Policy
- Cory took a closer look at the results of the Pet Survey and shared his results with the committee.
  - He provided a breakdown of the percentage of people who have pets:
    - Of the 925 residents who took survey, 142 have pets (15.4%).
    - Of the 119 waitlisted students who took the survey, 18 have pets (16.4%).
    - Of the 124 former residents who took the survey, 32 have pets (25.8%).
    - Of the 52 non-resident graduate students who took the survey, 23 have pets (44.2%).
- Brandon asked who the survey was sent out to.
  - Rebecca said all graduate students, all housing waitlisted students, and all residents.
- Cory provided a breakdown of those willing to live with a dog:
  - 79.6% said yes to living with a dog in the community.
  - 57.7% said yes to living with a dog in the unit.
  - 68.5% said yes to living with a dog previously in the unit.
- He also shared that 20% of people said that they did not want to live with pets either in the unit, community, or previously in the unit. He believes this is a significant population and that the committee should keep this in mind when looking at the pet policy.
- After reviewing all the data, Cory stated that there should be an area that is pet free. He said that the committee should also think about how to deal with a situation where a person moves in and decides a few months down the line that they do want to have a pet. He posed the following questions: Would the person appeal? Would they be put on a waitlist to be moved into a “pet area?” He believes the committee should develop a good approval process. He doesn’t believe the new pet policy should be a blanket "we are allowing all pets" policy because there are so many components involved.
- Lisa is against having pets and believes they will just cause more problems. Since the survey results indicate that many are OK with pets, she agrees that there should be a pet friendly community. She suggested having a trial community to test the pet policy out before rolling the program out to the other communities. She suggested that Mesa be the test community.
- Russ pointed out that the committee will have to keep elevators in mind too. In a building with elevators that allows pets, residents will often get on and off with a pet. If the elevator is carpeted, it will have to be changed and cleaned often. When considering which facilities should be pet free, he suggested thinking about those with elevators.
- Kim said that having pets will be an administrative nightmare for housing between developing the policy and all the cleaning needed. She believes that regardless of how the students answered the survey, their feelings when the policy is implemented will be different. She believes the policy should be implemented slowly.
- Lisa asked how Housing felt about having pets and changing the pet policy.
  - Rebecca said that Housing is here to take care of the administrative process. There will indeed be more cleaning but, as discussed, that cost will be built into the program.
  - Kim pointed out that there will be an endless amount of animal complaints.
  - Brandon pointed out that there are already a lot of dogs in the communities and the Housing Office has already been dealing with it.
  - Cory said that the new pet policy should have strong language regarding regulations so that Housing can enforce it easily.
- Brandon likes the idea of having a trial basis community in one part of Mesa. He said that his daughter likes to play on the grass and sometimes finds dog poop there. There is currently no policy about that. If there are designated pet areas, it might help the situation.
- Ruichen asked if the policy would require neutering. She also asked if there is currently a policy for service dogs.
  - Emily said the original plan was to have specifications about what is allowed (size, weight, immunizations, etc.).
  - Mark explained that service dogs are handled by OSD. He said that the committee can build into the policy, anything they want.
- Rochelle asked how the new pet policy will affect the waitlist. If part of Mesa is turned into a “pet friendly” area, she asked how Housing will deal with having an excess of one population over another (those who want pets versus those who do not).
  - Mark said that the number of pet friendly spaces would be controlled.
- Brandon asked how Housing currently addresses residents who are reported to have pets.
  - Rebecca explained that the Housing Office contacts the resident and informs them of the pet policy. This usually resolves the issue.
- Cory said the existing policy is overly conservative but doesn’t believe the new one should be too restrictive. If residents have to jump through too many hoops, there will be a lot of illegal pets.
- Ruichen suggested placing a limit on the number of pets allowed in a unit. She said there may be issues if different pets, or too many pets, live together. She also doesn’t think waitlisted students, who are OK with living with a pet, should have to wait until a pet friendly apartment is available.
  - Rebecca said that waitlisted students would be offered the first available.
- Mark said that this is an opportunity to address something that is very important to the residents. He believes there should be a pet policy and that those who break the rule should be held accountable. He agrees and doesn’t think the doors should be thrown open, allowing all pets into every facility.
- Emily said that it would be easier to enforce the rules if a policy is in place. This will also help with appeals.
- Kim asked if any of the other UC’s have a successful pet policy.
  - Rebecca said that she does not believe any of the other campuses allow dogs in their housing facilities.
- Cory said that the committee also needs to look into the guest policy and their pets. The pet policy should have clear rules about guests bringing over pets.
  - Taneshia believes that if dogs are not allowed in the community, residents should not be dog sitting, nor should guests be bringing over pets.
  - Cory shared that he had a friend who would bring their dog over every now and then for an hour. He said the verbiage needs to be clear about what is allowed and what is not allowed.
  - Rochelle said that the pet policy should be like the smoking policy. Guests are not allowed to smoke because the campus is smoke free. If the dogs are not allowed in the facility, guests should not bring dogs over.
- Mark asked the committee if they wanted him to bring forth a new policy for review. The committee could add, change, and remove parts as they feel is necessary.
  - Rebecca shared that the Housing Office does inspect regularly for signs of pets.
  - Rochelle said she thinks the committee should look at a policy to see if it can be tailored to what the residents want. She pointed out that although 20% do not want pets, the majority does and the committee can’t ignore that.
  - Mark said that the 20% that don’t want pets, is the reason why the doors shouldn’t be thrown open to allow pets everywhere. If the office knows where the pets are, they can plan for deep cleanings, etc.
  - Kim pointed out that the committee will start to get appeals about not being able to move off campus because off campus locations won’t accept their dog.
  - Mark asked if the committee would like Housing draft up a policy for review.
    - General consensus of the committee was yes.
Meeting adjourned at 5:08pm. The next meeting will be on Tuesday, March 18, at 4pm, in the Rita Atkinson 3rd Floor Conference Room.