Rebecca gave each committee member a copy of the past/present/proposed budgets and the rental rate comparison history.

- Rebecca explained that in 2010-2011, the rates were adjusted and lowered at One Miramar. The Housing Office noticed that people were waiting to get into Mesa because the rates were cheaper. She worked with the Advisory Committee to adjust rates for the purpose of leveling out occupancy in all of the communities. The % of increase in rent from 2008 to present ranged from 2.89 to 5.95.

- In preparation for the budget discussion, the committee was provided the 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 budgets. Rebecca explained that in previous years, the committee would be given last year's budget, the current budget, and the proposed budget to review. This committee requested to review the history so the 2011-12 was provided as well. The handout also provides the proposed budgets for 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17. She reminded the committee that the goal of determining the budgets ahead of time, is to be able to provide students with their rates up front for the entire time they will be living in graduate housing (2 years). The focus is the 2014-15 budget because the Housing Office needs to provide 60 days of notice of rent increase to their current residents. She will walk through the data and each item, line by line.

  - Brandon asked if the committee is set on determining two years' of budgets.
    - Rebecca said that the committee requested to have it put on paper so they could review and consider whether or not they wanted to do it.
    - Brandon mentioned that some parents live here for 4-5 years. He is worried that if the budgets are determined every two years, the residents would just be hit with a bigger increase every two years instead of a steady increase every year.
      - Rebecca explained that there will be an increase every year. The only difference is they will know ahead of time, what that increase will be. She also mentioned that the new housing facility has already been built into the proposed budgets. They are estimating an average increase of 3.5% over the next few years.

  - Mary Beth asked why families are exempt from the two year housing rule.
    - Rebecca explained that this committee made that decision. They reviewed issues like daycare, school, and stability for the families. They decided that families should have priority and that they would be able to stay in housing thru the duration of their program.
- Rafael said that this makes sense. It is hard to move a single person so imagine what it would be like to move an entire family.

- Rebecca reviewed the Income section.
  - The first line item is bad debt. This occurs when residents don’t pay rent and the debt has to be written off.
  - The next line is cancellations. A resident is assessed a cancellation charge if they cancel after the agreement is signed and prior to move in. This generates a small amount of income.
  - Damages include move-out, cleaning, and damage charges.
  - Late fee – A $20 late fee is assessed if rent is not paid by the 5th of the month.
    - Rafael asked why the late fee total is so high in this year’s budget as opposed to other years.
      - Rebecca explained that they realized they were underestimating in the previous years.
  - Miscellaneous charges include vendor rebates and any additional income they might bring in.
  - Regular session room/rent is budgeted based on 98% occupancy.
  - Keys - If a resident doesn’t turn in keys or needs to get a replacement key, they are charged accordingly.
  - Plus Card Commission – This is a small amount income received from the commission charged to Triton Cash vendors.
  - The next few line items are new.
    - New housing
    - 3rd party lease revenue – Rebecca explained that there may be an opportunity in the new housing facility to have commercial space that can be leased out.
    - Advisory Committee Managed Activity Fee – Rebecca explained that this the activity fee that Mark brought up at a previous meeting.
    - Other – this item includes any new opportunities to generate income.

- Rebecca reviewed the Expenses section.
  - She explained that ARCH Admin includes office employees but not ARCH maintenance or custodial staff.
    - FTE stands for full time employee salaries. Casual stands for any temp employees that we may use throughout the year. These amounts also include benefits.
    - S&E stands for supplies and expenses, which include pens, paper, etc.
  - Maintenance and Custodial have the same line items as well.
  - The HDH overhead is money allotted to pay for HDH services like IT, Administrative Services, Marketing, etc.

- Rebecca reviewed the General Services section.
  - She explained that these are services that received from other vendors.
    - Rafael asked why the cost of cable dropped.
      - Rebecca explained that we went from the campus provider to Time Warner Cable.
  - NGN Data Assessment stands for Next Generation Network Data Assessment, which is the Ethernet.
  - The next line item is trash removal and recycling. The amount of pickups has been reduced because they weren’t needed as often.
  - Utilities include water and sewer, etc. for all of the ARCH communities.
Mary Beth asked what the students pay for.

- Rebecca said electricity. Housing covers water, trash, and sewage. At Rita, she has seen bills between $2 and $40 (she’s hasn’t seen anything over $40).
  - Next item is refrigerator/stove replacement. There was no money designated for this in 2013-14 but there are funds allotted for this in the proposed budgets.
  - Fire/Life Safety Upgrades to existing is another line item where no funds were allotted for this in 2013-14 but there are in the proposed budgets.
  - The shuttle line item is an estimate because parking hasn’t provided their numbers yet.
  - Grounds includes salaries, benefits, supplies and expenses; all in one line item.
    - Rebecca shared that Russ is on a committee that walks the grounds regularly.
  - Rebecca said that tree trimming was reduced to zero for the 2013-14 budget. The committee will need to look at this again this year because the trees need to be trimmed regularly.
    - Mary Beth asked why this amount isn’t under Grounds.
      - Russ explained that this is a separate contract and HDH has to hire out for that.
  - Next is storm drain cleaning, which will see a small increase of 2.93% each year for the next two years.
  - The ACS/Internet and Services Recharge is the cost the campus assesses for these services.
  - Similarly, the Admin Recharge ACT is the cost the campus assesses for these services.
  - CAMPUS ASSA Assessment includes campus services like central HR.
    - Ruichen asked what the difference is between HDH Overhead and Campus ASSA.
      - Rebecca explained that HDH Overhead is payment for services from HDH divisions like financial services, strategic planning, IT, and marketing. The Campus ASSA is payment for campus services like police services and HR. Those amounts are not negotiable and is a percentage of the budget. HDH is an auxiliary service and is required pay for all services received from the campus.
      - Rafael shared that this is the same for his department too. They must pay for all the services they use too.
  - Insurance covers all the insurance costs.
  - The Post Office line item covers all mail related expenses and costs associated with the One Miramar and Rita mail rooms.
  - The Security line item pays for the RSO.
    - Rafael asked if this is where the committee would see an increase if the decision was made to add a second RSO.
      - Rebecca said yes.
    - Ruichen asked why the RSO is not under staffing with the other HDH employees.
      - Rebecca explained that the RSO is not an HDH employee. This person is from a different department on campus and HDH is contracting them for their service.
  - The VCBA Info System assessment is payment for the ISIS/IFIS system that is used to assess the housing bill.
  - Debt Services are the mortgage payments.
  - Rebecca then explained the final section: ARCH Capital Projects.
She said that these are items where there is more flexibility in terms of identifying what dollar amounts should be allocated. The categories include:

- Major Maintenance or improvement projects. Most of these funds will go to flooring, carpet, and vinyl.
- SGA improvements (the renovation was done a few years ago). Mark funded the improvements with reserves and a line item was added to the budget to repay the expense.
- On-going refreshing of existing apartments.
  - Mary Beth asked how long it took HDH to refresh the apartment.
    - Rebecca said about 10 weeks.
- On-going carpet/sheet vinyl replacement.
- Access control for OMS parking structure (the installation of gates, as discussed earlier this year).
- New housing project (pre-financing costs).
- New housing project (Furnishings - non unit).
- New housing project (Furnishing – unit).

- Rebecca asked the committee to review the numbers and bring any questions to the next meeting.
  - Taneshia thought that when Mark proposed to set the rates for the next few years that the rates would be the same for the next few years, with no increase. After seeing these proposed rates and the gradual increase, she is more comfortable with the idea of setting rates for the next few years.
  - Rafael agrees.
  - Brandon agrees and explained that this was why he was concerned for parents. He thought that setting the rates meant the rate would be the same for two years and then there would be a jump up after that. He was worried the jump would be high. After reviewing the proposed budgets, he is more comfortable with the idea of setting rates for the next few years.

Meeting adjourned 5:04pm. The next meeting will be on Tuesday, April 8, at 4pm, in the Rita Atkinson 3rd Floor Conference Room.
Associated Residential Community Housing (ARCH) Advisory Committee
April 8, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT:  EMILY GOODMAN
LISA DIEU (PROXY FOR KIM CIERO)
TANESHIA HIGGINS (PROXY FOR RAFAEL ACEVEDO)
DON JOHNSON
ROCHELLE LORKOVIC
REBECCA OTTEN
BRANDON STEPHENS
CORY STEVENSON (PROXY FOR RUICHEN SUN)
PA CHIA VUE
MARY BETH WARD

Proposed 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17 Budget Review
- Lisa asked if Rebecca knew where the new housing facility will be located.
  - Rebecca said that it might be built at Mesa. The building advisory committee is still being pulled together.
- Don asked if Housing will be tracking the number of families that will be displaced, due to the tearing down of some spaces.
  - Rebecca said that nobody will be displaced. The new facility will have studios, one bedrooms, and three bedrooms. There will be spaces for families there.
- Rebecca asked the committee to review tree trimming.
  - Lisa asked if there was a flat cost to trim all the trees or if it was charged per tree.
    - Rebecca said that it is charged per tree.
    - Lisa agrees that money should be allotted for it but not the proposed amounts.
    - Rebecca said that if necessary money allocated for S&E could be used to cover emergency tree trimming (instead of using it on appliances, for example).
    - Don said he would consider any amount between $25,000 and $50,000.
      - Rebecca said that whatever amount the committee decides, Housing will make it work.
    - Cory asked if Rebecca could provide more information about tree trimming costs and how much it cost in the past.
      - Rebecca shared that a full tree trimming for all the communities could easily cost $100,000.
    - Lisa thinks the amount should be $50,000 because she does not like the idea of using S&E money for tree trimming. She doesn’t want to take that money away from appliances.
    - Rebecca changed the proposed tree trimming amounts to $50,000.
- Rebecca asked the committee to review the proposed housing rates. She explained that in the past, a straight percentage increase was used. She also provided the committee with an example of what the rates would look like if the increase was done by the number of beds.
  - Don likes the fixed rate increase. He doesn’t think the increase by number of beds is fair.
  - Lisa agrees that the increase should be a straight percentage across the board and not done by number of beds.
    - Rebecca adjusted the proposed rates, implementing a 3.3% increase for 2014-15 and 2015-16. The 2016-17 budget was adjusted to have a 3.5% increase.
- Cory said that things may jump up in the future, due to circumstances like union contracts, so this will give a little bit of flexibility to move funds around.
  - Lisa asked if the committee only needed to approve 2014-15 and 2015-16.
    - Rebecca said that the committee would also need to approve 2016-17 because a resident that moves in December 2014 would need rates through 2016-17.
    - HDH will work with whatever budget the committee recommends.
    - Cory is concerned that there may be a huge jump after the new housing facility is built.
  - Don motioned to vote on the budget for the next three years with a 3.3% rate increase in 2014-15 and 2015-16, and a 3.5% increase in 2016-17.
    - Lisa seconded the motion.
      - Budget approved with 9-0-0 vote.

Meeting adjourned at 5:03pm. The next meeting will be on Thursday, April 17, at 2pm, in the Rita Atkinson 3rd Floor Conference Room.
Associated Residential Community Housing (ARCH) Advisory Committee
April 17, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT:  EMILY GOODMAN (PROXY FOR BRANDON STEPHENS)
MARK CUNNINGHAM
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PA CHIA VUE
MARY BETH WARD

Rent Increase Letter
- Rebecca shared that she and her team drafted the rent increase letter and would like the committee’s feedback on it.
  o Cory asked for clarification on why the committee reviewed and approved three years’ worth of budgets. He thought the committee was only going to review two years.
    ▪ Rebecca explained that if the goal is to provide two years of rates to each student when they sign a lease, a person moving in December 2014 would need rates through December 2016. We would need the 2016-17 budget to be able to provide them with the rate.
    ▪ Cory thought the committee was only going to review two years.
      • Rebecca reminded Cory that the motion (voted on at the previous meeting) was to approve a rate increase of 3.3% in 2014-15, 3.3% in 2015-16, and 3.5% in 2016-17.

- Rebecca showed the committee the rent increase draft and asked for feedback on the wording. She said that they would like to use the same letter at all the communities.
  o She asked for thoughts on having Emily, as Co-Chair, sign the letter too. She shared that this was something they used to do in the past.
    ▪ Emily said she wouldn’t mind.
  o Taneshia asked if all three years of rates are going to be listed in the letter or just two. She is concerned that residents may think they are here through July 2017.
    ▪ Rebecca suggested adding the following sentence to help with clarification: "These rates may extend beyond the terms of your rental agreement."
  o The committee asked Rebecca to put the same sentence on the other side of the notice (on the Notice to Change Terms of Tenancy).
  o The committee reviewed the rest of the letter and provided Rebecca with grammatical and punctuation suggestions.

Appeals
- Appeal 296
  o Mary Beth motioned to vote.
    ▪ Taneshia seconded the motion.
      • Appeal denied with 0-5-2 vote.
- Appeal 307
  - Mary Beth motioned to vote.
    - Taneshia seconded the motion.
      - Appeal denied with 0-4-3 vote.

- Appeal 311
  - Cory motioned to vote.
    - Mary Beth seconded the motion.
      - Appeal denied with 0-7-0 vote.

- Appeal 313
  - Cory motioned to vote.
    - Rafael seconded the motion.
      - Appeal denied with 0-7-0 vote.

- Appeal 315
  - Cory motioned to vote.
    - Mary Beth seconded the motion.
      - Appeal denied with 0-5-2 vote.

Pet Policy
- Mark prefaced that according to the pet survey, there are people who are “for” having pets and people against it. So, a list of options was created for the committee to review.
  - Rebecca shared that Derek, General Manager (Coast, Rita, and Single Grad) put together the list of options. She reviewed the options with the committee.
    - Option 1 is the current pet policy and regulations.
    - Option 2 allows dogs at all ARCH communities, except for Single Grad (but they are open to discussion about Single Grad).
      - With regard to the Estimated Annual Costs, Derek did some research and determined the costs based on his conversations with other rental properties and his own experience in the field.
      - With regard to enforcement, the third offense is a notice to quit.
    - Option 3 allows dogs in specific buildings in the communities, excluding Single Grad.
  - Rebecca shared that they did contact Legal Services to get advice when these options were prepared. The breed restrictions listed are based on what other communities are doing. She explained that if the committee decides they do want dogs in the communities, a more comprehensive policy would be drafted.
  - Cory pointed out that the survey showed that at least 20% of people did not want pets so he believes option 3 is the most feasible. He suggested restricting pets to the facilities that have open air layouts. He suggested Coast and Mesa.
    - Rochelle agreed and said that the first floor of OMS is ok too.
    - Cory suggested Mesa as a starting point.
  - Rochelle asked about the residents that currently have a pet. She asked if they would have to move into the designated pet areas.
    - Rebecca shared that her professional opinion is yes but she said that we can definitely talk about it as a committee.
    - Rochelle suggested telling them that they can’t have a dog until they can be moved into one of those spaces.
    - Emily said that if the request one of those spaces, it would let the office know who has a pet.
- Mark agreed. He said that if the office knows then they can prepare.
  - Ruichen asked how Housing will balance need versus supply when determining how many apartments to set aside for pets.
    - Cory suggested having students register online and indicate that they want to move into a pet community. This could help determine need.
  - Mary Beth asked Emily, Cory, and Rochelle how they felt about having dogs in the communities, since they live/lived on campus.
    - Emily shared that she has no problem with it, as long as there is a policy that pet owners will have to follow.
    - Cory thinks having a community with dogs is a great idea. He sees little downside to it. But, he would not want to live in an apartment with a dog. The only issue he sees is noise complaints.
    - Rochelle shared that she would happily live in community without pets because there are so many issues to deal with, including poop and allergies. She is on the fence about it. She said that as long as they can be in a separate area, she’d be ok with it.
    - Ruichen said that she does not want to live with one but doesn’t mind living in a community with dogs.
    - Mary Beth said that she is concerned about people moving into a space and not getting along with their roommate’s dog.
      - Emily said that this is going to happen because she’s had it happen in her house.
      - Rebecca shared that a Pet Regulation and Roommate Conflict position has been built into the cost to deal with issues like this.
  - Rebecca asked the committee if they wanted to include Rita or not, as one of the pet designated areas.
    - The committee said not to include Rita.

Meeting adjourned. The next meeting will be on Thursday, April 24, at 2pm, in the Rita Atkinson 3rd Floor Conference Room.
Associated Residential Community Housing (ARCH) Advisory Committee
May 1, 2014
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PA CHIA VUE
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Appeals
- Appeal 304
  o Lisa motioned to vote.
    ▪ Mary Beth seconded the motion.
      • Appeal denied with 0-8-0 vote.
- Appeal 306
  o Lisa motioned to vote.
    ▪ Mary Beth seconded the motion.
      • Appeal denied with 0-7-1 vote.
- Appeal 310
  o Michael motioned to table the appeal until the committee gets more information.
    ▪ Kim seconded the motion.
      • Motion approved with 8-0-0 vote.
- Appeal 319
  o Lisa motioned to vote.
    ▪ Mary Beth seconded the motion.
      • Appeal denied with 0-8-1 vote.
- Appeal 324
  o Rafael motioned to vote.
    ▪ Mary Beth seconded the motion.
      • Appeal denied with 0-9-0 vote.

Pet Policy
- Rebecca presented the committee with two more pet policy options, based off the comments received from the previous meeting.
- The first is the current policy with revised enforcement. By the third offense, the resident is served a notice to quit.
- The second designates 10% of Coast, Mesa, and One Miramar as dog friendly. This would allow two indoor cats or dogs per person, with a max of two pets per apartment.
- Michael asked about the roommate policy.
  - Rebecca said that those processes aren’t in here yet. Once the committee decides which option they prefer, they will move forward with developing those policies.
  - Emily believes that the general idea is that specific units will be deemed dog friendly and only people living in those units can have dogs.
  - Michael asked what would happen if you lived in a dog friendly unit and your roommate wanted a dog, but you didn’t.
    - Rebecca said that the office can find another apartment for the person who wants a dog, to move into. She elaborated further and explained that when a person is offered a space, they will be told ahead of time whether or not it is a dog friendly unit or if a dog is already present.
    - Cory suggested adding an addendum to the contract stipulating that if you live in a dog friendly unit, it could happen.

- Rafael likes the idea of approaching this slowly.
  - Mark said that they are going to get feedback from residents when this launches. This is going to take some time because they want to have a process in place that everyone can follow.
  - Rafael suggested adding “are you a dog lover?” to the housing application. He also suggested creating a better algorithm to match roommates.
Kim asked how Housing will deal with a person who says they are OK with a dog, but realizes later that they are not because the dog barks all day long when their roommate is in the lab.
- Mark said that this is part of the responsibility of having a pet. If Housing gets complaints about the dog barking all day, the owner has to be responsible for that. Somebody is going to have a dog that barks and Housing will have to be prepared for that.
- Emily added that paying $75 a month is cheaper than being evicted with a dog and trying to find a place that will take your pet.
- Michael said that the committee has made a great effort up to this point. If option 1 is selected, at least the problem is resolved partially. Option 2 seems like it’ll have a lot of potential problems. He motioned to adopt option 1 and strike two.
  - Kim asked, if option two is adopted, would the committee start receiving appeals about not being able to find an apartment that will take their pet?
    - Mark said it might happen. He pointed out that these are the right questions to ask.
    - Emily reiterated that when a person decides to get a pet, they have to take responsibility. These issues are what they are signing up for. She has minimal sympathy and pointed out that many of the members on this committee had to take responsibility and find a place off campus.
  - Cory objected to motion.
    - Sonha asked if there are big problems with the pets currently allowed in the facilities.
      - Rebecca said the only issue is that if a unit has a cat in it, it’s hard to put someone in there.
- Michael motioned again to adopt option 1 and strike 2.
  - Taneshia seconded the motion. There were no objections.
    - Option 1 adopted with 6-2-1 vote.
- Ruichen asked how illegal dogs will be dealt with since option 2 did not pass.
  - Rebecca explained that if a dog is found, Housing will take down the resident’s information and give them a deadline to get rid of the dog. They will follow up afterwards to ensure it was done.
- Sonha asked if there is currently a problem with fleas and cleanliness.
  - Mark said yes because there are illegal pets in the communities.

Next Week’s Agenda
- Mark asked the committee to put on their “forward thinking hats.” They are in the midst of getting the graduate housing project ready to go. This committee needs to discuss common spaces and amenities. He said that this should be a community that students want to live in.
  - Cory suggested getting rid of the 2 year policy.
    - Mark said we can talk about that too. He is going to post some information in the dropbox. He asked the committee to think about what they would want in the community and what graduate students need.

Meeting adjourned at 3pm. The next meeting will be on Thursday, May 8, at 2pm, in the Rita Atkinson 3rd Floor Conference Room.