

From: Morris, Michael <michael.morris@csuci.edu>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2020 1:52 PM
To: Jetton, Christopher <christopher.jetton888@csuci.edu>
Subject: FW: Question: Parking: Fines and new space

Question from Senate:

How much revenue comes to the parking budget from fines?
How is this used? Meaning: how much is overhead vs producing new parking spaces?
How have these changed over the past five years?

Should such numbers not be directly available, could you provide the past five year overview of:
parking revenue by year,
number of parking spaces, by year,
number of such spaces for faculty, by year,
cost of the overhead* by year within parking
*both loan repayment as well as cost to monitor/patrol parking.

Thanks,

Greg

From: Jetton, Christopher <christopher.jetton888@csuci.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2020 9:29 PM
To: Wood, Gregory <gregory.wood@csuci.edu>
Cc: Morris, Michael <michael.morris@csuci.edu>
Subject: FW: Question: Parking: Fines and new space

Hi Greg,

I hope this email finds you well in these unprecedented times. My apologies for not getting you this email sooner. Please find below my response to the Academic Senate's Intent to Raise Questions which may be shared. If you or any member of the senate have any further questions or need any clarification please don't hesitate to reach out.

CSUCI Transportation and Parking Services (TPS) is a self-funded Axillary Organization of the University, which receives no state funding. TPS generates all of its funding with revenues collected from the sale of parking permits and a limited revenue collected from fines and forfeitures. These revenues must cover all of our operational expenses, including parking lot maintenance, capitol construction of new parking lots, bond debt service for existing and future parking lots, all of our transportation programs, employee salaries and benefits, campus and chancellor's office administrative fees, and other department operational costs. Current transportation program costs alone (VCTC Intercity Bus, Zipcar program and Camarillo Trolley) add up to nearly \$600,000 in fixed expenditures each year, and this number continues to rise. While it can often be a common misconception that we would issue more citations to generate more revenue, this is far from the case.

The University Police Department and TPS, under the direction of Chief Michael Morris, adhere to an educational based enforcement philosophy by which we hope to encourage voluntary compliance with the Parking Rules and Regulations. It is our hope that through parking enforcement activities, members of our community will learn from their mistakes, and the improper parking will not repeat. Because of this, we encourage everyone who receives a parking citation to file an appeal online. Through the online appeal, we are able to engage the violator in an educational process and encourage voluntary compliance with the rules. To illustrate this point, last year we issued 4,971 parking citations on campus and in the University Glen Community. Of these citations, 2,006 (40%) completed an appeal online. Of those appealed citations, we dismissed 81% and reduced the fine amount of 11%. Our goal simply is not to generate revenue via issuing citations. In total, last fiscal year we generated \$142,650 in fines and forfeiture revenue. Each year we budget for approximately \$100,000 in fines & forfeiture revenue; however, the actual amount collected varies from year to year. Some years we have slightly more and other years we have slightly less. This may seem like a large sum, but it is a mere drop in the bucket in comparison to the overall 2.48 million dollar parking budget (from parking permit revenue). A breakdown of the last five years of revenue and expenses in the fines and forfeitures account is as follows.

FY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Fines & Forfeiture Revenue	\$164,006.00	\$77,590.48	\$172,775.42	\$129,492.75	\$142,650.00
Interest & Investment Revenue		\$557.65	\$1,118.33	\$2,323.46	\$2,496.71
Total Expenses	(\$106,611.23)	(\$100,224.88)	(\$99,304.47)	(\$89,284.63)	(\$115,273.90)
Account Total	\$57,394.77	(\$22,076.75)	\$74,589.28	\$42,531.58	\$29,872.81

To add to this discussion, California Education Code § 89701.5 (full text below), restricts the use of fines and forfeiture revenue to only be used for alternative transportation programs and to cover the cost of administering the fines and forfeitures program. As previously stated, our alternative transportation programs alone cost nearly \$600,000 annually, requiring TPS to fund the majority of our transportation programs from parking permit revenues. These revenues are the same funding used for the future construction of parking lot expansions (usually via a bond issued through the Chancellor's Office), all of our parking lot maintenance, including re-striping the parking lots, and our other operational costs. Simply put, revenue from fines and forfeitures is restricted primarily to alternative transportation and cannot be used for parking lot maintenance or construction or any of our other operational costs.

Parking permit costs are directly tied to long term projections based on anticipated bond debt payments, expected increases to operational costs, maintaining reserves for debt bond service

and economic uncertainty, as required by the Chancellor's Office, and all of our unfunded transportation program expenses. While we have needed to increase the cost of parking permits over time to cover all of these expenses and prepare for taking on additional bond debt to fund construction of our new parking lot expansions, these past increases have been primarily shared by the students and MPPs on campus. Faculty and staff collective bargaining agreements have placed restrictions on our ability to increase the parking permit costs in conjunction with the students. I have included a visual graph below illustrating the different costs currently paid by various bargaining units compared to students, consultants, and MPP work groups in the course of a single calendar year. Students have voiced concerns related to the inequity of parking costs on campus, and this will likely remain a hot topic of discussion in the near future.

As we continue to grow our beautiful campus, TPS has actively engaged with our Alternative Transportation Sub-Committee (which includes both faculty and academic affairs representation) and our campus planners to develop plans for the future development of parking lots, which will accommodate our growth, while still emphasizing alternative transportation options. We are working closely with our campus partners in the development of future Transportation and Parking improvements and expansions, including working with Academic Affairs in an effort to achieve some smoothing of the academic schedule to help alleviate the "parking crunch" times during hours of the day. Additionally, we will continue to seek a sustainable funding source for our alternative transportation programs, which may hopefully help to alleviate the inevitable increase of parking permit costs as the campus continues to grow.

Please let me know if you would like any clarification or if you have any further questions or concerns. I am always happy to speak with anyone about our TPS programs and our plans for the future and hear any feedback (positive and negative) about our services. I have attached a snapshot of the overall actuals from last fiscal year as a point of reference to this email. While this is not exactly the same year to year, it is fairly consistent with expenses increasing and parking revenue decreasing each year as we prioritize alternative transportation methods over single occupancy vehicle trips to the campus.

Respectfully,

Chris

Christopher K. Jetton
Lieutenant – Police Administration
California State University Channel Islands
One University Drive
Camarillo, CA 93012-8599
805-437-8444

From: Bowden, Nathan <nathan.bowden@csuci.edu>

Sent: Friday, February 28, 2020 8:47 AM

To: Wood, Gregory <gregory.wood@csuci.edu>

Cc: Hunt, Thomas <thomas.hunt@csuci.edu>

Subject: Follow-Up on Herbicides/Pesticides Question

Hi Greg,

Hope you're doing well. We met a while back at the Campus Acquisition Committee meeting last fall. I work in the BFA Vice President's Office and am following up on a question that was raised at the recent Academic Senate meeting regarding herbicides and pesticides used on campus. I understand the specific questions were (1) what herbicides and pesticides are used on campus and (2) whether there is a spraying schedule. The following is the information provided by our Facilities team in response.

The Facilities team does not have a set schedule for application of herbicides and pesticides. Per the team's standard operating procedure, referred to as the Integrated Weed Management Plan (attached), the Facilities team first looks to use other methods for controlling weeds and pests before the application of chemicals. When herbicides and pesticides are used, they are generally applied in early spring, before weed seeds start to germinate.

Following is the list of herbicides that are used on campus:

1. Finale
2. Speed Zone Southern
3. Turflon Ester
4. FreeHand
5. Pendulum AquaCap

One pesticide is used on campus: Zylam 20SG. Please see the attached document entitled "Herbicide and Pesticide SDS sheets," for a listing of labels for each of the chemicals.

We hope this provides the requested information, but please let us know if not or if additional information is needed.

Thanks,
Nathan

Nathan Bowden

Director of Strategic Operations
Division of Business & Financial Affairs
California State University Channel Islands
805-437-3719

Question:

"In 2006, noted architect, Norman Foster, a Pritzker Award winner, was hired to design the John Spoor Broome Library. The project cost \$56 million dollars to build and opened in 2008. Original designs as represented by a model currently on display in the Library indicate

clearly that the Library was not completed, as he intended to fold in or reuse the two Spanish Mission Style wings that were initially built as part of the Camarillo State Hospital.

Equally interesting is that there was at one time a group that has been called at different times Campus Planning Committee or Master Plan Committee both of which included faculty representation. The last mention of this group that I can find on our web site is 2015.

The Broome family funded a large part of the Library construction. Many in the Library understand that the Broome family was particularly drawn to Foster's vision of the Library.

I learned recently that soon ground will be broken on a project that will see both the flattening of Sage as well as the demolition of the North wing adjacent to the Library. And I just attended a briefing on the Early Childhood Education construction which would demolish the south wing of the Library. Both plans represent a departure from Norman Foster's initial plan.

My questions are: Why have we abandoned the vision set forth by Lord Norman Foster? In what way were faculty engaged or participants in that decision making process? Is this decision reviewable? Has the Broome Family been notified about changes to the building that they helped fund? What space will be left for an inevitable Library expansion if one or both wings are coopted into other projects? Further, what body has replaced the Campus Planning Committee of the Master Plan Committee, both of which were Presidential Committee? Last, what is the role of faculty in the architectural design of our campus as the President sees it, noting her commitment to shared governance? "

Matthew Cook
Head, Unique Collections
John Spoor Broome Library
CSU Channel Islands
1 University Dr.
Camarillo, CA 93011
matthew.cook@csuci.edu
805.437.3653

April 10, 2020

RE: Mixed Use Center/Broome Library

Recently, concerns have been raised regarding the proposed Mixed Use Center location adjacent to the existing John Spoor Broome Library. Below is the historical background of the development of the Broome Library and conceptual planning for the Mixed Use Center.

The original concept plans for the Broome Library developed by Norman Foster's firm Foster and Partners in 2000. Their plan carved out the center portion of the old hospital building at the east end of the central campus core. The final project was delivered in 2008 at a construction cost of approximately \$55M and architectural fees of \$3.4M. During the preliminary phases of the library design, the unoccupied hospital building wings to the north and south of the project were identified as future potential expansion zones for the library in the event that such expansion was needed. At no time was Foster and Partners engaged to provide any design services for either of these two unoccupied hospital wings.

The current Broome Library facility contains approximately 75,000 Assignable Square Feet (ASF) of library space. In addition, there is considerable space within the building housing five academic classrooms as well as the OSHER are five existing classrooms plus the OSHER Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI) classroom. These spaces comprise approximately 6300 square feet, which could be converted to library usages in the future if the need is identified.

The Mixed Use Center is planned as a two-phase project. The first phase will be located south of San Luis Avenue in the area of the existing unoccupied hospital wing. This first phase of the project will demolish approximately 40,000 square feet of the old hospital building sitting on a 3.3 acre parcel and construct approximately 120,000 square feet of new construction. The future second phase of the Mixed Use Center will be constructed north of San Luis Street where Sage Hall, Yuba Hall and the A2 Parking Lot are currently located. The conceptual renderings for the Mixed Use Center which show the proposed demolition of the hospital wings to the north of the library have been presented to the primary point of contact for the Broome family. No concerns have been raised by the family.

The unoccupied south wing of the old hospital building has approximately the same square footage and acreage as the north wing. The campus has no construction plans for this parcel in the foreseeable future. If library expansion demand develops in the next decade, this parcel could be developed as a library expansion zone which would more than double the existing library footprint.

President Beck first shared a vision for the Mixed Use Center to staff and faculty approximately two years ago. At the Fall 2019 Convocation, the President discussed the planned Mixed Use Center to be located along San Luis Avenue. The phased Mixed Use Center concept was presented at the November 2019 Physical Master Plan Committee meeting. This committee includes faculty representation, who were present at the meeting.

In November 2019, the Planning, Design and Construction department (PDC) began a North Quad Precinct Study which included review of the Mixed Use Center's placement in the north hospital wing and Sage Hall sites. Members of the faculty participated in this review and discussion.

Question:

From: "Wood, Gregory" <gregory.wood@csuci.edu>
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2020 at 7:30 PM
To: "Perez, Scott" <scott.perez@csuci.edu>
Subject: Fw: Materials for Senate Exec for 28 April 2020

Hi Scott,

I have a question: if faculty have unspent research funds due to the Covid-19 crisis (could not attend conference, for example) is there any way they can be retained?

I'm sure this varies by grant.

Marie is asking about:

- Mini grants
- Sabbaticals
- Research Competitions (from Chancellor's Office funds - sorry I do not know more about this one).

Thanks,

Greg

Answer:

Hi Greg,

You're correct, it does vary by program.

1. Faculty Research and Development MiniGrants – Funds for these grant come from the Faculty Development budget. These are general funds and expire June 30th each year. My understanding is they may not be carried forward into the following fiscal year. However, I would hope that grantees who cannot utilize funds from their current awards would step forward and notify our office and Academic Planning and Budgeting. If the PI does not have an alternate use for those funds, it may be possible to use them for a non-MiniGrant expense in that fiscal year. I would need to check further into that though. I don't have documentation regarding the restrictions on use of those funds. The two Senate policies I found (SP 11-14, SP 07-15) only speak to composition of the committee and procedures for administering the competition.
2. Our office is not involved in the sabbatical process so I don't know what the restrictions are for those funds. I suppose there may be contractual and other obligations that could get thorny.
3. Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (RSCA) – Funds for these awards come from the Chancellor's Office. There is a bit more flexibility with the timeline and extensions for individual awards are possible. However, RSCA funds are allocated

specifically for faculty research and scholarship and may not be allocated to other uses. Similar to the Faculty R&D MiniGrants, I would expect that awardees who cannot use funds as originally budgeted would step forward. Our Chancellor's Office allocation is quite small (~\$44K/yr.) and there are many more worthy applications than can be funded. So, the RSPAC committee would look to fund further down the list of proposals, issuing additional awards to PIs who can carry out their projects under the current restrictions.

4. Other Chancellor's Office programs, e.g., Affinity Groups, etc. – There are some other research and curriculum improvement grants awarded by the CO. Some are coordinated through my office, most are not. There may be some possibilities there, but it also would vary by program.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Scott

Scott Pérez, MA, CRA
Director
Research and Sponsored Programs
Madera Hall 1308
California State University, Channel Islands
One University Drive
Camarillo, CA 93012-8599
805-437-8808