**Draft Minutes**

**Budget Resource and Development Subcommittee**

**October 13, 2021 1:00 pm to 2:30pm**

**In attendance**: Brett Bell (Co-Chair); Dawn Diskin (Co-Chair); Channing Booth; Kandice Brandt; Michael Brown; Adrian Gonzales; Darren Hall; Kurt Hill; Denise Kapitzke; Chloe Le; Laura Murphy; Michael Odu; Bill Pacheco.

**Absent**: Vanessa Garcia; Sadayoshi Okumoto

**Guests:** David Buser; Jesse Lopez; Max Moore; Wai-Ling Rubic; Lesley Pearson; Elizabeth Whitsett

**Call to Order:** 1:02 pm with quorum

**Approval of Agenda**

* Motion to approve the Agenda for October 13, 2021, meeting. MSC Kapitzke; Channing, approved.

**Approval of Minutes**

* Motion to approve the Minutes of September 22, 2021, meeting. MSC Odu; Murphy, approved. Booth abstained.

**Action Items**

* None.

**Committee Reports/Other**

* None.

**Old Business**

1. **BRDS General Fund Allocation**
2. Bell shared the BRDS general fund allocation spreadsheet and a PowerPoint to support a detailed discussion around what the Civic Center program is all about and how we allocate the money generated from it to the four identified categories. Civic Center has revenue from Facilities and Community Recreation rental fees and must first cover all expenses incurred when renting the facilities. The extra revenue generated is considered “net income” and available for allocation. The four identified areas that benefit are Athletics (playing fields), Fitness Center, BRDS RFF and Professional Development. It was noted that Tech Refresh funding was not reviewed at the last meeting.
3. Athletics - The 30% allocation of net income from the prior year supports the playing fields maintenance, repair and renovation. The unrestricted budget allocation is 100%, with unused funds set to carry over for next year’s needs in Athletics. The committee discussed who determines the athletic needs (Groundskeeper Staff) and who reviews and approves those expenses (Bell). Future events in a Performing Arts Center would also be considered Civic Center rentals. The committee can explore if the funds generated by events hosted by Fire Tech can specifically support replacement of equipment used for those activities.
4. Fitness Center - The 20% of net income from prior year Facilities rentals are used to build the fund balance over time to replace large chunks of fitness center equipment. The unrestricted budget allocation is historically funded at 100%, with unused funds set to carry over for Fitness Center needs the next year. Spending typically occurs every 3-4 years. Decisions for purchases made by the Fitness Center faculty and approved by Bell.
5. BRDS RFF - The 35% of net income from prior year Facilities rentals are available for BRDS RFF unrestricted allocation. Of the unrestricted funds, 90% is allocated and 10% is retained and used for emergency purchases throughout the year. Unused funds carryover for BRDS RFF needs the next year. The committee discussed the types of purchases that are supported or not supported by BRDS’s one-time funding source model. Software licenses are not supported. Bell explained that the rental income is what were are allocating and that District discretionary funds do not commingle with BRDS, as they are distributed on a different allocation funding model. The discussion transitioned into the allocation of discretionary funds across the different campus departments. It was recommended for the BRDS committee to review the annual discretionary resources process from budget development through requesting new resources to get a big picture budget view.
6. Professional Development - The 5% of net income from prior year Facilities rentals is allocated to campus-wide professional development. There are other funding sources for PD that are more restrictive, outside of BRDS. Consideration is given to supervisors, as they are the only classification on campus that do not have another source of funding for PD. The PD Committee approves all funding requests. The PD Committee typically has a $1000 individual limit for expenses, but it can be increased. Unused funds carry over for PD needs the next year.
7. Summary - The four areas were identified, over time, to have no identifiable funding source and are in need of the revenue generated from the Civic Center. In total, 20% of net income from Community Recreation is allocated for BRDS, while 80% is used to support ongoing Community Recreation Civic Center operations. The BRDS committee has allocated 60% for distribution to the four areas, and 40% is used to support the ongoing Facilities Civic Center operations. The committee learned that classroom rental revenue is included in Civic Center totals and is not used fortechnology-specific purchases for the classrooms. The idea to maximize the campus’ ability to generate revenue was discussed. Bell shared that President Lundburg wants to expand the services and opportunities to get the general public on our campus to experience what Miramar has to offer. It was observed that classroom rentals do create more wear and tear and damages to the facilities. Bell stated the 40% ongoing operations allocation does support the damages to classroom and facility rentals. The idea to create a sub-committee to boost fundraising was floated, but Bell pointed out that the Civic Center is an operational activity, not governance, so no subcommittee is warranted.
8. For 2020-2021 there is $12,402 in revenue available to allocate to the four areas. Bell summarized that the BRDS funding model, which was narrowly approved at the last meeting, could continue to be discussed and reevaluated. The Committee discussed changing the year-to-year BRDS process, what that looks like and the implications of the extensive review process for this year’s allocation. A request to re-evaluate the current BRDS funding model could come at the request of an outside committee as well. Bell entertained a motion to include a two-step process to approve this current process and to look to begin any changes for this year. After further discussion, it was decided the funding allocation formula was already voted on and approved at the last meeting, so the motion Bell entertained was withdrawn.

**New Business**

1. **Department Chair and Dean Q&A for RFF**
2. Bell opened the discussions with the Dean in attendance, then to the Committee. Booth pointed out that the RFF form doesn’t allow for the supplies and equipment designation to be separated. No additional questions from the committee or guests.
3. **HEERF II Status Update**
4. Bell stated HEERF II was approved last year at 6.7 million dollars to be allocated to support three areas: Student Direct Aid, Institutional, and Minority Services Institution (MSI). The committee discussed what funding is considered institutional and what the regulations are on spending. Bell shared that the funding is used specifically to support student reengagement, health and safety needs on campus, to support remote learning and remote working and also for professional development. MSI can be used for non-minority spending needs. The HEERF II remaining balance as of 9/30/21 is $4,084,674.00.
5. **HEERF III Budget Allocation**
   1. Bell stated it is a continuation of HEERF II and has the same three support goals. There is $7.1 million for Student Direct Aid/Institutional. There is a noted increase in the Instructional Operations budget, up from $230,000 to $480,000 in preparation for the spring semester, as a set aside for the unknown COVID situation. These funds can be reallocated if they are not needed. College-Wide RFF set aside is for $750,000 and $900,000 for Student Direct Aid. There are 13 other categories with funding. The committee is interested in how the new allocations for HEERF III was decided and have requested definitions and descriptions on what falls in the numerous categories. Bell will create an addendum to show more detailed definitions for a future meeting. Liberal Arts was left off the allocation list because they were not offering on-campus classes at the time. Bell stated it can be reassessed if there is a need and if requested by the Dean of Liberal Arts. College-Wide RFF has its own process, separate from BRDS. An observation was made about unspent HEERF III funds and if we can allocate additionally to Liberal Arts reengagement. Bell stated there are many places to fund Liberal Arts within the College-Wide RFF student reengagement category. Gonzales shared that all HEERF funding works together, but each has specific language on how the funds are spent on direct aid to students for reengagement with regard to restricted and unrestricted funds. It was suggested to update the two Student Direct Aid line items to denote the differences in the two.

**Announcements**

1. Diskin introduced the new student committee member, Chloe Le.
2. Brandt asked to include a future agenda topic to discuss a discretionary line item for campus-wide accommodations for students.

**Adjourned 4:33 pm. Next meeting scheduled for October 27, 2021 at 1:00 pm via Zoom.**