

Minutes

of the Academic Senate Meeting

Wednesday, October 15, 2025

Start Time: 3:00 p.m.

Location: Building 98, P2 – 007 Lecture Hall

PRESENT SENATORS: Melissa Aaron, Corwin Aragon, Gregory Barding, Aaron Cayer, Chitra Dabas, David Edens, Saeideh Fallah Fini, Ghada Gad, Michael Giang, Berit Givens, Mario Guerrero, Paivi Hoikkala, Mohammad Husain, Alex John, Rita Kumar, Kelly Min, Sean Monemi, Jessica Perez, Jonathan Puthoff, Erin Questad, Dennis Quinn, Jeffrey Ray, Jeffrey Roy, Bharti Sharma, Julie Shen, Zahra Sotoudeh, Kang Hoon Sung, Sabrina Toney, Nicholas Van Buer, Faye Wachs, Preeti Wadhwa, Gerd Welke, and Alireza Yazdani

GUESTS: Craig LaMunyon, Aaron DeRosa, Brnadon Tuck, Lisa Rotunni, Cheryl Kooz, Pia Gupta, Ethan Orr, Laura Massa, Keith Forward,

PROXIES: Vice Chair Barding for Chair Peter Hanink, Senator Hoikkala for Senator Newman, and Senator Wadhwa for Senator Adams.

ABSENCES: Amiyah Ellsworth (ASI) and Teresa Lloro (Statewide CSU)

Vice Chair Barding seated Senator Michael Giang, new CLASS senator.

1. Academic Senate Minutes – September 24, 2025

September 24, 2025, are located on the Academic Senate website at
..\09.24.2025\Academic_Senate_MINUTES_09.24.25.pdf

There was no discussion.

Senator Shen motioned to approve the minutes. Senator Welke second.

W/s/p to approve the Academic Senate Meeting Minutes from September 24, 2025, with one abstention from Senator Quinn.

2. Information Items

a. Chair's Report

Vice Chair Barding announced Staff Senator Sabrina Toney as the new senate parliamentarian for AY 2025-2026.

b. Vice Chair's Report

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Senator Kumar, Former Senate Chair, announced the Vice Chair's Report

NEW REFERRALS: (2)

AA-003-256 2026-2027 Academic Calendar with 5 Year Projection
AP-006-256 Policy 1121 Blended Program Update

SENATE REPORTS FORWARDED TO PRESIDENT: (0)

PRESIDENT RESPONSES TO SENATE REPORTS: (0)

- c. ASCSU Report
 (a) Plenary September 2025 Report

Summary:

Senator Wachs provided updates from the statewide Academic Senate (ASCSU), highlighting current initiatives, concerns, and opportunities for faculty involvement.

Key Points:

- **CalGETC Mathematics Requirements:**
 - ASCSU is seeking faculty to assist with the implementation of **CalGETC mathematics requirements**.
 - This request has been forwarded to **Dr. Givens and her department**.
 - Interested individuals are encouraged to contact **Senator Wachs or Herb**.
- **Statewide Advocacy Efforts:**
 - ASCSU is actively **pushing back against the release of personal information** by the CSU system without faculty consent.
 - The **California Faculty Association (CFA)** has filed a **lawsuit** to challenge this action.
- **Vote of No Confidence Discussion:**
 - There is growing interest across academic senates in pursuing a **vote of no confidence in the CSU Chancellor**.
 - Local senates, including CPP, are beginning to explore this possibility.
- **Committee Participation:**
 - Senator Wachs and Senator Teresa Ural both serve on the **JEDI (Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion) subcommittee**.
 - While serving on the same subcommittee may limit influence, both are committed to representing CPP's interests.
- **Communication and Engagement:**
 - Faculty are encouraged to reach out to **Senator Wachs or Senator Lloro** with questions or concerns.

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

- Updates from ASCSU plenaries are available for review, and senators are open to bringing feedback forward.

d. Budget Report

Summary:

Senator Sharma presented a detailed report on the Budget Committee's recent activities, focusing on transparency, alignment between academic and operational priorities, and infrastructure challenges.

Key Points:

- **Committee Meetings:**
 - The committee met twice during the reporting period: **October 1** and **April**.
 - The October 1 meeting featured a presentation by **AVP Matthew Whinery** and **CFO Michelle Cardona**, representing Facilities Planning and Management (FPM).
- **Facilities Overview:**
 - FPM employs **135 staff members**, including custodial, grounds, trades, and administrative personnel.
 - The campus maintains **350+ acres of land** and numerous buildings.
- **Deferred Maintenance:**
 - FPM reported a **\$900 million maintenance backlog**, reflecting extensive infrastructure needs.
 - The committee has requested clarification on whether this figure represents current needs or includes future projections.
- **Capital Calls and Budget Constraints:**
 - Capital calls have been **scaled back** due to system-wide budget limitations.
 - The **Campus Master Plan**, completed in **July 2025**, positions CPP favorably for future funding from the Chancellor's Office.
- **Committee Discussions:**
 - Emphasis on **budget transparency**, including:
 - Total FPM budget and allocation for maintenance.
 - Cost determination for projects and management fees charged by CPP and the Chancellor's Office.
 - Clarification sought on **annual vs. capital call funding**:
 - Annual budgets cover manageable facilities.
 - Capital calls are funded through interest in reserves held by the Chancellor's Office.
- **Recommendations:**
 - Develop a **transparent revenue analysis** to enable broader participation.
 - Create a **project dashboard** to track maintenance progress and timelines.
 - Encourage **transparent prioritization** of capital projects within divisions and colleges.

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

- Address **trade division staffing shortages** and concerns raised in the **residential forum**.
- **Appreciation and Next Steps:**
 - The committee expressed gratitude for the dedication of FPM staff.
 - Next steps include follow-up with the **CIO and AVP** for further clarification and updates.

Q&A Highlights:

- **Clarification on Deferred Maintenance:**
 - Senator Sharma confirmed the **\$900 million figure** was shared during the meeting.
 - The committee has requested formal clarification from the CFO to determine its accuracy and scope.

e. CFA Report

Summary:

Senator Puthoff provided a brief update following the recent all-member meeting and shared important information regarding ongoing union-related developments.

Key Points:

- **All-Member Meeting Recap:**
 - Appreciation was expressed to those who attended the meeting.
 - Productive discussions were held regarding current status and future direction.
 - No formal updates were presented at this time.
- **CSU Data Disclosure Lawsuit:**
 - In reference to Senator Wachs's earlier comments, Puthoff noted that the **California Faculty Association (CFA)** has filed a **statewide lawsuit** against the CSU system.
 - The lawsuit concerns the **release of personal information to federal authorities**.
 - Further details are pending; members are encouraged to **monitor their emails** for updates.
- **CFA Engagement:**
 - Senator Puthoff invited members to reach out directly during meetings with any **CFA-related questions or concerns**.

f. ASI Report

There was no ASI Report.

g. Staff Report

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

The staff report was presented by Staff Representative Sabrina Toney.

Summary:

Sabrina Toney provided a brief but informative staff report, highlighting key updates and resources for the campus community.

Key Points:

- **Technical Difficulties:**
 - The staff report was nearly lost due to a technical failure but was reconstructed in time for the meeting.
- **Great Shake Out Reminder:**
 - Scheduled for **10:16 a.m. tomorrow**.
 - Expect alerts via phone, email, and other channels.
 - Staff are encouraged to be prepared and not alarmed by the drill.
- **Training Opportunities:**
 - **Concur training** is available on **October 29**.
 - Noted that while the system is challenging, training is essential and encouraged.
- **Professional & Personal Development:**
 - A comprehensive list of **professional development classes** has been included in the report.
 - Also featured are **wellness sessions** such as mindfulness and breath work.
 - Many sessions are short (around 30 minutes) and designed to support both **professional growth** and **personal well-being**.

Closing Note:

Sabrina emphasized the importance of self-care and encouraged staff to take advantage of the available resources, especially in the current climate.

3. Academic Senate Committee Reports – Time Certain 3:45 PM

Vice Chair Barding called for the motion to move the time certain from 3:45 PM to 3:13 PM. Senator Sotoudeh motioned to move the time certain. Senator Quinn second.

- a. AP-027-234 Program Review for BA in Philosophy – SECOND READING

Senator Husain reported.

M/s to adopt AP-027-234, Program Review for BA in Philosophy.

Summary:

- No recent comments have been received since the first reading.
- A key concern from the first reading was reiterated:

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

- Departments may be disproportionately impacted by changes in the GE structure.
- Particular attention should be paid to departments that are heavily affected when GE requirements change multiple times.
- This point was emphasized as a critical takeaway from the program review.
- The meeting noted some progression since the first reading, though no specific updates were detailed.

The senators were all in favor of adopting AP-027-234, Program Review for BA in Philosophy, passed unanimously. There were no abstentions.

b. AP-011-245 Program Review for MS in Civil Engineering – SECOND
READING

Senator Husain reported.

M/s to adopt AP-011-245, Program Review for MS in Civil Engineering.

Summary:

- No significant recent comments have been received since the first reading.
- Key points highlighted during this meeting include:
 - The importance of **prominence and compensation** for faculty members supervising the project.
 - A proposal was mentioned to **increase awareness and promotion of comprehensive exams**.
 - There was a suggestion to **expand the knowledge base** related to the project and its outcomes.

Notes:

- These points are intended to support faculty engagement and improve the visibility and effectiveness of the program.
- No further discussion items were raised.

The senators were all in favor of adopting AP-011-245, Program Review for MS in Civil Engineering passed unanimously. There were no abstentions.

c. AA-005-245 Correction to Policy 1021: Division of an Academic Department –
FIRST READING

Senator Jeffrey Roy reported.

M/s to receive and file AA-005-245, Correction to Policy 1021: Division of an Academic Department.

Summary:

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

- The referral was introduced by Dr. Massa from Academic Programs, with input from senior curriculum specialists.
- The issue discussed pertains to **Policy 1021**, which addresses the **division of an academic department**.
- The policy currently contains an **inconsistency**:
 - It incorrectly identifies the **Academic Affairs Committee** as part of the process.
 - This does not align with standard policies and practices.
- The correct committee involved should be **Academic Programs**, as noted elsewhere in the policy.
- The inconsistency appears to be a **typographical error**, confirmed by further references within the policy text.
- This meeting served as the **first reading**; a vote to adopt the correction will occur during the **second reading**. The second reading of AA-005-245 will be on November 5, 2025.

Policy 1021 contains a minor error under section V on page 3. Section V incorrectly notes that the process includes the Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate.

Proposals related to the division of an academic department should go to the Academic Programs Committee, which is correctly noted under step V.A.5.

In practice department splits are sent to the Academic Programs Committee. For example, when Psychology and Sociology split in 2018 the Academic Programs Committee was assigned the proposal (see AS-2787-178-AP).

Vice Chair Barding called for a senate recess until 3:50 PM PST (30 Minutes)

4. New Business

There was no business to report.

5. Old Business

There was no old business report.

6. Discussion

The presentation on the Lanterman Update was given by Anthony Orlando, Associate Professor for the Finance Real Estate & Law Department – College of Business Administration | Time 3:50 PM PST

Summary:

Anthony Orlando provided a comprehensive update on the Lanterman Project, particularly focusing on developments since his last presentation in February.

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Key Points:**• Project Overview:**

- The Lanterman site is a 300-acre property located just south of Cal Poly Pomona.
- Formerly a state-run mental health facility, the site includes over 100 one- and two-story buildings, most of which are currently uninhabitable.
- Approximately half of the land is developable; the other half consists of foothills with challenging topography.

• Historical Context:

- The site was operated by the state for over 80 years before jurisdiction was transferred to Cal Poly Pomona.
- The transfer was based on proximity and potential impact on campus.
- The university is not permitted to sell the land due to a Memorandum of Understanding with the state.

• Strategic Importance:

- Retaining control over the site allows the university to ensure development aligns with campus and regional needs.
- Selling the land would forfeit this control and potentially lead to developments that are not beneficial to the university.

• Feasibility Studies:

- Conducted by the Urban Land Institute and HOK architectural firm.
- Concluded that development is feasible through a public-private partnership (P3), given the high remediation and infrastructure costs.

• Developer Selection:

- Initially, FivePoint was selected as the master developer.
- Leadership changes at FivePoint led to a shift in priorities, prompting the need for a new developer.
- Anthony Orlando joined the Developer Selection Advisory Committee in 2021 to assist in identifying a suitable replacement.

• Vision:

- The site represents a “once-in-a-generation” opportunity for Cal Poly Pomona and the surrounding region.
- The goal is to create a community-oriented development that supports housing affordability, education, and long-term campus growth.

Next Steps:

- Continued developer selection and planning.
- Further updates and stakeholder engagement anticipated.

Continued Key Points:**• Developer Negotiations & Market Shifts:**

- Initial negotiations with ERG (Edgewood Realty and Graystar joint venture) began during a favorable market period (2021), with low interest rates and high development activity.

- By 2023, market conditions had shifted dramatically, leading to increased developer risk aversion and a pause in construction activity.
- ERG ultimately withdrew from the project due to market uncertainty and unwillingness to assume full development risk.
- **Challenges with the P3 Model:**
 - The original public-private partnership (P3) model aimed to minimize financial risk for Cal Poly Pomona.
 - The university sought a developer willing to handle all aspects of the project, including infrastructure, environmental assessments (EIR, CEQA), and construction.
 - This approach proved unfeasible in the current market, as developers were unwilling to take on such comprehensive risk.
- **New Strategic Direction:**
 - In response, the university engaged **Cosmont**, a leading consultant in public financing strategies.
 - Cosmont explored options like **tax increment financing** to allow Cal Poly Pomona to participate without direct financial investment.
 - Their insights informed a revised approach focused on:
 - **Updated market assessment** to reflect current financial feasibility and stakeholder priorities.
 - **Re-evaluation of the original vision**, acknowledging that campus needs and perspectives may have evolved over the past decade.
 - **Improved understanding of entitlement and pre-development costs**, which developers are hesitant to fund without guaranteed project approval.
- **Next Steps:**
 - Conduct a new market assessment.
 - Engage campus stakeholders to reassess development goals.
 - Explore shared-risk models to attract long-term, mission-aligned developers.
 - Continue refining the development strategy based on lessons learned and evolving conditions.

Continued Key Points:

- **Site Challenges & Risk Mitigation:**
 - **Historic Preservation:** Over 100 buildings require evaluation for preservation, demolition, or adaptive reuse—each with significant cost implications.
 - **Hazardous Materials Remediation:** Most buildings are uninhabitable and require remediation, even if demolished.
 - **Seismic Upgrades:** Necessary for any structures retained, many of which are nearly a century old.
 - **Unknown Infrastructure:** Underground utilities are undocumented and must be assessed to reduce developer uncertainty.
 - **Environmental Review:** Completing the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and CEQA process can reduce risk for developers and improve project viability.
- **New Development Strategy:**

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

- Cal Poly Pomona (CPP) will take a more active role in the **pre-development process**, including funding initial assessments and planning.
- This approach is informed by lessons from other CSU campuses and expert guidance from Cosmont.
- CPP has added experienced team members from other CSU P3 projects to strengthen internal capacity.

Action Plan:

1. New Market Analysis

- Determine the highest and best use of the land based on current market conditions.

2. New Development Concepts

- Identify feasible building types and densities suited to today's environment.

3. Financial Feasibility Analysis

- Provide developers with clear financial models to guide proposals aligned with campus goals.

4. Phase 1 Environmental Assessment

- Begin environmental review to reduce uncertainty and risk.

5. Historic Significance Assessment

- Consult with the State Historic Preservation Office to determine which buildings must be preserved and which can be modified or removed.

6. Utility Infrastructure Assessment

- Investigate underground systems and estimate upgrade costs.

7. Conceptual Land Use Plans

- Develop draft plans for campus and community feedback.

Consultant Engagements:

• Kaiser Morrison Associates

- Conducting market analysis, development concepts, and financial feasibility studies.
- Will also survey campus stakeholders to align development with current needs.

• Michael Baker International

- Leading environmental assessments and historic preservation consultations.
- Known for extensive CSU experience and collaboration with the State Historic Preservation Office.

• Architecture & Engineering Firm (TBD)

- An RFP will be released soon to select a firm for utility infrastructure analysis and conceptual land use planning.
- This firm will also facilitate campus focus groups and feedback sessions.

Vision for the Site:

- The current vision remains a **mixed-use community**, with **housing at its core** due to regional shortages and its role in making other uses viable.
- Additional possibilities include:
 - **Retail and “downtown”-style amenities**
 - **Office and incubator space** for startups and faculty partnerships

**TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona**

- **Laboratories and academic research zones**
 - **Innovation alley** for R&D and hands-on student learning
- Housing must be offered at **varied price points**, including **affordable options for faculty and staff**, which could support recruitment efforts.
- The project is seen as a **long-term investment**, not just a cost:
 - Development would be structured as a **ground lease**, providing CPP with **annual revenue** independent of state funding, federal support, or enrollment fluctuations.
 - This model supports **financial sustainability** for the university.

Community Engagement:

- CPP leadership met with the **Mayor of Pomona**, who expressed strong support for the project.
- His primary request: **ensure the development is inclusive and connected to the broader Pomona community**, not a private, walled-off enclave.

Financial Overview:

- **Ongoing maintenance costs** exist, though Anthony Orlando clarified he is not directly involved in that aspect.
 - These are managed by **Enterprise Foundation and Facilities**.
 - **Film production revenues** help offset some maintenance expenses.
- **Pre-development costs** are the focus of Orlando's role:
 - Funded by a **\$750,000 grant from the CSU Chancellor's Office** (not from Cal Poly Pomona's budget).
 - This covers the three consultants and the seven key planning items previously outlined.
- **Future costs** (e.g., infrastructure remediation, full EIR) are still unknown and will be determined based on consultant findings.

Stakeholder Engagement:

- A renewed effort is underway to engage all relevant campus and community stakeholders.
- Meetings have already occurred with:
 - The President's Cabinet
 - This committee
 - Upcoming meetings include the **Poly Post**, **ASI**, and other campus groups.
- Two key engagement activities will be led by consultants:
 - **Campus-wide survey**
 - **Listening sessions** to inform conceptual land use planning
- All other outreach will be conducted by Anthony Orlando and the internal project team.

Project Team Updates:

- **Ben Quillian** – Former CSU system CFO and interim CFO at Cal Poly Pomona; continues to provide strategic financial guidance.
- **Debbie A. Stone** – Recently joined the team; retired CFO of Fresno State and key figure in the Campus Pointe P3 project. Credited with securing the \$750,000 CSU grant and advancing project planning.

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

- Weekly coordination meetings include:
 - Michelle Cardona, Interim Vice President for Administration and Finance and Chief Financial Officer
 - Enterprise Foundation representatives
 - Other key stakeholders involved in day-to-day operations

Transparency & Communication:

- A **public-facing website** is maintained with:
 - Developer proposals
 - Presentation slides
 - Project updates
- The site will be improved in the coming months to include more detailed information.
- All project materials are **public record**.
- Anthony Orlando encouraged direct communication via email for questions or feedback.

Closing Remarks:

- The next update will include more clarity on:
 - Estimated future costs
 - Division of financial responsibility between public entities and developers
- Orlando emphasized the importance of stakeholder input and welcomed feedback to guide the next phase of planning.

Q&A Highlights:

1. Senator Question: Developer Partnership and Campus Use

- **Question:** Is the developer arrangement essentially a real estate deal where we lease land and earn revenue? And could part of the site become a special campus?
- **Response:**
 - The site is not officially designated as a campus due to lack of state funding for academic buildings.
 - While some refer to it as “Campus South,” CPP avoids that term to manage expectations.
 - If a developer builds usable facilities like lab space, CPP could utilize them, but it would not be a stateside campus.
 - The developer arrangement would be a **long-term ground lease** (likely 99 years), allowing the developer to operate as if they own the land while CPP retains ownership and permitting authority.
 - The CSU Board of Trustees is the final permitting authority, and the land remains **state-owned**.
 - A favorable ground rent formula is expected, especially if CPP assumes some pre-development risk, increasing developer confidence and potential revenue.

2. Senator Question: Historical Buildings

- **Question:** Are there buildings that must be preserved, and what is their potential usability?
- **Response:**
 - **Michael Baker International** will assess historical significance in consultation with the **State Historic Preservation Office**.

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

- Most buildings lack unique architectural value, but some may be historically significant due to their use.
- Example: The **superintendent's house** on State Street is likely to be preserved due to its character and historical relevance.
- CPP is exploring **virtual and in-person tours** to help stakeholders understand the site's potential.
- The goal is to balance **adaptive reuse** with practicality, preserving valuable elements while allowing redevelopment.

3. Senator Christine Question: CSU Permitting Authority

- **Question:** Will CSU retain final say in permitting under the lease arrangement?
- **Response:**
 - Yes, CSU is the **entitling and permitting authority** for the site.
 - All development must be approved by the **CSU Board of Trustees**.
 - The site does not fall under city or county jurisdiction due to its status as **state land**.

4. Senator Question: Campus Oversight and Affordable Housing for the Community

- **Question:** Will Cal Poly Pomona have oversight in permitting decisions? And will affordable housing be available to the broader community?
- **Response:**
 - While the **CSU Board of Trustees** is the official permitting authority, **Cal Poly Pomona will lead day-to-day decision-making** and will only advance development plans it supports.
 - Regarding housing, Orlando clarified the distinction between **“Big A” affordable housing** (government-subsidized) and **“little a” affordable housing** (market-rate but lower cost).
 - The site is intended to serve **both campus stakeholders and the broader Pomona community**, with potential **set-asides for faculty and staff**, but not exclusive to Cal Poly Pomona.

5. Senator Quinn Question: Value vs. Burden

- **Question:** Given the effort and resources required, has there been discussion about handing the project over to the CSU system?
- **Response:**
 - Orlando acknowledged this is a valid and ongoing consideration.
 - His personal view is that **Cal Poly Pomona is best positioned to realize the site's value** due to proximity and vested interest.
 - He believes the **new approach will attract a developer** in the coming year and lead to meaningful progress.
 - He welcomed differing opinions and encouraged open dialogue on the matter.

6. Senator John Questions: CSU Grant, Stakeholder Engagement, and Revenue Distribution

- **Question 1:** Why did the CSU invest \$750,000 in the project?

- **Response:** CSU views the Lanterman site as a **system-wide asset** and believes the investment supports long-term value for the CSU system.
- **Question 2:** Why is campus engagement listed last in the stakeholder plan?
 - **Response:** The slide order was not chronological. Campus **surveys are already underway**, and listening sessions will follow once the A&E firm is hired.
- **Question 3:** How will revenue from the site benefit the campus?
 - **Response:** There are **no finalized plans yet** for revenue distribution.
 - Orlando emphasized that this will be a key topic in future discussions once a developer is secured and financial models are clearer.

7. Senator Wachs Concern: Long-Term Losses and Faculty Impact

- **Concern:** The project has incurred approximately \$10 million in losses over 10 years, which translates to a significant per-faculty cost. Faculty are facing resource shortages, stagnant wages, and lack of support, raising concerns about continuing investment in a project with no immediate return.
- **Response:**
 - Orlando acknowledged the concern and confirmed that **there is currently no direct benefit** to faculty or students.
 - He estimated the total loss at **\$7.5 million over 10 years**, with most losses occurring early on before film production revenue increased.
 - The **current annual loss is approximately \$113,500**, significantly lower than in previous years.
 - Orlando emphasized that this is a **long-term investment** and agreed that each individual must weigh its value personally.

8. Senator Husain Concern: Transparency and Budget Oversight

- **Concern:** Previous presentations lacked clarity on personnel expenses and financial transparency. There is a need for a **business assessment and budget plan** to ensure Senate support.
- **Response:**
 - Orlando agreed and committed to **ongoing communication with the Senate Budget Committee**.
 - He clarified that some personnel are paid through the project, including **Enterprise Foundation staff and university personnel** involved in operations.
 - The **largest expense is security**, requiring multiple full-time and part-time staff to maintain the site, especially during film production, totaling **\$700,000–\$800,000 annually**.
 - Orlando acknowledged past miscommunications and emphasized the importance of **accurate financial reporting** moving forward.

Closing Notes:

- Orlando reiterated his openness to feedback and welcomed continued dialogue.

- He is committed to improving transparency, engaging stakeholders, and sharing financial projections with the Senate Budget Committee.
- The next steps include consultant-led assessments, stakeholder surveys, and further planning to determine the site's future viability.

Adjourned @ 4: 33 PM PST

TIME CERTAIN ADJOURNMENT 3:00 P.M.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona