

**Auraria Board of Directors**  
**April Retreat Meeting Minutes**

**April 22, 2026**

**Tivoli 320**

**Members Present:** Angie Rivera-Malpiede, Kara Powell, Ken Christensen, Callie Rennison, Janine Davidson, Jerry Glick, Paul Washington, Yolanda Ortega, Peter Lindstrom, Adam Glick, Jared Bynum

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Colleen Walker, Sophia Tran, Sandra Zuniga, Cody Phelps

**Others Present:** Carl Meese, Skip Spear, Zach Hermsen, Jason Mollendor, Alyssa Inouye, Savannah McKinney, Erika Friedlander, Devra Ashby, Justin Verardi, Liz Mendez, Cassy Cadwallader, Teri Wilson, Jasmine Padilla, Amber Cook, David Olguin, Jack Hershey, Mitchell Mauro, Dan Maxey, Melanie Layton, Ed Brown, Jim Carpenter, Dan Whitaker (online), Genia Herndon (online), Jarrick Brown (online), Lilly Djanians (online), Sarah Buller (online), Tristy Hillestad (online), Ben Pearse (online)

**1. Call to Order**

Angie Rivera-Malpiede called the meeting to order at 8:10 am.

**2. Auraria Land Acknowledgment**

Savannah McKinney, Auraria Campus' Special Events Coordinator, read the land acknowledgment.

**3. Announcements**

- a. Welcome new board members – Callie Rennison
  - i. Angie Rivera-Malpiede welcomed the new board member, Callie Rennison, and read a short biography of her.
- b. Board Ice Breaker
  - i. Board members had a short ice breaker.

**4. Approval of Minutes**

Angie Rivera-Malpiede asked for a motion to approve the February 25, 2026, meeting minutes as presented. Jerry Glick motioned; Paul Washington seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## **5. Discussion and Presentation Items**

### **a. Legislative Update**

Melanie Layton provided a legislative update, noting that the legislative session will conclude in three weeks. She began with an overview of the state budget, explaining that significant cuts were required. The budget bill (HB 1410) outlines a \$46.8 billion budget for FY 2027–28 and has passed both the House and Senate. A conference committee is scheduled to meet on Thursday to finalize details, with the bill expected to be sent to the governor early next week. The budget represents a modest \$300 million increase from the prior year, primarily to address the General Fund deficit. To achieve this, reserve levels were reduced from the targeted 15% to 13%, and the largest cuts were made within Medicaid across multiple areas. Additionally, an overpayment related to TABOR refunds was used to justify eliminating refunds this year; legislation has been introduced to clarify this approach, and a potential lawsuit may arise.

Layton also reported that 64 orbital bills accompanied the budget, including HB 1372, which continues the direct appropriation model for the Auraria Campus. Higher education funding remained flat, while tuition increased by 3.5% for in-state students and 5% for out-of-state students. On the capital development front, only one higher education project—at CSU—was funded, though Level 1 controlled maintenance received full funding, which includes a project for Auraria. Overall capital funding levels were significantly lower than in previous years. It was also noted that the Capital Development Committee will not be funded moving forward, eliminating official site tours, though unofficial campus tours may still be arranged. Layton added that approximately 20 bills were reviewed this session, all currently categorized as “monitor,” including SB 34.

Colleen Walker expressed appreciation for Melanie Layton’s 25 years of collaboration with the Auraria Campus.

Jared Bynum was invited to share progress on SB 26-34. He reflected on what he described as a 50-year effort, highlighting that SB 26-34 was signed into law on March 30. He shared his experience working with a cohort of engaged and motivated students and noted his involvement in preparing next year’s cohort. He outlined four key provisions of the bill: granting voting membership to SACAB and FACAB representatives on the Auraria Board of Directors, allowing part-time students to serve on SACAB, and reducing the residency

requirement from three years to one year. Bynum emphasized the importance of these changes for a diverse and international campus community. He also recognized Mitchell Mauro, Alyssa Inouye, and previous SACAB cohorts for their contributions, and noted that Isaias Salazar, Vice President of CCD Student Government, co-drafted the bill with Skip Spear.

Angie Rivera-Malpiede commended Bynum for his leadership and dedication, stating she was honored to work alongside him. Colleen Walker also recognized Skip Spear for his critical role in shaping legislative language that was viable at the state level, describing the collective effort over the past three years as a “dream team.” Peter Lindstrom acknowledged Isaias’s contributions, noting the complexity of the legislative process and expressing strong admiration for the work of CCD students. Adam Glick added that Diana White had led the initial faculty-side efforts last year before Bynum stepped in and emphasized the significant work Bynum contributed. He also thanked board members for their support, particularly the Board Chair, who was among the first to endorse the initiative.

#### b. Events 101

Colleen Walker and Alyssa Inouye presented “Events 101,” providing an overview of the Auraria Higher Education Center’s events operations and the behind-the-scenes work that supports campus activation. They emphasized the importance of shared understanding and noted that the Special Events Office is led by Lulu Lantzy and Alyssa Inouye, with Amber Cook serving as Director of Special Events. The Special Events Office has evolved into a distinct operational category, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic. Prior to COVID, the model was primarily service-based, with approximately 90% of business comprised of internal events and operating at a loss. Following the pandemic and adoption of a new ABOD strategic plan, the concept of “activation” was introduced to create a more vibrant campus environment, support recruitment and retention, and generate auxiliary revenue. A tiered pricing structure was implemented—external, departmental, and student rates—allowing external revenue to offset internal operational deficits.

The events department operates as an auxiliary unit that receives no general fund support and manages all AHEC-owned event venues on campus. It serves institutional departments, student organizations, and external clients, supporting a wide range of events from small meetings and tabling to large conferences and weddings. Services include venue tours, scheduling and contracts, pre-event planning, coordination of AHEC services, setup and teardown, AV support, custodial services, and equipment rentals. Office hours are Monday–Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and Friday from 8:00 a.m. to

3:00 p.m., while the on-site event crew operates seven days per week from 6:00 a.m. to 11:30 p.m., with extended hours to 2:00 a.m. and additional seasonal hours during peak periods (September–November and February–April). The team consists of five full-time administrative staff, eight crew members, and five student employees.

Financially, the events operation has made significant progress. When Colleen Walker became CEO in 2019, the unit was operating at an annual loss of \$552,896. Historically, bookstore revenue offset these losses, but the bookstore has since transitioned to a service model with minimal net revenue. Under the leadership of Lulu Lantzy and Alyssa Inouye, the department has moved towards breakeven. While internal events now account for 81% of total events, external events generate approximately 73% of revenue, providing critical financial support to the department. The focus remains on supporting internal campus needs while reinvesting in event spaces. Pricing examples highlighted student affordability, including two free hours of space and significantly reduced rates compared to external clients.

The events team supports numerous campus functions, including commencements, career fairs, athletics events, student programming, and board meetings, as well as large-scale activations such as Christkindl Market and Outside Days. These events contribute to campus visibility, community engagement, and partnerships with organizations such as the Downtown Denver Partnership, Visit Denver, and Xcel. Activation efforts have also increased traffic to campus venues like Degree Brewpub and Quad Side Tavern, enhanced the reputations of the partner institutions, and aligned with statewide initiatives. The events program directly supports AHEC's strategic goals of exemplary service, activated partnerships, vibrant environments, and sustainable funding, and is considered essential to maintaining campus relevance.

Board members then discussed strategic alignment and operational considerations. Paul Washington inquired about the importance of the Tivoli Reimagined project to events, and Alyssa Inouye noted that while event spaces are funded separately, Tivoli remains the most desirable location for events. Improvements to layout, access, and wayfinding were identified as key opportunities to enhance the event experience. Yolanda Ortega raised concerns about parking challenges for large events such as Christkindl. In response, Alyssa explained that parking coordination includes analyzing peak usage times, directing attendees to multiple parking locations, and offering shuttle services through the parking team. Janine Davidson suggested expanding “know-before-you-go” communications and improving signage, which Alyssa confirmed is an ongoing effort.

Adam Glick asked about the long-term strategy amid competing venues reopening, such as Civic Center Park. Colleen Walker and Alyssa Inouye emphasized the importance of maintaining competitiveness through strong partnerships and compelling event offerings, noting that vendors experienced increased traffic on campus and that activation efforts benefit the broader Denver ecosystem. Additional discussion focused on affordability for student groups, with Alyssa acknowledging this remains a challenge and emphasizing efforts to keep costs low while helping students plan events within budget constraints.

Board members also discussed metrics and the evaluation of upcoming events. Peter Lindstrom and Ken Christensen raised questions about how success and impact are measured, particularly as external events increase. Alyssa noted that current metrics include partnership value, audience engagement, and student involvement, though more robust tracking is still needed. Suggestions included involving institutions earlier in event planning, developing shared metrics, and improving post-event evaluation through data and surveys. Janine Davidson recommended elevating strategic planning discussions to the Auraria Executive Council (AEC), including reviewing an annual events calendar and establishing a more systematic approach to prioritization and evaluation. Colleen Walker noted that AEC is actively refining this approach and exploring the creation of a cross-institutional working group to support event strategy.

## **6. Board Education Session**

### **a. Annual Board Training**

Skip Spear congratulated FACAB and SACAB on the successful passage of their bill and thanked the Community College of Denver (CCD) for partnering with AHEC to establish a legal internship program. He noted that Isaias Salazar, who drafted the bill, previously interned with AHEC, and that the office currently has another intern, with an additional intern planned for the summer. Skip then introduced Michael McMaster, First Assistant Attorney General for the Higher Education Unit, the same unit in which Skip previously served before joining AHEC as its General Counsel and Chief Administrative Officer.

Michael McMaster provided an overview of the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA), emphasizing that board members should assume that most records created in their official capacity are public records. This includes electronic records, hard copy documents, emails, and text messages. He explained that if a public resource (such as a state-issued device or AHEC email) is used, or if public business is being discussed, the record is likely subject to CORA. While there are limited statutory exceptions, the general guidance is to err on the side of transparency and consult legal counsel when questions arise. He also

cautioned that generative AI chat logs used for board-related business could potentially be considered public records.

Michael then reviewed the Colorado Open Meetings Law (OML), which is intended to ensure transparency and accountability in government. He explained that a meeting occurs when two or more board members discuss public business or take formal action, regardless of location. Certain meetings must be publicly noticed in advance, particularly those involving a quorum or formal action, with at least 24 hours' notice and sufficient detail for the public to understand the purpose. While the public has the right to observe meetings, participation is not guaranteed, and boards may remove disruptive individuals. All public meetings must have recorded minutes, and in most cases, audio recordings are also maintained.

Executive sessions were discussed as a limited exception to open meeting requirements. Michael explained that executive sessions require a two-thirds vote of the full board and may only address specific topics outlined in statute, such as legal advice, personnel matters, or property transactions. No formal decisions or votes may occur during executive session; those must take place in public. Sessions must be recorded and retained for 90 days in case of legal challenge, and boards are encouraged to provide a general summary upon returning to open session without disclosing confidential details. He emphasized that executive sessions cannot be used to avoid transparency or conceal controversial discussions.

Board members asked clarifying questions regarding executive sessions and governance practices. Paul Washington confirmed that a quorum and a two-thirds vote are required to enter executive session and asked about participation in cases of conflict of interest; Michael advised that members with a conflict of interest should not participate in the discussion. Angie Rivera-Malpiede confirmed that this includes leaving the session entirely. Adam Glick inquired about how OML applies to the Auraria Executive Council (AEC), and Michael noted that discussions involving board business may trigger OML, while institution-specific discussions may not. Ken Christensen asked about timing for requesting executive sessions, and Michael noted that while requests can be made during a meeting, advance planning is recommended.

Discussion also addressed the distinction between board-level and management-level work. Janine Davidson emphasized the importance of operating at the appropriate "altitude," noting that not all operational matters should be treated as board business, particularly in a complex environment involving three institutions. Michael acknowledged

the uniqueness of AHEC's governance structure and agreed that the key consideration is whether an issue is a board matter or a campus/operational matter.

Michael further outlined fiduciary responsibilities under SB 26-34, clarifying that all board members serve as fiduciaries of AHEC rather than representatives of specific constituencies. He explained the duty of care (remaining informed and exercising independent judgment) and the duty of loyalty (prioritizing AHEC's interests over personal or institutional interests). Regarding conflicts of interest, he emphasized that board members must not participate in decisions where they have a direct financial interest and should formally recuse themselves from both discussion and voting. In some cases, members may be required to leave the meeting space entirely. He noted that violations could carry legal consequences, though a limited exception exists if participation is necessary to achieve a quorum, and proper disclosure procedures are followed.

Additional guidance included protecting confidential information, adhering to state gift restrictions (generally prohibiting gifts over \$75), and following ethical standards established by executive order, including integrity, impartiality, and accountability.

Board members discussed the practical challenges of balancing fiduciary duties with institutional affiliations. Paul Washington asked about situations where decisions may benefit AHEC but not a member's institution; Michael advised that most cases do not constitute a true conflict, but when they do, recusal is appropriate. Callie Rennison highlighted the tension for student representatives elected by their peers to represent the student body's interests, and Michael reiterated that fiduciary duty is owed to AHEC, not to a specific constituency. Janine Davidson added that leaders often navigate multiple roles and may need to pause discussions to consult with their respective institutions before proceeding. Ken Christensen emphasized that AHEC's mission is to serve the three institutions, which helps align decision-making and minimize conflicts.

The discussion concluded with suggestions for improving training accessibility. Adam Glick recommended offering the training at the start of the academic year rather than in April, and Skip Spear noted that this shift is under consideration. Callie Rennison also suggested recording the training so it would be available to new board members.

## **7. Voting Agenda**

### **a. Tivoli Facilities Program Plan**

Carl Messe introduced the ZGF team and noted that, over the past six months, they have presented the evolution of the Tivoli Reimagined Facilities Program Plan, which was brought forward for approval. He explained that the Program Plan is a required document by the Office of the State Architect (OSA) for capital construction projects and reflects work that began in October 2024, with ZGF joining in spring 2025. The Plan incorporates extensive engagement across all three institutions, including steering committee meetings, focus groups, town halls, and leadership feedback. The purpose of the Program Plan is to outline existing building conditions, infrastructure deficiencies, space needs, improvement opportunities, and provide preliminary cost estimates and phasing concepts. Approval of the Plan enables AHEC to request state funding, contingent upon both ABOD approval and OSA eligibility. OSA has confirmed Tivoli's eligibility, allowing AHEC to pursue approximately \$30 million in state funding, with an anticipated timeline of one to three years. Since February 2026, additional engagement has reinforced student priorities around belonging, community, and shared experiences, and the Plan has been refined accordingly. Continued engagement is proposed throughout the next year, which would result in the creation of a Tivoli Projects Goal document to guide future design and address outstanding concerns.

Zach Hermsen reviewed the capital stack, which remains consistent with prior presentations, including \$30 million in student fee bond capacity (without increasing student fees), \$30 million in state capital construction funding, \$15 million in AHEC bond refinancing, approximately \$8 million in historic tax credits, and \$3–5 million in philanthropy and naming opportunities. He emphasized that the student fee has historically supported operations, maintenance, and infrastructure, and will continue to do so without an increase. Risks of delaying the project include losing eligibility for state funding, reduced legislative momentum, and potential for costly emergency repairs to aging infrastructure.

David Levo from ZGF discussed how the Tivoli is unlike any other student union; this is true on both the physical and operational levels. The Tivoli comprises 14 interconnected historic buildings that were not originally designed to function as a single facility. Structural systems vary across buildings: mechanical and plumbing systems are independent, and floor levels do not align. We have a rare opportunity to transform a historic campus landmark into a unified, student-centered destination. One of the big risks is the high rooftop air conditioning units; you can't easily get to them, they have long lead times, and when they fail, a third of the building can be without AC. The Reimaging will give us the opportunity to make informed decisions rather than reactive ones. One of the strongest moves in the program plan is to create a clear conceptual organization of the building

across the three large floors. The first floor would be where students connect with each other, the second floor would be where students connect with the community, and the third floor would be where students connect with their institutions.

The plan is to have the Tivoli Student Union be a student-focused campus living room. We aim to have clear, intuitive navigation throughout the building, expanded seating options across the first three floors, shared kitchen infrastructure supporting MSU and CCD food pantry access, with dining repositioned on the second floor as the social heart of the building, and increased daylight and comfortable lounge spaces.

Another point is to strengthen the Tivoli as a space for student belonging by having a significant increase in student-serving space throughout the building, shifting the Tivoli toward daily student use: socially, academically, and informally. We are reinforcing the Tivoli as a shared living room for all three institutions and creating greater visibility and connection among students across campus.

Board discussion focused on project timing, cost considerations, institutional alignment, and long-term funding implications.

Paul Washington asked about the financial implications of delaying the project by one to two years. David Levo noted that costs are expected to increase over time and that Milender and White served as the project's cost estimator. He explained that the estimate includes projected cost escalation over a three-year period, but projecting costs over a five-year period would be difficult given current construction market volatility.

Angie Rivera-Malpiede asked whether delaying the project would jeopardize the \$30M state funding request. Carl Meese responded that delaying the project would extend the overall timeline, as it would require that AHEC remove the project from the state queue, which would diminish the momentum built over the past year.

Peter Lindstrom prepared a written statement that was shared with board members:

*"Dear Auraria Board of Directors:*

*CCD supports the long-term goal of preserving and revitalizing the Tivoli. It is a historic and symbolic space, and the Board's role as steward of that asset is critically important. Precisely because of that importance, I believe this project must only advance when the planning is complete, financially sound, and broadly supported across all three campus communities.*

*At approximately \$85 million, this would be the largest student-funded, tri-institutional capital project in Auraria's history. That scale demands rigor. As of today, important questions remain regarding institutional identity and presence within the building, the prioritization of student-centered uses, and how the Tivoli Student Union can best foster belonging on a shared campus by ensuring students feel welcome, comfortable, and at home.*

*Equally concerning are the financial implications. Further analysis is needed to understand CCD student perspectives related to the use of existing Tivoli-related fees. They are being asked to shoulder long-term debt obligations tied to a plan whose scope, cost, and assumptions differ materially from what was authorized in the original student referendum. The argument that no new fees are being charged misses the point. The real question is whether existing student fees are producing value that students recognize and support. The meagre allocation of 2% of usable space for CCD is itself an answer to that question since CCD students have contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for that return.*

*There is also a broader strategic concern. Advancing a program plan without a clear, visible support from all institutional communities risks undermining the project's prospects in a constrained and highly competitive capital funding environment. Projects that demonstrate strong institutional alignment and stakeholder support are more likely to secure funding. Proceeding prematurely could weaken, rather than strengthen, the Board's ability to fulfill its fiduciary obligation to maximize the likelihood of securing state support to protect this important campus asset. Our obligation runs to the students of this entire campus. Missing a capital construction request cycle to get this right is a recoverable problem. Advancing a fractured project into a competitive state process is not.*

*I also need to speak directly to process.*

*We have clear disagreement on the campus about the urgency and readiness to submit this project plan at this moment. Two of the three IHE's supported a recommendation to delay the submission of the project plan until the next legislative session. The other IHE supported moving forward. This disagreement was not resolved and my question is how ABOD would like such uses to be brought forth? We all received the position statement memo from President Davidson and Board Member Jerry Glick, and I drafted my own to help*

*provide a balancing frame for the discussion today. I opted not to send it because I'm unsure if it is the expectation of this body to have such debate carry over from the AEC meetings at all. The KPMG study seemed to indicate that such work was expected to stay at the AEC level. Importantly, if the expectation is to have this kind of debate at ABOD, I suggest that clear processes be established so that IHE members of ABOD are not unintentionally running afoul of open meetings laws.*

*Given these issues, I move to table the vote on the Tivoli Reimagined Project Plan until such times as all three IHEs are in full support of the plan. I look forward to working toward a plan all three campus communities can stand behind together – and that the state will be more likely to fund because of it.*

*Thank you.*

*Peter Lindstrom*

*Interim President & ABOD Member, CCD*

Peter Lindstrom introduced a motion to postpone the vote, citing concerns from CCD regarding institutional identity, financial implications, and the need for broader alignment among the three institutions. Ken Christensen seconded the motion, emphasizing the importance of institutional alignment, student support, and confidence in the project's financial structure amid current fiscal constraints.

Discussion on the motion followed. Jerry Glick stated that the project is critically important to the campus and that the Program Plan had been thoroughly developed. He noted that it would be unusual for a project to advance further before formal Program Plan approval and asked whether CCD was seeking unanimity on all elements of the Plan, which he stated would be a difficult standard to meet.

Ken Christensen clarified that the ask is to seek consensus rather than unanimity. He stated that significant questions remained within their respective campus communities regarding the project's structure and viability. He further noted that, given the constrained state budget environment, a request for state funding should be supported by broad institutional consensus to strengthen the proposal. Ken acknowledged that AHEC had shared a proposed engagement plan the prior evening, but there had not been adequate time for discussion. He also raised concerns about the student fee, noting that it was

approved 10 years earlier under different circumstances and for a different student population.

Ken Christensen requested clarification regarding the historic tax credits, specifically whether the credits were federally funded and how AHEC, as a nonprofit entity, would accept them. Zach Hermsen confirmed that the credits are federally funded and stated that AHEC would work with a consultant to maximize and navigate the available funding opportunities. When asked whether the credits would require selling a portion of the building to a private entity, Zach stated that such action would not be necessary.

Janine Davidson stated that she supported approving the Program Plan in order to preserve the opportunity and flexibility to move forward within the proposed timeline. She noted that failing to approve the Plan could limit future funding opportunities. Janine asked whether there was any risk associated with submitting the Program Plan to the CDC queue. Carl Meese responded that there was no risk.

Adam Glick commended the board for engaging in a difficult but important discussion and requested clarification on the language of the 2016 student fee referendum. Zach Hermsen clarified that the referendum authorized the continued use of the student fee for operations and maintenance, capital repairs, and building improvements for the Tivoli Student Union, including the ELC, and was not limited solely to debt service.

Peter Lindstrom stated that the Program Plan serves only a portion of the campus community and does not fully address the needs of the broader campus population. He noted that CCD currently only occupies approximately 2% of the building, while CCD students pay the same fee as other students on campus. Peter reiterated concerns regarding the state's fiscal environment and suggested that it may be more prudent to delay consideration of the Program Plan until the state budget outlook improves.

Ken Christensen stated that the project's capital stack is highly dependent on the debt capacity supported by the student fee. He noted that prior to 2016, the student fee had required periodic reaffirmation votes, which he characterized as a healthy practice. He also expressed concern that anticipated tuition increases could affect future student support for continuing fees.

Callie Rennison stated that she had received a phone call from a faculty member who had only recently become aware of the project and expressed frustration regarding the timing of the information.

Jared Bynum stated that SACAB had not taken a formal position on the Tivoli Reimagined Program Plan. He emphasized that the Tivoli is critical to student life and stated that the building, in its current condition, does not adequately meet student needs.

Jerry Glick addressed concerns about the student fee, stating that the fee discussion was separate from the Program Plan itself and that any further discussion of the fee should be done as a separate agenda item. He further stated that the previously referenced 2% occupancy metric was misleading because it reflected only administrative office space, whereas CCD students have open access to the majority of the building.

Janine Davidson shared MSU Denver's experience pursuing state funding for the Health Institute beginning prior to 2020. Although the project was not immediately funded, she stated that the CDC process provided valuable feedback while the institution continued fundraising and phased planning efforts. She further noted that, because the project remained in the queue for several years, an opportunity later emerged for significant state funding.

Colleen Walker thanked the board for the discussion and stated that she was proud of the work completed by the AHEC team in developing a phased capital stack strategy. She noted that the student fee represents approximately 35% of the capital stack, with campus leadership responsible for identifying the remaining 65% of funding sources, reflecting a significant institutional commitment to students and the future of the campus.

Colleen also referenced the historical development of the student fee, noting that in 2015–2016 students directly proposed language to the Board of Directors to continue the fee in perpetuity in support of the Tivoli Student Union and related student facilities. She outlined the timeline of the process, explaining that students introduced the proposal and its purpose in December 2015, presented referendum language and key questions in February 2016, and returned in May 2016 after students had approved all related referenda, which were subsequently supported unanimously by the Board of Directors. She emphasized that the intent was to create a sustainable funding mechanism that would support ongoing operations, deferred maintenance, capital repairs, building improvements, and related needs without requiring recurring renewal votes.

Colleen stated that the institution's responsibility is to make decisions not only for current students but also for future generations of students. She noted that the collaborative planning process conducted across the institutions with ZGF had been thoughtful and respectful, while emphasizing that opportunities for additional input remain important and that alignment with broader campus and state processes continues to be critical.

Yolanda Ortega noted that she served as board chair when the student fee referendum was approved.

Angie Rivera-Malpiede stated that she was a student on campus in 2016 and voted in favor of the student referendum. She characterized the Program Plan as a fluid document and stated that it should proceed into the state queue while engagement efforts continue.

Ken Christensen suggested that the proposed AHEC engagement timeline be discussed with AEC as soon as possible and that the matter return to the board at its next meeting. Carl Meese clarified that the state submission deadline is May 22 and that the vote could not be postponed further. He noted that the Office of the State Architect had already granted a two-month extension for Program Plan approval.

Following the discussion, the board voted on the motion to postpone the item. The motion failed, with three votes in favor, five opposed, and one abstention.

Ken Christensen requested an emergency AEC meeting to continue the discussion regarding AHEC's proposed engagement plan. Skip Spear and Carl Meese clarified the voting process and the timeline for the state submission deadline in May. They noted that the current vote pertained specifically to approval of the Tivoli Student Union Program Plan as presented, while the May ABOD meeting would be to approve AHEC's five-year capital construction request list.

Angie Rivera-Malpiede called for a motion to approve the Tivoli Program Plan as presented. Jerry Glick moved for approval, and Paul Washington seconded the motion. The motion passed with five votes in favor, one opposed, and three abstentions.

Angie Rivera-Malpiede stated that due to time constraints, the remaining agenda items, updates from MSU and CU Denver, will be shared at next month's meeting.\*

## **8. Public Comment**

3 people made public comments.

## **9. Adjourn**

The meeting ended at 11:48 am.