I. Call to Order
Chair Burney called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

II. Attendance
The following members were present: Kizzmekia Corbett, Zach Ferguson, Nitin Goel, Kim Niver, Braxton Reyna, Jonathan Stupak, Max Williams, Chair Jocelyn Burney

The following members arrived late: Stephani Mellini

III. New Business
   i. SCR-94-187 A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE FINANCE CHAIR’S APPOINTMENT TO THE YACKETY YACK BOARD OF DIRECTORS
   The appointment introduced himself, explaining that he was a journalism major and on the yearbook staff for all three years – he has been a photographer and was a design editor last year. He wanted to be on the board to directors to make behind the scenes decisions. He said that the yearbook is a dwindling organization and he wanted to liven it up and make it relevant. He’s qualified for the management position because he was on the yearbook in high school and was responsible for keeping the yearbook records.

   Chair Burney asked what the board of directors did. The new appointment said that they currently don’t do much, because they’re restructuring the bylaws so they will be more relevant.

   Representative Stupak asked if the appointment had any specific ideas to make the yearbook more relevant. The appointment said that in past years they’ve been struggling to put the book out on time, and prospects look the same this year. On the board of directors, he would want to help pick a leader that could actually succeed, so he could fix bad management decisions in the past.

   Chair Burney said that it is hard for yearbooks now, because everybody wants to do stuff online. She asked how he would combat that problem. The appointment said that last year he began researching ways of putting out a yearbook without a physical book, such as possibly putting it on a disc, so they wouldn’t continue the model of charging students a hundred dollars for something that will be free online in a matter of years.

IV. External Appointments

i. SFAC
Representative Stupak reported that currently SFAC is in the process of auditing student fees, so they haven't meet a lot recently. He said that they are hoping to hear back from the student body treasurer and the student organizations this week, and then they would be able to meet in groups and do the audits.

ii. Union Board of Directors
The appointment said that they've been discussing improving the bottom of the union by installing lockers for students as well as student organizations to rent throughout the day. They're currently in the process of discussion – no decisions have been made. She reported that they are also in the process of interviewing for a new president. They interviewed three candidates last weekend, but aren't set on any of them and are considering opening the application up to the public.

Representative Griffin asked if there would be lockers as well as storage units. The appointment said that there would be lockers for students. Representative Niver explained that they would be advanced, similar to lockers at amusement parts. The appointment said they would operate on a first come first serve basis, and would be available for rental until midnight. The student organization lockers would be bigger, and where the bowling alley used to be.

Representative Griffin asked if this was definite, but the appointment clarified that the union board of directors is still discussing the idea, they haven't decided anything. Representative Griffin asked if they were able to do whatever they wanted with the money, or if it was only for the lockers. The appointment said that the decision is up in the air, the money is merely allocated for the improvement of the union.

Representative Stupak said that it seemed like the lockers for student organizations were a really good idea, but he said that people are less sold on the day lockers. He asked what the next best proposal is. He said that Congress agreed that the student group lockers are very helpful, but was worried the day lockers wouldn't see much use. The appointment said that they decided to survey students, and they would drop the idea if people weren't interested.

Representative Goel asked if organizations that have an office in the union would get a locker. Chair Burney said that she assumed if they had an office, they wouldn't get first choice for the lockers.

Representative Goel said that he supports the idea for lockers for organizations, but doesn't know if the student lockers would catch on. He suggested doing a two-phase plan by implementing the organization lockers first, and then testing the student lockers.
Representative Stupak asked when the money had to be spent by. Representative Niver said that they want to have an idea for what the money will be used for by the end of the semester, but it definitely has to be an improvement on the union. She also clarified that the student organization lockers would be a five by eight foot space. She said that it’d be a space allocation, just like offices – groups would apply, and then spaces would be decided based on the need of the group. She said groups probably wouldn’t have a storage space and an office at the same time.

Representative Mellini asked if it was possible to split the funds up into multiple projects, or if it had to be used on only one. The appointment said that it is already split up – $4,200 for lockers, and then $2,500 for student organizations.

Representative Stupak suggested finding a way to gauge the need for what students would want out of the union – similar to the O&A petition page. The appointment said that they’re asking friends for suggestions, and then asking the majority of the population based on those suggestions.

Chair Burney asked if the Duke portal went through the board of directors. The appointment said no.

Representative Goel asked what the reason was for tearing down the bowling alley. Representative Niver explained that it was getting really old, and many of the broken parts weren’t made anymore. It was falling into disrepair, but building a new one would cost a million dollars, and the operating fee of the old one would quickly add up to that amount as well.

V. AlertCarolina
Chair Burney asked if everybody got a text message when the test sirens went off – the answer was a collective yes. Chair Burney said she didn’t have a perfect understanding of the issue, but the main problem is that incidents have happened on Franklin Street including shots being fired, and AlertCarolina didn’t tell everybody until hours later. She said the issue is that for DPS it might be a liability to misrepresent a crime, but she asked if people would rather get a text that says something at 3 in the morning or an be told later if shots were fired.

Representative Mellini asked if people had to choose between the two options. She suggested a way to receive both a quick notice, and then a full explanation later about what happened.

Representative Williams pointed out that people choose whether or not they want to receive the text messages, so he thinks that DPS should absolutely send a text message out – if an individual chose to get the messages, they’re obviously concerned about such incidents, whereas if they didn’t sign up, they wouldn’t mind not hearing about it until later.
Representative Stupak cited a personal experience where an armed robbery was happening close to him, and he accidentally walked into the scene. He said that if he had had a quick alert from AlertCarolina he definitely wouldn’t have walked into a situation where police were chasing a man with a gun. Even if they didn’t have all the details, he pointed out that he would’ve found out in the Daily Tar Heel the next day.

Representative Niver said that living far off campus, if she got a text message at three in the morning she’d read it, acknowledge that it wasn’t a threat to her, and go back to sleep – no harm no foul. She believed it would have more benefits than consequences.

Chair Burney asked what constituted a threat to students. Representative Corbett said that she thinks that everything AlertCarolina sends messages about is appropriate, and it’s up to each individual to decide whether the alert is important to them or not, but it’s preferred for students not to be ignorant to the fact that a person close to campus is using a gun.

Chair Burney asked what distance from campus would be acceptable. She said that currently it seems that only Franklin Street and on campus are included in AlertCarolina. Representative Corbett said that she believes there definitely has to be a scope, and that Franklin Street and campus are acceptable. She said that she’s not familiar where undergraduate students live, but if UNC were to try to target graduate students, they’d be sending AlertCarolina messages from Cary, which is way too far away. She added that Carrboro could also potentially be part of that scope.

Representative Mellini said that she would hope DPS could filter what’s going on within the scope as well – for example, if an armed individual were running towards campus, she would hope that DPS wouldn’t wait until he actually reached campus to warn students.

**VI. Funding Ammunition**
Chair Burney asked if the representative had any strong feelings towards funding ammunition – many have voiced an opinion that it might be considered personal gain, since it’s only shot once.

Representative Griffin said that as part of finance committee, they’ve talked a lot about this topic. He said that somebody made a fair point that it’s not personal gain if it’s used to fire a weapon, because that’s not a tangible thing to keep, whereas if they were merely hoarding the ammunition it would be personal gain.

Chair Burney clarified that the ammunition would be used to go to a shooting range, and would be bought there.
Representative Mellini thought that the fact that it could only be used once speaks to the fact that it is personal gain. Chair Burney pointed out that only one student would ever benefit from it. Representative Goel pointed out that that’s the reason that student congress doesn’t fund food for events.

Representative Mellini said that Joseph Strader brought up a good point once – if anybody were to be injured by an accident occurring with congressionally funded ammunition, would congress be liable? Representative Griffin said that member of the finance committee are actually discussing that issue with legal council in regard to title five – the state law has a ban for firearms on campus, as well as at any university-sponsored event. Exceptions do exist if it’s for educational purposes though, so they’re trying to get the fine print sorted out.

Chair Burney voiced her opinion that she doesn’t have any problem with paying money to rent a weapon to shoot, but she can see where ammunition would fall into a grey area.

**Adjournment**
Chair Burney adjourned the meeting at 6:32 p.m.