Call to Order (Roll Call): 8:34

Members Present:

(Chair) Travis Crayton
(Vice Chair) Peter McClelland
Laura Brush
Brittany Clark
Brad Dunnagan
Josh Guzek
Will Stelpflug
Chris Woodward

Members not present:

Andrew Lucas
Austin Gilmore
Nishma Patel
Paige Comparato

New Business

Resolutions

Chair: We have two resolutions to discuss today.

SCR-94-188: A Resolution to Approve the Student Body President's Appointments to the Student Grievance Committee

Chair: I will ask the student body treasurer to introduce the nominees.

Treasurer: This is Susanna, Mia, and Zach. Rachel picked these people out of seven people who interviewed. This is a new appointment that we would like to have approved by beginning of February so it needs to go through congress. They can tell you more about themselves, but Susanna is sophomore, Mia is first-year, and Zach is also a first-year.
Woodward: I think the committee is interesting. What are the opinions of what you bring to this committee?

Mia: I am a survivor and secondary survivor. I want to bring a case of what the victim can be going through, especially when it comes to interpersonal violence and not knowing how to reach out for help.

Susanna: I transferred from Wilmington. I was on a board that dealt with this, so I understand how to operate on this board from experience.

Zach: I'm conscientious and interested in the law. This essentially is civil trials, so I figure it's a good way to get a feel for what the law is like.

Dunnagan. Move to report favorably.

Brush: I second.

Consent.

Approved.

SCR-94-191: A Resolution to Schedule a Student Body Referendum to Renew a Student Fee to Fund Renewable Energy on Campus and in North Carolina

Chair: This is representative Brush and he's going to introduce the ne

Brush: RESPC, not to get confused with R E S P E C T, is a renewable energy committee within student government. Students have voted it on twice, favorably. It has been around for a while. There is a $4 fee that goes into education and research of renewable energy. This year it needs to be voted on again.

Woodward: One of the concerns that I have is voter turnout on election. I completely agree with the fee, think the committee is worthy and great, but I worry about turnout on the 19th. I don’t know if anyone else has a comment on the subject, but there are only two candidates for student vice president so I’m concerned.

Student body treasurer: I looked up the history of this fee so I know what it's about. I'm concerned that it would not get approved in time because they only have one week to campaign.

Clark: The group has no experience with campaigning. I’m not sure if they will have enough time to campaign with such a small group. So I’m concerned about that.
McClellan: There’s a little more than a week so I don’t think there will be enough time. They can’t start now because it would be a constitutional violation. The next one is on the fifth. I support this because I don’t want it to fall through the cracks. We would need another bill to replace this with SFAC.

Farley: They’re only 20 signatures away, so more likely to be a runoff.

Guzek: They would have to wait until the following year if they don’t do the 19th. What is the result of this not being on the ballot? Would have to wait till next year?

Treasurer: The committee would still be paid for because the tuition fee advisory task force would keep it alive, but the committee would be held in limbo. Money would still be collected from students, but not used until a referenda can get on the ballot.

Woodward: With that said (runoff election) and with them still only having a week, there is still a chance that we could have another referenda, with it being on the SFAC bill.

Treasurer: The only reason why I suggest runoff is because the student vice president election is the only time we get a massive turnout of voters, so it’s the only time to get good student opinion.

Guzek: While I don’t think one week is enough time, I think a month is better, but the alternative doesn’t sound very promising. I don’t support money just sitting there either. Regardless of the campaign, we’re not going to see a lot of voters that would turn out with a runoff election. So while it’s not my favorite, but don’t see another option.

Woodward: So I think we’re all in agreement to have this as referenda, we just don’t know when. I motion to report without prejudice to full congress.

Second.

Approved

Chair: I will now ask member of committee to please go get Representative Root of finance.

... 

Chair: I now call the committee to order.

Bills

SCB-94-190: A Bill to Responsibly Allocate Publication Money*
Root: This bill is sponsored by the vice chair, Comporato, and others. We have changed the funding multipliers. We used to use (old formula) but now we've changed it to reduce the amount. Also, we've written a new clause that says we won’t fund in full anything over 800 copies. This deals with the entire issues. If we decide we want to fund a group for 1500 issues, we could do that because we could override it. The bill also says that the group can receive proportional issues depending on the fund, it would just be a larger decrease, or the other option could be to give us another quote. It doesn’t affect groups right now, but depending on how long it takes to get passed will determine when it will affect them. No one really disagrees with it. There are some groups exempted from it (essential groups – don’t want to alter that).

Chair: The floor is open.

Guzek: What was motivation to do this?

Root: Many publications sit unused and unread. The publications request many issues but only use some. For example, Blue and White wants 1500 issues, but only used 7. It’s unfair to give them money that they’re not really using. We’re not cutting fund, but redistributing money so that it will be fairer.

McClellan: Why did you not change the funding multiplier?

Roots: We didn’t want to change it because it would have affected smaller publications more than larger ones. She [Comporato] decided and I agree that it should affect larger ones more. It will affect every publication that prints over 800 copies.

This change is also environmentally friendly because cuts down on paper.

Clark: Is there a list of exempted organizations?

Root: In constitution, lists who would be.

We will have to pass prejudice on this because we need 2/3 of full congress to approve.

Clark: Did you talk to organizations to find out their minimum print?

Root: We did not. We discussed this amongst ourselves based on observations. Many groups do not print over 800, but some do. Originally, we were going to do 1000, but we didn’t think would affect anything.

McClellan: Carolina Review prints 2000, so 800 is less that half. That seems like a lot.
Root: If we were compelled, we could override this bill, but there are boxes of publications that aren’t read but are funded. This just creates a standard.

Clark: This is for the whole year?

Roots: This is for each issue. It seems like a lot of copies but compared to 1500 requested each time for 7 issues, too much.

Guzek: Do you know how many groups this will affect?

Roots: I do not, I would say more than 5. This would save a lot of money. If anyone knows what finance has been doing lately – the rate that we go through money is atrocious. We’ll go through $40,000 in one sitting. Publications contribute their fair share. We’re talking about saving money and reducing our carbon footprint.

Stelpflug: I like the bill. It gives more opportunity to fund start-up publications. Even with the ones we fund, they can use their money/publications more efficiently. It’s a better sharing of resources. I move to report favorable.

McClellan – I object. I move to report without prejudice.

Second.

Consent.

Announcements

Woodward: During the next cycle, we’re going through a large document of the ethics log, which need to be updated. This is just a heads up that we will have a longer meeting next time.

McClellan: Will is just be a discussion?

Woodward: No, need to be updated. The haven’t been touched in the past because they’ve just been copy and pasted to the next one. The language needs to be changed to keep continuity, so that the next ethics chair can have firm guidelines. The laws are contradictory and not clear.

Stelpflug: Will we be emailed this?

Woodward: yes, I will email to them to Paige.

Chair: Anything further?

Dunnagan: I move to adjourn.
Consent.

**Adjournment:** 9:03

Respectfully submitted,

Travis Crayton
Chair

* If applicable, pending favorable referral from Finance Committee