



TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1ST, 2011
TWENTY-FIRST MEETING OF THE 2010-2011 SENATE

Call to Order

Start Time: 7:00pm

Roll Call

Finance: All excused
Student Activities: All Present
COLA: Senator Cooper, unexcused
CODEEE: All Present
Student Action: Chair Simmons, Excused
Public Relations: All Present
Academic Affairs: All Present

Approval of the Minutes (0:00.12)

From 1/25/11 - passes

Public Forum (0:00.48)

Guest #1: I wanted to talk real quick about the Lockheed Martin green washing carbon war room issue. I just sort of wanted to say that if you are taking this seriously you should really look at the history that Lockheed Martin has in terms of its effect on the environment and its carbon emissions in general and its total disregard to the environment and recognize the public relations campaign that this really is to take a bunch of these not for profit initiatives that are going around in Burlington, these green initiatives and make them private and throw a Lockheed Martin sticker on it. It's really disgusting. Anyway, you should look into it more and ultimately vote for a resolution against it.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:02.09)

Senator Caster: Could you yourself maybe spend a couple minutes illuminating what your talking about here a bit maybe a historical context as well as maybe a personal context as to why you're here?

Alex: I got an email saying there was a public forum about this. History about this, they are the number one military contractor with the U.S. with a large, large army. The U.S. Army uses more oil than a lot of countries, most countries, a majority of countries. And they wreak havoc on the environment. They are the ones who are pushing for the new war planes to come in to Burlington which would be even less fuel efficient than the ones that are already here going around. They're just not environmentally friendly. [inaudible].

David Ross: I can probably talk here. Ok, is anyone having a problem hearing me? I'm going to make this short because you don't have time to hear a big harangue. My name is David Ross I'm an alumni at the department of Anthropology here, I majored in cultural anthropology. There are two things going on. One is issue of the F35 which initially evolved out of a not in my backyard thing to an issue for Veterans for Peace which I represent and am involved in. As to whether we need this airplane or not. These airplanes and this base up here no longer protecting the United

States from Russian bombers. Something like that happens, it's going to be thermonuclear missiles, it's all over. Those planes won't even shoot down one of them. Those planes and the mission of the air guard in Vermont which is trained, yes, but they are being rotated in and out of the war zone and they're involved in killing people. That's the job of the military to produce body counts. When I was your age, I was terribly idealistic, I volunteered twice and served two terms in Vietnam as a Combat Medic in the infantry. You can't begin to imagine. People at your age I put in bags, I dealt with amputations, with tourniquets, I dealt with people that had really already burned to death and were still alive by other means if necessary. I have a really close idea of what war is and I've been in areas that were bombed out and I've seen the little kids and grandmothers and ducks, chickens and everything else. These airplanes are about death. The second issue, if you care to research it or talk with people that have, Lockheed is one of the most dishonest companies ever produced. They are sleazy. They ingratiate themselves into situations and lie about the cost of their products. They get the government so locked in the government can't get out. These planes are already overdue and they're going to cost 2, 3 times what they were supposed to. Their history of integrity and also their history around issues of women, of non-whites, of labor and everything else you can think of is atrocious, possibly the worst of any major corporation in this country. My question to you, in terms of however you want to influence it and that is your decision. The Burlington area has a reputation for being number one in a whole lot of things. Lockheed now wants to come in and save us with a whole lot of Green technology and put a smiley face on their death machine. You've got right here in Vermont out in the Hinesburg area NRC, a leading alternative energy company. You've got people working in their garages on new technologies to use as product. They will come in here, take the smiley face of Burlington, put it on their death machine, and I think they will negatively affect the image that Vermont has. I put it to you, and it's your decision, I'm not an elected official on this governance board, but my mommy always taught her kids that you're judged by the company you keep, and how you decide on whether Lockheed should be part of our family community here is basically a decision of who we are and that is your decision.

Guest #2: So I'm going to keep this brief since the two speakers before me mostly took care of what I wanted to say. I mostly wanted to come out and make my voice heard in opposition to this carbon war room that's being proposed in this merger between Burlington and Lockheed Martin. What we need to understand here is that Lockheed Martin are war profiteers. If the military industrial complex in our country were to be considered its own country, if I'm remembering my figures correctly, we would be ranked, the military industrial complex by itself would be ranked 8th in total output of pollutants among all the other countries in the world. The military industrial complex in this country of which Lockheed Martin is the head is the leading source of pollutants. If every other corporation in the country cut out all of its pollutants, they dropped to 0, but the military industrial complex stayed the same, we would still be heading off the cliff of environmental disaster. This is the level of pollutants that these types of war profiteers put off into the environment. I think that these facts alone should show that the whole idea of Lockheed Martin coming in and talking about green solutions to the environment is a total sham. It's an absolute cover to rebrand what they are doing and to cover up the fact that they are one of the leading polluters in the world. If Lockheed Martin wanted to do something about the environment, it would shut down. It would stop becoming a war profiteer and stop profiting off of occupations and military conquest. This idea that one of the leading polluters is going to step up is just a total sham. And also the idea that the free market capitalist enterprises is going to solve this is just b.s. This idea of taking NGOs and privatizing them and placing them in a profit driven system and forcing them to conform to the narrow ideological and economic structure that is required for industry is just absolutely ridiculous. I think it's really important that we see through the sham that this is and that the SGA come out and take a stand against this idea of the carbon war room and the merging of Burlington with a war profiteer like Lockheed Martin. I'm going to leave it at that.

Old Business (0:11.02)

Bill Allocating Funds to UVM Gymnastics

Senator Tran: So I'm going to read the bill and it's out of the nationals fund for our supplementals. [*reads bill*].

Open the Floor for Questions (0:12.04)

Chair Filstein: What was their original request?

Senator Tran: I think it was around \$3,400.

Senator DeVivo: It was either \$3,500 or \$3,400

Senator Tran: they came in and originally had asked for a certain amount of room for a certain amount of nights and they came in and changed that at the last minute.

Chair Morgan: What's the balance for the nationals funding looking like? Are we running on par what we need to be?

Senator DeVivo: Point of Information: We're a little bit over where we'd like to be with nationals but we have more than we'd like in supplemental, we've spent more than we like in nationals so overall I think we're fine.

Senator Tran: Money can always be moved around so it's not a big deal.

Senator Vitagliano: friendly amendment to add association after student government.

Senator Tran: accepted.

Vote on Bill Allocating Funds to UVM Gymnastics - passes

Resolution Calling for Full Transparency from the Mayor of Burlington Regarding Partnerships with Lockheed Martin and other Corporate Partners (0:14.10)

Senator Bennington: So I've never done this part of senate before. Cool. So resolution calling for Full Transparency from the Mayor of Burlington Regarding Partnerships with Lockheed Martin and other Corporate Partners [*reads resolution*]. So I have a little presentation. I think that the people who spoke, as I'd hoped, the people said it best. Thank you all for coming in. I can't say it much better than you all did. Just to give some background. There's not a lot of information out about this, which is why we're calling for more transparency. I have a little timeline here. Dec 20, 2010 is when a press release announcing Mayor Kiss' cooperation which sets for the parties with respect to their goals of leveraging the experience of each parties in the areas of sustainable environmental practices and technology to enhance the city of Burlington and yadda yadda yadda. So that's their broad goal that they've stated so far. That's about as specific as they care to get. January 6, 2011 after lots of emails and letters and meetings to the mayor from citizens, Mayor Kiss began issuing a blanket statement to citizens because he's getting too many emails. It is basically defending the need for Burlington to partner with Lockheed Martin in the face of grave climate change. Some of the language he used in his letter made it sounds like people had no idea how serious climate change is when in fact probably some of the people he's talking to know more about climate change than he does. January 28, two concerned citizens met with Mayor Kiss. They have a child that has gone through the Burlington School District. He essentially told them that his mind was set, that he didn't care what the people had to say, he didn't care what City Council had to say, he was going to go forward with Lockheed Martin. One of the things he mentioned was his excitement about the possibility of Lockheed engineers teaching about sustainability. Keep in mid this is the #1 polluting corporation in the country. So what's so bad about Lockheed? Aside from the moral and I guess this is still kind of moral and ethical, they're just not a good business partner. They have 54 cases of misconduct. That makes them the top in

the Government Oversight's Federal Contract for Misconduct Database. You can use that as a benchmark to say they are the most unethical corrupt corporation in the nation. Some of these alleged violations, a lot of them have been settled out of court and a lot of them have to do with nuclear contamination, age discrimination, sex discrimination, contractor kickbacks, fraud with military contracts. Right now they are in a pending suit involving a systematic glass ceiling and preventing women from reaching their top-level executive positions. It's pretty disgusting what they do. Historically, as someone mentioned, their deal to build the F35 planes for the Air Force, they've already gone over budget. They historically go over budget on military contracts. Right now Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has put their contract for the Marine version of the F35 on a two-year probation because they have gone so far over budget already and are showing that they don't really have a good idea what they're doing and how to efficiently build this plane. More than 80% of their profits come from defense contracts. This is very clearly a company that depends on the most violent military in the history of this world. So, just going to go to the Burlington Climate Action Plan now. Never mind. Anyways, I wanted to show a slide Springfield Associates was commissioned by the City of Burlington a couple of years ago to help with a Climate Action Plan. They did a cost carbon benefit analysis which basically laid out different strategies the city could enact to combat climate change. One strategy that would result in the greatest reduction of emissions and cost the least money was reducing the amount of community vehicles miles travelled every year. Lockheed Martin has not mentioned anything like this in their dealings with Mayor Kiss. It's not a project that requires a corporation that has a large amount of money, it's just figuring out how to make people drive less. Public campaigns to encourage Carpooling, making bigger bike lanes, encouraging people to ride the bus. Some of the more expensive projects like taking waste heat from McNeil and using it to heat homes in the North End, while it does reduce carbon emissions, it's absurdly expensive and it wouldn't give us the biggest bang for our buck. This is kind of like the in to the F35 stuff which if anyone isn't aware, Lockheed Martin is building the F35, the largest fighter plane ever. We're lucky to have it come to the Burlington airport. The Burlington airport accounts for about 38.4% of city emissions. Lockheed Martin is going to try to save us from climate change and reduce our emissions. They are also going to contribute with one of the most inefficient airplane ever built by bringing it to our airport. It's clearly a case of greenwashing. They're going to increase emissions in a place where most of our emissions are coming from and then they are going to slap stickers all over projects around Burlington and say that they are reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. I don't know if that resounds with anyone else, but it makes me kind of irritated. So real quick, I'll try to wrap this up. Just this one, this is from the Bali Principles of Climate Justice, which came out in 2002. They were created by a largely indigenous organizations and organizations of other oppressed people. It's like 26 or 27 statements about climate justice created by the people who are most affected by climate change but are asked to come to table the least. This one is especially resounding, climate justice opposes military action, occupation, repression and exploitation of lands, water, oceans, people, and cultures, and other life forms, especially as it relates to the fossil fuel industry's role in this respect. Having military contractors fix our climate change problems may be the most absurd idea of our time. Like to open floor to questions.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:24.53)

Chair Adams: I have a bunch of questions. For when you were talking about the meeting with the mayor on January 28 with the two concerned citizens, how did you come by that information and have you heard anything from the mayor's office in regards to this resolution or his stance on the issue?

Senator Bennington: I know, I'm vaguely associated with those two people. I know them not very well but they actually posted their conversation on a facebook page that is called the No Lockheed facebook page, so that's where it got this. It's a group of people who are organizing against this, so that's where I got this information from. And your second question...

Chair Adams: In terms of the mayor's office, have you heard their stance on issue or any comments from them?

Senator Bennington: The mayor wrote a letter to the editor of *Seven Days* two weeks ago, I think it was last week, and the gist of that was that Lockheed Martin was too important so it needs to happen. As far as we can tell, his gist is that he doesn't care what the citizens of Burlington have to say. He is going forward with this. That's the most I've heard. I think others in this room can testify to that too.

Senator Lovell: I will say, I agree on the nature of transparency, however I struggle with some of the other points being made here. You bring up the fact that Lockheed Martin is a bad company because it's a war profiteer. I understand that people that make things that kill other people can be seen as bad. However, Lockheed Martin is primarily a commissioned company. The U.S. government puts out contracts that are bid on by multiple companies and the U.S. Government just has a tendency to give these to Lockheed. The fact that Lockheed isn't efficient enough, I think points out more flaws in the U.S. Government's choice in who it funds for projects, just saying. Further, with respect to- if you could scroll up a little- Whereas Lockheed Martin has 54 cases of misconduct reported in the Federal Contact including charges of racial and age discrimination. I decided to spend less than 10 minutes on Google and see if I could find any other companies that had lawsuits against them in the last 10 years based on racial, age, or sexual discrimination. We have Abercrombie sued for racial discrimination. South California Edison, EEOC, Signal International, Waffle House, Xerox, Evian Water, NASA, the Library of Congress, Sara Lee Bread- with 190 cases in the past 5 years- Target with 5, Social Security Administration for the U.S. Government, 2,200 accusers, the UVM Cake Walk. United Airlines was sued in 2 cases because of gender. Morgan Stanley, Quality Inn, American Express, Hooters- surprise, surprise- Rent A Center, Ford, Bell Atlantic, and last year, March 11, UVM for hiring a male professor at a higher rate than 5 female professors for the same job. If we're not going to work with someone because of sexual or racial discrimination, we're going to be working alone. I agree it's deplorable, it's the state of the world. We should try to fix it, but not working with people is not the way to do it. If we could scroll down a little more please. Friendly amendment in regards to last be it further resolved, I feel as if this has been arbitrarily inserted because Burlington doesn't have standards of partnership, that's why you do not see a Wal-Mart anywhere in this town, otherwise I imagine it would be here as it is in other towns, so obviously there are some standards and you inserted this as a means of trying to get Lockheed out which I think is kind of a crappy way of going about it. Friendly amendment to remove the second two 'be it resolveds' as well as the second to last 'whereas'.

Senator Bennington: I'll consider that. It is important to note though that the city of Burlington has standards for who it contracts with in terms of who it pays to do services but it has no standards in terms of who it accepts money or projects from being done for free, which is why that is not arbitrarily inserted in there. I also think that it's important to note that, yeah, this is the state of the world, and if we just keep going with it, nothing is going to change. That's not the kind of institution that I think this university is. I know that we can probably, like you said, UVM has been sued for racial discrimination, but I think it's also important to note that energy systems has not been sued for racial discrimination. Efficiency Vermont has not been sued for racial discrimination. Vermont car share has not been sued for racial discrimination. Maybe they haven't so far, I'm not sure. I don't think that it is, I think we're walking on a thin line, we're walking on thin ice when we're talking about this is how things are so we might as well deal with it. If we start saying no to every company that has been sued or found guilty of discrimination then maybe companies will have to stop discriminating.

Senator M. White: Jordan, I think we should strive to never accept racial or sexual discrimination. I think that the fact that companies do it is not a reason we should just accept it. Thirdly, I'd like to yield the floor to our guest from earlier if he'd like to finish his thought.

David Ross: It was just a comment on the nature of the airplane because I noticed some confusion on it. The mission of the airplane has nothing to do with the defense of the United States. For that purpose it's basically useless. It's what they call a first strike aircraft. It is

specifically designed to fly very low, very fast, basically to hug the ground to avoid radar or to have radar deflected from it. As a first strike aircraft, its function is to fly deep into whoever your enemy's territory is and to hit primary targets. It can carry almost its own weight in munitions. These are anything from 1000s of little tiny bomblets that can just slaughter anything out in the open through your regular bombs to thermo nuclear weapons. It is basically designed to sneak attack deep into a country that you want to take out like we did in Iraq. It's nothing about defending Mom and apple pie and keeping pollution down.

Chair Filstein: I just wanted to say that I fully support this and it has been well researched. I'm really happy about the conversation that we're having right now, it's one of the best we've had all year and I wanted to throw my support behind Will and say that this is kind of a no brainer if you look at everything UVM is supposed to stand for. You guys can carry on.

Senator Goodnow: So I just wanted to address a couple of quick points. First of all, in my personal opinion, although I really appreciate the emotional appeal that has been brought forth by some of our public people, it's completely subjective. The idea about offensive and defensive weapons, there's no way you can make a statement on how a weapon is used in defense of our nation. Offense is as much of a defensive technique as anything else. Secondly, I feel like it's really reactionary for us to simply put forth an idea simply not involving ourselves with someone who is going to be using really environmentally detrimental techniques for building weapons. Simply just having them not in our state. I really think that ecological looking towards our environmental impact is not a statewide thing but a global thing that we need look at in that sense. Why we would want to discourage a company coming into Vermont who is so environmentally sounds and environmentally conscious, where it could move their industry somewhere else where it's less of an issue.

Senator Caster: Morally and ethically, of course, how can you not support something like this morally and ethically? As far as what the initial investment looks like here, I didn't really see you present any numbers about what the investment project would look like, what they plan on doing physically in terms of construction or working with the community. Second, I understand that we as a body can support this, but I'm just curious if you feel like you have a mandate from the student body to pass this and as we as representatives have mandate on passing something like this.

Senator Bennington: So, the money thing, there hasn't been much mentioned of the amount of money. One project that is particularly disturbing is having Lockheed engineers going into the schools and teaching children about sustainability. I think that there is probably plenty of people in this city who might know a little bit more or might have better things to say to school children than engineers that make nuclear arms and strike planes. In terms of the mandate from the student body, there are students here tonight who have spoke on public comment. Also, a few years ago Students Against War did a lot of work to get the Board of Trustees to agree to divest from corporations that manufacture cluster bombs and munitions that use uranium. I've been trying really hard to get the list of the companies that they actually ended up divesting from, but if I remember correctly, in the end of that campaign, Raytheon and Lockheed Martin were two of the corporations that were on the top of the list. I think there has been a pretty strong mandate from the student body here that they do not support corporations like Lockheed Martin.

Senator Fitzgerald: I was just wondering since we were able to hear from the side that is against Lockheed Martin if there was any invitation to have Mayor Kiss or anyone from Lockheed Martin come to speak on public forum about this issue.

Senator Bennington: No, I didn't make that invitation. I invited some City Councilors but I guess they couldn't make it. I'm not sure that we always invite people from the opposition. I don't know, when Vermont Yankee legislation was passed if anyone from Vermont Yankee was here.

Speaker Chevrier: Point of Information: We had both sides.

Senator Bennington: I stand corrected. So no I didn't. I think Mayor Kiss has made it pretty clear when every single person has asked him what he thinks about it. It would have been great, someone brought it up to me last night, and I didn't even think about it, but I figured it was probably too late to ask the Mayor to come to our meeting.

Senator M. White: Point of Information: Public Forum is a public forum.

Senator Fitzgerald: I guess my only worry is that we really haven't heard what Lockheed Martin's plan is and how many jobs this would bring to the state and how much money it would bring. Because that information hasn't been released yet, I'm a little hesitant to completely vote against them coming.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Thank you for writing this. Morally, I don't understand how someone could stand against it. I think that ultimately we're doing great and I just wanted to voice in opposition to this general statement that jobs are jobs regardless of the company that is providing them. I think this is one of those cases where we have this constant tone of disgust it comes to Wal-Mart in this room. When we're talking about war profiteering, we're suddenly all ok with the idea of jobs coming from a group that has this many lawsuits based solely in race and gender. I'd be curious to see whether you expand the range of issues they have had whether it goes beyond the issues of race and gender and goes into further violations. I think that just because it doesn't come up when you Google it, on the whole with U.S. contracting, while this may ideally be the fault of the U.S. government for choosing to pay for it, I think that it has to be taken into consideration that this is Burlington, a town that likes to promote itself as progressive and against all of this and I think what you're doing is great.

Alex: I just wanted to respond to our pink shirt friend about the response to the alums comment on the F35 fighter planes and the nature of them. That is that Lockheed Martin markets the F35 bomber to the U.S., to Israel and to a couple of other nations as a first strike weapon and it can be used for all sorts of things. They do market it as its intended nature. I have a lot else to say but that's all.

Senator DeVivo: So, just to respond against that whole weapon of mass destruction defense system. Whatever you want to call it, whatever you want to argue, it's a matter of opinion to whoever is voting in the room and that's all I have to say about that. The other thing I wanted to say was, for this reason I really wish we had more engineers in this room, because I personally would be really excited, regardless of what Lockheed's company profile with sustainability is, just because the aircraft industry is fundamentally pollution based. Aircrafts give off pollution. That doesn't mean that Lockheed's engineers couldn't teach UVM students or Burlington students something about engineering and sustainability. I don't think they're completely blind, as a company, to the fact. They have qualified engineers because they build aircrafts. I think that personally, as an engineering student, that I could learn a lot from a Lockheed engineer whether its about sustainability or aircraft manufacturing, and I really do see the benefits of bringing them in. I'm really uncomfortable saying I'm scared to have them come in and teach me. And I do realize that their company's profile with sustainability and it does concern me, but I wouldn't say I'm afraid to be taught by a Lockheed engineer and I can see the benefits and differences between engineering and sustainability.

Senator Rifken: I had a couple of questions. I think it's a little bit hard because a lot of us didn't really get this until a few days ago. I haven't done as much research as I would have liked to do. The whole school thing is one of the aspects that I've heard a lot about, and read that parents were concerned about pencils with a Lockheed Martin logo on it. Is there a policy, I don't know if anyone knows about this, but I know because like for prescription drugs and pharmaceuticals and things like that, there is a policy on gifts. I don't know if there's anything similar to that. Then my second question was just about speaking to the Mayor or getting in touch with him at all. I know

that you said you read an articles that said he didn't want to talk to anyone, but was there any kind of reaching out made to him because that's just something I'm concerned about.

Senator Bennington: The Burlington school district in 2005, did have an incident where General Dynamics was in their school and I think that's where the fear of the pencils comes from. A little girl who is actually the daughter one of the women whose comments we heard earlier, she said something to her teacher right before they went to a presentation being given by General Dynamics don't they make bombs? And the teacher made her sit in a classroom by herself while the rest of her class went to this presentation, which is essentially silencing her opinion on General Dynamics.

Senator Lovell: Point of Clarification: Isn't that just an awful teacher?

Senator Bennington: In response, they did pass a policy on corporate sponsorships in amounts over \$1000. Don't quote me on that. It is definitely a bad teacher, but it's still an issue. There might be more bad teachers and when it's involving a corporation that has a lot of money to give, people are generally a lot more willing to silence the dissent. Your second question, so I've emailed the mayor personally to speak to him and I emailed Jennifer Green who is the person at the Burlington Legacy Project who is working on this project to try to get on the board for their action plan as a student representative, but no I did not send a direct correspondence to Mayor Kiss asking him to come here tonight.

Chair Adams: As the only education major in the room, it would be up to the school as to whether or not Lockheed could come in, so that would sort of be a different issue in and of itself. I don't know what happened, but I kind of agree that's a bad teacher. Moving on, you said that there was a negligible amount of conversation that's in the bill. Also, going back to what you said earlier, that they're going to come in and slap stickers. Is that meaning that they are going to try to come in and take projects that are happening elsewhere and make them part of the corporation, or they're throwing money at projects that are already happening or what exactly is that slapping a sticker idea?

Senator Bennington: I think slapping a sticker idea plays into the theme of corporate greenwashing. There are projects that Burlington is already working on, maybe not physically working on, but one project is taking waste heat from McNeil electric plant and piping it into the north end to provide heat, which is an awesome project but I think that the sticker idea there is that Lockheed comes and helps with that project and slaps their logo all over it and maybe it's not a physical slapping of the logo but it's saying 'Look! We built this steam project and we gave all this heat to these homes. Ignore the fact that we build bombs and planes and look at this project.' I think that's the idea of the stickers. There has been themes discussed of the projects and the specifics have not been very well publicized so far.

Chair Adams: I mean companies do that all the time. Tobacco companies are infamous for doing that, so are we now going to take a stance on anti-tobacco campaigns as well? My other question is would you be willing to table so we could hear the other side of the story. Perhaps COLA's influence could get some more public officials in the room here.

Senator Bennington: For the tobacco thing, I don't know if any senators want to introduce a resolution not supporting tobacco. I would probably be down. I did reach out to COLA if they wanted to take on this issue and contact the mayor and they didn't think it was in their general responsibilities for obvious reasons because it has to do with town relationships they didn't. If COLA would be willing to reach out to the Mayor and really try get him here, I think that I would be maybe into the idea of tabling it.

Senator Cesario: I don't want to say this as any means of cycling the dialogue we've sparked because I think it's great that we're talking about this. Just as a clarification, we're not voting against Lockheed Martin as a company, we're not voting against any type of policy, we're voting

for more transparency in the process of making partnerships and signing letters of intent. As student representatives we're constantly fighting against the lack of transparency from our upper administrators, it would be absurd for any of us not to vote for more transparency from the mayor, in my opinion. I'm in full support.

Senator Lovell: Point of Information: Read the second be it further resolved.

President Mensah: I'm hearing a couple of different sides to this whole Lockheed... So what I'm hearing right now are senators are presenting different sides to the story. The story of the resolution that was sent out by Senator Bennington to the listserv 7 days ago. Folks are asking how come there's not another pro Lockheed group here. If you had felt as if a pro Lockheed group was needed for this week's discussion, I don't understand why that information wasn't sent over to Senator Bennington a couple of days ago so he probably could have tried harder to get other supporters for this here. The thought of Lockheed Martin coming to Burlington and trying to, I completely support what Senator DeVivo is saying with engineers teaching high school and middle school students about engineering, but it's a contradiction for Lockheed Martin to come to Burlington and try to tell them that they are going to manage their sustainability better when this is a company that on average burns through 330,000 barrels of fuel a day. Their F35 plane, jet, whatever, on an average hour goes through 2,000-4,000 barrels of oil. It makes no sense for a company that is profiteering off of war and as Senator Lovell brings up a lot of companies around the world are bad, this we know. This is not the best way to shut them out without working with them, but in this instance, working with a company that is funding the denial that global warming is happening, but yet trying to slap a positive image on their company and trying to profit from it just makes no sense. I'm in full support of this resolution, to throw my 2 cents out there.

Senator Caster: Do you feel like an investment like this from Lockheed Martin is more of a public relations campaign and that they view this investment as not as relatively important or do you feel they believe there is profitability to get in Burlington?

Senator Bennington: I think that PR is a huge part of this. I think that the carbon war room is essentially a PR stunt. If you talk to ecological economists and ecological engineers, the general consensus among a lot of those people right now is that technologies, especially the kind of technologies being offered by companies like Lockheed are not going to save us from this crisis. Albert Einstein said something like you cannot fix a problem with the same mindset that created it. He said it much more eloquently than that. Industrialization and militarization is what has created climate change. We cannot fix climate change by relying on the companies that have been perpetuating it for 50, 60, 100 years. Therefore, I don't know if Lockheed knows that, I'm sure they wouldn't want to recognize that, but I do think that it's a PR campaign. If Lockheed really cared about climate change, they would stop manufacturing weapons of mass destruction. They would stop participating in activities that bring upon them nuclear safety and violations and water contamination violations.

Senator Goodnow: So I just want to address a couple points really quickly. Firstly, a point brought up by the public. Unless credentials were brought forth when information was first said, I don't really see anyone as a military expert here, so they don't have the credentials to really say whether a weapon is used for defense or not in the United States military force. Second, the use of weapons of mass destruction is kind of being used very loosely. There has been no information brought forth in this bill or evidence that says that they are going to be producing weapons of mass destruction in Vermont or if they have done that in the past. Unless I missed something, and that could definitely be a possibility. Quickly, I just wanted to point brought up by one of the other senators and was brought up in a POI, and I'll try to actually use it correctly. This entire bill is broken in two parts. Firstly, calling for transparency because there is not enough information, which is completely legitimate and I totally support that. Why would we as a senate then go on to further completely reject something that we don't have all the information about. That seems completely in conflict to what this body is responsible for and to what we as senators have a responsibility to our student body for, which is getting all the information possible. That's

transparency calls for and that's what I feel this body should be voting for, not the second part, which is why I support the amendment that was brought forth earlier and why we should strike down this last part of the bill. Thank you.

Senator Bennington: There is a vet in the room, I would say we have a military expert here.

Senator Ballas: He said it way more eloquently than I did. Just that, we don't know what Lockheed Martin is going to be doing here. Although they may have a lot of problems with them, they could bring a lot of potential good to Burlington, especially with all of our green initiatives. If they could help with that, I don't see why, well I can see why, but it could help what we want. So I think that I'm also in favor of just having this as a resolution in support of transparency.

Chair Filstein: I'd like to yield the floor to long time community activist Jonathan Leavitt.

Jonathan Leavitt: Hi. I'm actually a freelance journalist and I've met with the mayor twice on this issue. I've met with the city's Community and Economic Development Organization with this issue. With the city's legacy department on this issue, with multiple city councilors on this issue, with clean engineers on this issue, with various heads of green and sustainability organization based locally here in Burlington on this issue. I've written articles and published articles on this issue, and everything that I have read, every memorandum that I've seen come across the desk of the mayor has caused one of the mayor's own party members on the City Council to draft a resolution which will be introduced on Monday night. Emma Mulvaney-Stanak of Burlington's Ward 3 to condemn her own mayor of her own party's deal with Lockheed Martin. On issues of ethics, on issues of transparency, on issues of Lockheed's business practices. It's very interesting when someone condemns one's head of one's own party on a deal with a city's business partner. I think Ms. Mulvaney-Stanak is of very sound mind in doing so for all the reasons that Senator Bennington has laid out tonight. When city engineers who have been working for 25 years on piping waste heat from the McNeil woodchip burning plant into homes in the Old North End tell the mayor that they are opposed to Lockheed funding the project that is their own baby. Like Jan Schultz of the City of Burlington, there are reasons why. And there are very sound reasons why. Jan Schultz is very old, mid 60s, he has a big grey beard, and this is his baby, this is his one project, the waste heat project, and Lockheed could make it happen, but he says I want no part of it. He says I do not want Lockheed involved in this whatsoever. He tells the mayor of Burlington that, but that doesn't make it into the Mayor's letter to *Seven Days*, that doesn't make it into the mayor's sound bite to Channel 5. There's a reason why. I think there's a real danger here. As the owner and chief executive of AgRefresh, Jeffrey Frost, will tell you, Lockheed Martin coming in and damaging the brand of every other renewable energy and sustainability corporation based locally in Burlington. I think if people want to casually yield those brands to war profiteers like Lockheed Martin, then what does Burlington truly stand for? People said that perhaps this isn't the place for this body, or perhaps that locally or statewide we shouldn't take a stance. If that had happened 20 years ago, UVM wouldn't have taken a stance on apartheid, and other campuses wouldn't have taken a stand on apartheid South Africa, which is what ended apartheid South Africa. I think there is a real opportunity here for this body to help redress a problem. As Senator Bennington said, there is not a single standard that exists today for the City of Burlington's partners with corporation when the funding comes from the corporation to the city. The Mayor told me that directly, twice, in separate meetings. The Mayor also says that he won't respond to citizens of Burlington. To [inaudible name], parent, South End, Burlington, with two children in Burlington schools. To Laurie S., parent with children in schools. They met with him, he was unmoved. If that's the lack of transparency in governance that informs this partnership with Lockheed. Check out the letter of intent, it's one page single sided, there's not much to it. It was buried inside the consent agenda in one of the busiest Burlington Telecom filled City Council meetings. It wasn't even a deliberative session. The City Council didn't even get a chance to discuss it. The Mayor was just saying, oh, I'm moving ahead on this without you. That was when I asked him, how come there isn't any public comment? It was in the consent agenda. That alone should be rationale to move transparency issue. When a member of the mayor's own party writes a resolution for City Council condemning all of the second half of Senator

Bennington's resolution, in very similar language, that should open the door to pass this resolution.

Senator Vitagliano: Thank you so much for adding that crucial insight and information to this issue, and with that I'd like to call to question.

Vote to call to question – fails

Senator Sadek: I just want to build on a point that Senator Goodnow did bring up, in that this is a bill supposed to be calling for more transparency, but we're also being asked to condemn this business partnership in the first place. Something that you did say yourself is that we don't have a lot of information on what's going to happen. What the practical benefits that could in fact exist for Burlington residents and the potential positive effects that it could have. What we have heard is a lot of problems people have with Lockheed Martin as a company which have been well detailed and well described by everybody here. The thing is, it would be imprudent for us to vote and to condemn and interaction with the city and with Lockheed Martin without actually knowing all the facts of this case in the first place. Calling for more transparency is something that I would in fact support, however the secondary part of this, calling for us to condemn this business practice, is something that I think I have a problem with.

Senator DeVivo: I don't want to say the exact same thing they said again in a long way. I'm just going to ask, will you take the friendly amendment to take out the second be it further resolved, just because I fully support asking for transparency and the third be it resolve to make standards. I fully support that. And I think that everyone else has asked for the same thing 5 or 6 times has done that, but I can't agree with everything in either of those two statements, and I think that's the same problem all of us are having. Really those are just statements that don't really add to the credibility of purpose of the resolution. I think if those were taken out, a lot more of us would fully support what the resolution is trying to say.

Senator Bennington: Motion for an informal poll.

Vote on Having an Informal Poll – passes

Informal Poll: All those in favor of passing said resolution as it stands now versus accepting the friendly amendment-

Senator DeVivo: My friendly amendment would be to take out the second be it further resolved and the second to last whereas.

Senator M. White: Point of Information: Tabling, would that not be a third option?

Chair Adams: Point of Clarification: Do you want to know if we would vote yes if that friendly amendment were made and if we would vote yes as it stands right now?

Senator Bennington: yes

All those in favor of the bill as it currently stands – 12

All those in favor of the second option of including friendly amendment- 20

Chair Herman: I have a different problem with this entire process. I honestly don't understand why we are having this conversation as of right now when Senator Bennington introduced this bill last senate meeting. We could have had this long conversation over the last 7 days regarding the friendly amendments and everything else, which is why I don't understand why this is existing right now. This is ridiculous. Friendly amendments or not.

Senator Rifken: Point of Information: The new senators only received the resolution last night or yesterday afternoon.

Senator Tepper: I just wanted to voice my personal support for the bill and also to appreciate Senator Bennington for all the work he did putting together the slideshow, the resolution, and all the research that went into it. I know a couple of senators asked why we were going to go ahead with this if we didn't know whether or not Lockheed Martin was going to build weapons of mass destruction in Burlington and I would just hope that no one would be in support of a company that builds weapons of destruction regardless of weapons of mass destruction in general. I hope that the body votes accordingly to their own research. Also, that information about Lockheed Martin is pretty available on the Internet. You didn't have to wait to get the bill to look for it.

Senator Benner: Friendly Amendment to actually amend the portion that the body just voted for simply because I just want to reiterate Senator Goodnow's point earlier, simply that as is, it really is not logical. We either want more transparency or we want them gone completely and I don't think that as is it's clear so friendly amendment to actually change that.

Senator Bennington: I'm not sure as to what you're...

Senator Benner: The friendly amendment that the majority of the body just voted for, to eliminate the last two be it further resolved and the last two whereas.

Senator Burns: Point of Information: I believe the friendly amendment called to delete the second to last whereas not the last 2.

Chair Adams: I don't think we should accept that friendly amendment because then I think it's a weak bill about transparency and if we want to write a bill about transparency then we should write a strong one and if we want to write a bill condemning Lockheed Martin we should do that. Really at this point, if people are having issues with one and not the other then we might as well pass or vote on two resolutions. I think it's a weak resolution about transparency if you remove those two clauses.

Senator Ballas: Point of Clarification: Why are we getting rid of the whereas?

Senator Lovell: Point of Information: I mostly wanted it gone because of the sheer number of companies that already do business in Burlington despite the charges of racial and age discrimination that have been lobbied against them and we haven't spoken out against them. It seems hypocritical to do it against Lockheed Martin when we haven't done it with businesses that already exist here.

Senator DeVivo: Point of Information: my friendly amendment was actually regarding the third whereas, I just couldn't see it. I thought we had agreed but, my fault. I agree with this whereas and not this one.

Senator Cesario: Thank you. So keeping with what I said, that we're voting for more transparency but the whatever be it resolved that we're basically saying that they're a sketchy company, we're saying that we want more transparency because they're doing dealings with sketchy companies, and we're just saying that they are a sketchy company. Sorry for using such a casual term. I also thinking, I'm waiting for any of you to give any information about Lockheed Martin that is positive about the company because all I've heard is more negative research. Well, there's other companies that are bad. We've had this for a week. New senators I guess have had this for a day, a day and a half, that's still time to do some research. If any of you have anything redeeming about Lockheed Martin, throw it at us, but otherwise, how can we not condemn such a company?

Senator Rifken: I mentioned before that we only got this yesterday, which is why I may abstain because I would love to look into this more, but I've had classes all day. The other part I want to say also is I was wondering about footnotes on here and if there are other sources that are not cited because I feel like there's a lot in here that is made statements. I want to make sure that all of the resolutions that come out of this body are as strong as they can be and having a weak resolution is not going to do anything. And having a backed up, I'm willing to work on that. I wish I had known earlier. For instance, if you go down, further down, the largest war profiteer, just like data on that, I know that the only citation you do have on here is the project on government oversight and the misconduct database.

Senator DeVivo: So I guess we want redeeming qualities about Lockheed Martin. They are, and I will admit from a sustainability standpoint they are very few and far between. From a pure engineering standpoint, Lockheed Martin has made a lot more innovations, well I wouldn't say a lot more, but most of the innovations that we have today in the aircraft industry. That is a redeeming quality as much as you may disagree or agree with the engineering of aircrafts these days. I think there are redeeming qualities to Lockheed Martin as a company and when we talk about sustainability it's really not there. My discomfort is calling them, they might be a war profiteer, but they're also our nation's largest defense company and we don't mention anything about that. The reality of the thing is we are a country that's at war right now, and whether we support that is neither here nor there in this particular resolution. If we want to write a resolution that condemns the War on Terror, let's do that to, but they are also our nation's largest defense company and we don't say anything about that, rather we call them a war profiteer. I think that's my biggest concern.

Senator Burns: Point of Information: I don't believe we're actually at war.

Senator DeVivo: We have troops in other countries.

Chair Monteforte: I support that too. I really think we should just pass a resolution on transparency and see where that goes and if we get more transparent information then we can go from there. If you have plans to make a more efficient plane, I'm sure Lockheed Martin would love to know them.

Senator Burns: Kind of going off of where Senator Cesario left off, there weren't any students here today who came out in opposition to this bill. There weren't any students here today who said maybe we should watch out for Lockheed Martin. People who came to public forum to speak who would not ordinarily be here. Taking the fact that we do represent the student opinion, the students who actually came here were in support of this resolution.

Senator M. White: Do we want to discuss tabling or do we want to just vote because if we vote we might do something that we don't want.

Speaker Chevrier: Point of Information: If there is nobody else left on the speaking order, which there currently isn't, then the bill is automatically called to question and we will vote on it.

Senator Bennington: I want to talk about the friendly amendments. I totally hear the concern that we're calling for more transparency and at the same time basically giving our statement on this issue. I don't agree with it, but I hear it. I'm wondering if those who were in favor of passing a resolution solely concerning transparency which, Senator DeVivo, I'm probably going to get this wrong again, but would involve removing this clause.

Senator DeVivo: I really, honestly don't care if you take out the whereasses because when you say whereas there's a little more but when you say be it further resolved you're basically saying because I'm a member of the Student Government if I vote yes for this than I also find that Lockheed Martin is the nation's largest war profiteer and an unacceptable business partner for the City of Burlington... I don't agree with that. That's the only thing I'm really concerned about.

Senator Bennington: I think I want to accept that friendly amendment to take out the be it further resolve that the University of Vermont Student Government Association finds Lockheed Martin the nation's largest war profiteer an unacceptable business partner for the City of Burlington and does not support war profiteers or other ethically dubious corporations.

Chair Filstein: I would propose that we keep that in there, table it because it's not super time sensitive, and all take a week to do our research and come to the conclusion that they're either an acceptable business partner or they're an unacceptable business partner. After a week of research we can come to that conclusion and have it in there and be able to make our judgment on this as well.

Senator Ballas: That sounds good but we don't really even know what Lockheed Martin plans on doing here. We can't base, they are a bad company, sure, but it could be positive for Burlington and still negative for other places.

Senator Bennington: I'd like to table the bill until next week and urge everyone to do research and I think that the request of Senator Filstein was that we make a decision whether or not Lockheed Martin is an acceptable business partner. You can check out a book called *Profits of War*, it has a lot of good information on Lockheed Martin.

Emergency Business (1:19.30)

Senator M. White: Motion to Censure President Mensah

Speaker Chevrier: Point of Information: They way a censure works, is that now the motion has been made to censure somebody, but we're not actually going to vote on it this week as laid out in the constitution. We can talk about it now but more debate will go on afterwards because it was seconded, but the Constitution Committee will have to meet to be able to look into whether or not the allegations are correct and we will vote on it next week.

Senator M. White: Ok, so it goes like this, in the Constitution we wrote in this year that the President's BOT oral and written reports would be out a week in advance and they were not, therefore, I move that we censure President Mensah.

New Business (1:20.38)

Chair Filstein: Resolution in support of CCTA Bus Drivers and Mechanics Receiving the Fair and Humane Contract Offer that they Deserve

Chair Adams: Bill Recognizing Demonin and Bill Authorizing UVMtv to Provide Compensation

Senator Tran: Bill Allocating Funds to Triathlon

Chair Monteforte: Bill Recognizing UVM Rescue as Club of the Month

Executive Reports (1:21.15)

Speaker Chevrier: Hi. So, as for my Speaker report, I want to remind everyone and tell the new senators that may not be aware that there is no eating during Public Forum, it's just a courtesy thing, so just wait until we go on to Old Business. Another reminder and a plea, please send your legislation to me by Thursday. So Chair Filstein, Chair Adams, Senator Tran and Chair Monteforte, I need those bills by Thursday. Also, if the Constitution Committee could please stay after the meeting real quick, we could do what we have to do, that would be great. Also, point of informations and point of clarifications, they're being misused and really improperly. So point of

Information, that is when you have a factual thing to say that will aid debate. So if I said 'everyone should come to this great program but I don't remember where it is' someone could point of information it's in the Livak Ballroom. You can't point of information, I think you should go too. That would be inappropriate. Point of clarification is when you are trying to ask a specific question to try to understand something that's being talked about in the debate and because you don't understand it is hindering your ability to participate in the debate. So if I said 'Oh my god, I totally hate the TRI' someone could say 'point of clarification what is the TRI?' and I would say the transdisciplinary research initiative. That's not the way that it's been used tonight and that's not good. To take off my speaker hat and to put on my elections chair hat, I'm just going to do it now instead of speak again. How many people are seniors graduating in May? Please raise your hand. How many people have absolutely no desire to be on senate next year and do not plan on running and are not seniors, please raise your hands. So, those are the people, Lucas and all of the graduating seniors, those are the only eligible people to be on the elections committee. Those are only eligible because cannot be on committee terms of elections or to call you to say did or did not get on. Please join the only eligible people because you cannot be on the committee that will create the terms of your election or call you to say that you did or not get on. If you raised your hand, please join the Elections Committee. With that, we have the dates of the elections, I just sent it out to you. It's coming up really quick. In 15 days, the President and Vice President packets will go out. Then on March 4 they will be due at noon and then on March 23 and 24, the election will take place. March 15 the packets will available for senatorial elections and then on April 6 and 7, we will have senatorial elections. That's really soon so I can't do it on my own. Everybody who can should be on the Elections Committee. Also, to try and get you excited or terrified to be on the Elections Committee, this is what I'm working on for the debates. There's gong to be 3 different debates for the P and VP to try and get as many people as possible to watch them. Holly Pedrini and Davis Center Operations permitting, we're going to have one the same way that it occurred when Chelsea Clinton came to speak at our school where it will be a question and answer type session in the Atrium during the middle of the day so that as many people as possible, passer bys and people who choose to come will be able to watch it. Also Bijan in Brennan's permitting, there will be one in Brennan's. And there will also be one at senate on the 22, the day before the Presidential elections. They are also going to be done via YouTube debates if anyone watched the real presidential election of the United States a few years ago with the help of PR. They are going to be videotaping random students asking them questions and those are the questions that will be shown on big screens and the candidates will have to answer them. Hopefully, this is my way of trying to get more people to actually come to them. I wanted to give a big shout out to PR for agreeing to help. Again, please, I'll send around a sheet, be on the elections committee.

Vice President Maciewicz (1:25:52): Hi everyone. I hope you are all having a good week so far. Thank you to all of you who were at the retreat. I think it was a productive day. For those of you who couldn't make it, we'll be having a really short make up session in the next week or two. A very abbreviated version of what we did, just to catch you up. Also, I'll be starting to schedule one on ones with all the new senators and I have my office hours online. If you go to our home page and click on office of the Vice President you can see my office hours as well as President Mensah's. So please stop by and see me whenever you'd like. I'm there a lot of the day and would love to meet with you and then I don't have to track down. In other news, the President Student Advisory Council, which is something that I've been working on for a while, and for those of you who are new, it's a new group of students who are forming to advise President Fogel, will be happening in mid February for the first time, February 16. I'm down to the last few students that I'm trying to get for it. There will also be a campus wide application process for students that are not affiliated with any leadership organizations to join it. It will be capped at 25 students selected by me and some appointed to represent all areas of campus as well as by administrators and they'll meet 4 times a year. This is sort of mocking President Fogel's senior leadership meetings, which is all his VPs. I think it will be really cool and hopefully there will be a campus wide press release really soon, so stay tuned for that and I'll make sure to inform you. Also a new thing that we're starting, President Mensah and I are going to be starting a new Lynx improvement or replacement task force. The Lynx that we use so much for is coming up for

renewal in the summer. It's also something that's given us some problems over the years. We've had a lot of offers from a lot of organizations who have been soliciting President Mensah and I to switch organizations. We need to hear from you, senators, we need to hear from club signers who use it a lot, and we need to hear from the office staff who use it. We have a sign up sheet. If you are at all interested in interviewing companies or just being involved in the process, it could be a lot of work but it really needs to be collaborative because a lot of people depend on the Lynx. Finance, Student Activities, Clubs, me. Please, if you are at all interested put your name on this list. I'll send that around. The appointments process is also open again because we had one resignation. Applications are due Friday, there will be an email, it's already on the Lynx, you can apply at any time. Please tell your friends to apply if they are interested. I know we just did it but we're going to keep doing it because I think a full body is important. Then moving on to something that has been bothering me. I think we need to take purposeful action during senate, and I think that sometimes people are not fully living up to their senatorial obligations and I have 2 examples. One, the minutes that are something that I help oversee. Some people pretty regularly vote against the minutes, which is fine, it's your right to do so, but I would appreciate if you would send constructive feedback as to why you are voting no. Voting no for the purpose of voting no is not a very good reason. I suggested a new format last semester of how we could change the minutes. I asked for everyone's feedback and no one got back to me. So, if you would like some changes in the minutes in any way, come talk to me, shoot me an email, but voting no and not saying anything for weeks at a time I don't think is productive. The other thing is, on several occasions have set some deadlines asking for things to be done in the office space which include posting office hours and cleaning up the space because it's getting quite messy. I set a deadline of today and multiple committees ignored one or both which, you know, bothers me on a personal level because of the amount of time I spend working in office. Little logistical things that I ask you to do like fill out a form or post a piece of paper I know is annoying. I hate sending the email just as much as you hate reading it, but it is really disrespectful to not acknowledge it, especially when it's my constitutional duty to uphold it. So, the deadline for all of those things was today, so the executive branch will be having some conversations with different committees with senators and chairs who really are not respecting the process. It's kind of becoming a problem. So please, even the little things count. Little things become big things and we have way more important things to work on as a body than posting your office hours. We represent a lot of students with a lot of real problems, so let's move on from the small stuff. Besides that, I hope you have a great week. Welcome new senators. Congrats to Senator Filstein who is now Chair Filstein and I hope you all have a good week.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:30.45)

Senator Mason: In regards to the Lynx since I personally hate it, sorry, have we looked into people who actually in classes like UVM students and that aspect because I know a lot of people in communications do website design and stuff so I don't know if that might work or they might be able to help a little bit in the searching process and what companies would be good.

Vice President Maciewicz: Yeah that's actually a really good idea that I didn't think of. I may be including that in President Mensah's campus wide, it doesn't have to be senate only thing. I think it's important to have a lot of us here because we use it the most but there's a lot of people in clubs that really hate or maybe really love the Lynx. We've been having a lot of offers who are soliciting us. I'd love to make it a big group but we need to work quickly because the change over that needs to happen I think is August 1. So be on the lookout for this to be happening soon.

Senator Yeager: I was wondering if these companies provide trial runs that you can test it or do it so a lot of people can test it so it can be a balanced decision?

Vice President Maciewicz: Probably. Honestly, I've been kind of storing their emails in a folder. They're really excited to have our business because it costs a lot of money. We can probably get quite a bit out of them. We can compile all of their different offers when we get a group together.

Speaker Chevrier: If I remember correctly, we paid a lump sum of money to start the Lynx and then we spend a little bit less money each year to have it. So if we would be choosing to change to any other similar organization we would then again have to pay the lump sum and then the smaller amounts, is that correct?

Vice President Maciewicz: That is correct. We did pay a lump sum to join the Lynx. I don't know, we actually haven't found out if we have to pay it again to renew our contract. It's all part of the investigatory process. Part of the decision last time was also made on price. It's really at the beginning stages but I'm looking for people who can commit to being a part of the conversation from the start to the end.

Chair Adams: Point of Information: When the Lynx started, it was one of only a couple of options. So, a lot of the newer options are cheaper because they're trying to compete with the old ones so the lump sums have decreased significantly.

President Mensah (1:33.36): Good evening everyone. First, I'd like to give a warm welcome to all the new senators for having their second official senate meeting. It makes me happy to see that we for the first time in a while have a full senatorial table. The first thing I wanted to touch on is my oral report. You all received it early Monday morning when you all woke up. It has been sent out. I received a few suggestions and feedback on it and I'm appreciative of that. A few hours ago I also sent out a revised copy based on some of the suggestions I have been receiving from some senators. Again, the deadline for that still holds until Thursday morning at noon so I can get it out and edit it for grammar and syntax. The second thing is Club 590. The Executive Committee after discussing it last week have decided to go ahead with it and partner with Campus Programs. For those of you that are new here, Club 590 is a new initiative that is being started by Campus Programs out of Student Life to sort of bring partying back to campus because of the Burlington law that clubs downtown can only hold one 18+ night a month. We are trying to provide an opportunity for more students that are 21 and younger to be able to party on campus. They've called it Club 590 and it signifies the Davis Center and its building number is 590 Main St. The first party that is going to be happening is this Saturday that is being put on by Black Student Union and they're having their All Black Everything Party, so one of the suggestions from the planning committee was for us to check it out and see logistics and how they ran the party so we can better provide and put on a party one our date which is February 19. This sheet that is being passed around there is a 590 planning committee. As good at making plans as I think I am, I know I'm not the best. So, I would love to have a group of people come together so we can all select a DJ and select whether or not we want to have food and things of that nature, but the ball needs to be moved quickly so we can set up a theme and start to get flyers created. The more people that know about this event, the more people we can hope to have turn out for this. If you're wondering, to save you from asking the question if this is going to come from our budget, it's not. The Campus Programming they are providing between \$800 to \$1000 for each group to individually put on this event. As I mentioned last week, different clubs around campus like Free To Be are also planning on putting these Club 590 events. Tomorrow I'll be having a meeting to discuss the catering waiver process. Currently in the Davis Center and other areas around campus such as Billings, if you put on an event and you are a club and provide food, you have to go through Sodexo. Currently, Sodexo as a catering company, I think is unfair but the prices present an unfair situation for students. If a club has maybe a budget of \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year and they want to be able to put on a nice end of the year event that consists of providing food to entice members to come, it's going to cost them anywhere from between \$800 to \$1000 just because a three course meal might cost like 30 something dollars. I think that for Sodexo to have such a huge clamp on the Davis Center, it's not a student center, it's a campus center, but it's a place where a lot of students come together and put on events and other things I think it needs looking into and that's what I'll be doing tomorrow. Later on in the day myself and Vice President Maciewicz will also have a meeting with Chris Lucier about the S-Cubed, the Student Success and Satisfaction that I think we mentioned in October or November that is gauging the student experience, especially the first year experience. It is focused on retention, it is focused on surveying students and finding how first year experiences are. There are some students saying

that they came here and we weren't as environmentally open as they thought or that we were too environmentally focused or they weren't academically challenged of whatever it may be. David and I will report more on that in the coming weeks. I'd like to thank Senators Denton, Vitagliano, Monteforte, Lisa White, Fitzgerald, and Calder for volunteering to give out the SGA beanies this Friday at the hockey game. The information I'm sure has already been sent out to you so I'm sure you know here to go, but if not just email me. One of the other things I wanted to talk about is yesterday morning I met with Annie Stevens, the Dean of Student Life about the naked bike ride funding. For a long while, ever since if I'm correct the second semester of my first year, the Student Government Association along with other campus organizations such as IRA, have funded the Naked Bike Ride. I personally thought it was a little bit iffy, not because I was against funding them, but more so there was no set budget as to how much we are going to fund the Naked Bike Ride. Granted, the amount of money we have given each year has not inflated, I still think that there needed to be structure. The conversation that I had with Annie really presented historical background to where the Naked Bike Ride came from. As you all are student representatives is that the Naked Bike Ride is not a university recognized event. It is sponsored by different departments in the university but it is not a university recognized event because of the risk and liabilities that are included in the event. Funnily enough, the history of the Naked Bike Ride actually goes back a couple of decades when it used to just be a primal scream. Students would open their windows at midnight just to scream in relief from classes being over. It turned into a snowball fight and then it eventually turned into a Living and Learning program that became the Naked Bike Ride. Actually, Pat's son was one of the founding members of this Naked Bike Ride group. The conversation with Annie pretty much centered around it being a safety issue. Year after year, students were being harassed, and groped and snow was being thrown at them. The stipulation was that if we do fund the Naked Bike Ride, our money doesn't go to security or Green Mountain Security, or overtime that the UVM Police Department gets. The funds that we as SGA give goes to fund the food, the t-shirt, and the volunteers as in giving them food and t shirt. That's pretty much is for the Naked Bike Ride. I think that this semester the amount we are giving them is \$1,200 and that's what it's going to look like probably for next semester. Tuition increase. As I've mentioned in my email that I sent out yesterday, I was going to touch on conversations that I've had with VP Cate. I encourage anyone that has concerns or questions about the potential 5.8% proposed working number to go to this Friday's Board of Trustees meeting. Quickly, to touch upon it again the main factor that is causing tuition to go up again next year is the increase in Financial Aid. The increase in Financial Aid, the inflation of salaries through the contract that professors have at UVM that is coming to an end this year, their salaries go up 5% every year. The cost of tuition has to keep at a pace with providing more financial aid for students to come and providing fringe benefits and salary increases. The 5.8 working number is not the definite number that they want to increase tuition for next year but it's just the number they are going to present the Budget Finance and Investment Committee Friday and just in response that they receive from that, they are going to go back to the drawing board and see where other cuts can be made. Also, the latter reasons why the tuition working number to 5.8 from the original 4.5 was to decrease the deficit of UVM from I think 8.6 million dollars to 1.9 or 1.6 million dollars based off of the increase in tuition. The second to last thing that I wanted to mention are senators of the week. Senators of the week, for new members, are folks that either myself or other senators that approach me deem worthy to be Senator of the week and to get the title of Senator of the week have to show almost going the extra mile, you have to show presence in the office. David and I are in the office almost 10 hours a day so we tend to see the senators that are sitting around engaging other senators and also the listserv. Engaging other senators, presenting new information and new facts. There are other things that go into senator of the week and I would love to have a conversation about that. The two Senators of the week are surprisingly two new Senators to the Senate body. Senator Goodnow and Senator Rifken. Senator Goodnow was actually recommended by a fellow senator for all the work he has been so far doing as new member. Just last week he met with various people to talk about a new idea that he and another senator had about a whole month of service getting closer to the end of the semester. Senator Rifken the other day sent out an email sparking conversation on the senate listserv. This is actually the beanies that are going to be given out this Friday by a few senators at the hockey game. So I'm going to pass it around but the beanie is going to go to Senator Goodnow and the

scarf is going to go to Senator Rifken. The last thing that I wanted to mention is the censuring. I just wanted to quickly correct what was mentioned in regards to the censuring. Senator White brings up the point that my oral report, my oral report, not my written report, he mistakenly said that both my written and oral report were late to the Senator body. The written report was sent out over the winter break well in advance of the one week deadline, but I did miss the one week deadline. I should have sent out the report on Friday but I waited until Monday simply because over the weekend I was waiting for some new information to present from the Chief Diversity Officer Wanda Heading-Grant and Richard Cate, both of which I have explained to a few people that inquired as to why the report was two days late. Also, sadly, I'm going to be truthful about this, I quite frankly even though this is stated in the Constitution, didn't see the urgency to push forward sending my report over the weekend even though it was constitutionally stipulated that I had to because the trends had shown that over the winter break when I sent out my report more than a week in advance and was over a time period where no one was in classes, I only received 2 responses from senators, and this was the written report that has for the past week and a half has been in front of Board of Trustees members, and they have had more time to go through my report than they will in the few minutes they hear me speak my oral report. It's just a big disconcerting that over winter break I only received 2 responses for my written report. It could have been that it was just that fantastic and I didn't need any feedback but it was a little disconcerting. Secondly, I don't know even know why the censuring was brought up before I was able to give my report and give an explanation as to why the report was late when conversations that I have had with other folks I said I'll take a few days and I'll think about it. It seems as if the proper time for me to address this would be in my presidential report, which I'm doing right now.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:47.08)

Senator Rifken: I have a couple questions. First of all, that February 19 date for the Club 590, is that already set in stone because I know that's the weekend where Monday is off and I don't know if there's going to be lots of people gone, FYI.

President Mensah: That's a very good point. I didn't set the date, they did. I think it's pretty much set in stone but in lieu of that information I will talk to Jimmy Doan and Brennan Keeler and see if I could potentially change date but I don't know the feasibility of that.

Senator Rifken: Also, I'm not sure if you guys have already done this, but are Richard Cate or Chris Lucier coming in by any chance?

President Mensah: Prefect question. I invited Richard Cate yesterday as I emailed him at the ending of last week to come in and speak to us this Tuesday. Per the email conversations that we've been having, he deemed it better to come in and speak to us next week or the week following after he's gauged the response from the Budget Finance Committee about the 5.8 tuition working number. There wouldn't be that much new information that he could present as of now until Friday's BOT. The invitation was extended by me to him on Monday and we will be working up a time for him to come and speak to the Senate body in the next few weeks.

Senator Rifken: Are you creating a budget ad hoc at all?

President Mensah: We had talked about that yesterday and I forgot to include it in my report. I'm not too familiar with the Budget Ad Hoc Committee. I know it's a non-standing committee and it has to be formulated by the President. I know there was one created last year by President Bryce Jones and there was a whole lot of conversations going on about the proposed 6% increase to tuition. He created a budget ad hoc committee where different senators and other students came together to talk about the tuition and try and get more of an understanding about it and try and disseminate that information to students. Within the next day or two I'll be thinking more about that and sending more information to the senate. If anyone is interested in seeing that committee formed please let me know because a few people have expressed interest in it.

Chair Adams: This goes back to a really long time ago. Point of Information: The primal scream still happens at 11:59 right before quiet hours. It's basically only an HCOL thing at this point, which is sad. I was just wondering with Sodexo if you had talked to the Davis Center Advisory Council or where you were hoping to go with that.

President Mensah: Now as of yet. I haven't yet. I'm going to start the conversation with Tom Oliver and Shane Cutler over at conference and events and see how that conversation goes and then see who the follow up parties are.

Senator M. White: So I wanted to do two quick things. One, just for a quick explanation, the motion of a censure is not an explanation of a good job or a bad job, it's just that you haven't followed the Constitution. You are doing a wonderful job, we've had this conversation. Number two, the reason we couldn't wait until after your report, as we talked about before, is that it has to be under Emergency Business. Number three, our response is not dictated by the constitution whereas your sending it out is.

Senator Benner: I just wanted to bring up, first of all, I want to say thank you for sending out the new BOT report, but I just wanted to say something that kind of irked me. Regarding your paragraph on the course eval boycott, you mentioned how you, as a senator, wouldn't have signed it and you feel it was a last resort and it was not the best course of action. You have the power to veto that and I remember we discussed it for a long time. I feel if you come out and you tell that to the Board of Trustees and you comment how Knodell prudently raised concerns, you are insulting the integrity of the body. Honestly, I think that you are making excuses for what we've done and the actions that we've done. Frankly, I think that the Course Eval Boycott, I didn't hear of one student who is dissatisfied with what we've got from Knodell to get the course eval looked at. We are making changes and in your Board of Trustees report, you very much seem apologetic for the actions of your body and I don't feel that you're speaking from a student perspective, I feel that you're speaking from a different perspective of being on a podium above the students, and I just really don't want you to make excuses for what your body's and I want you to stand up for who we are and the actions that we've gone through and the resolutions that we've passed.

President Mensah: You make very legitimate claims but unfortunately I think they're misplaced. I don't think in the new revised report that I sent out, I wasn't apologizing. I said that the boycott was an act of last resort. If the conversations that we had been having with the administration not just this year but over the course of the previous years had actually led somewhere, we wouldn't have done the boycott. So the boycott was very much an act of last resort. We didn't want to do the boycott, remember that's why we set the December 1 deadline. Had they met the December 1 deadline, we would not have done the boycott. Can you repeat the second part about apologizing?

Senator Benner: I said the tone was apologetic and did not stand up for actions that the body did.

President Mensah: I say in there that I'm in complete support of the actions of the body in the boycott and what I said

Senator Benner: Point of Information: you said, quote "that it was not the best course of action".

President Mensah: No, no, I said that the boycott might not have been viewed in the best of light by the administration, not necessarily the students, but it was our best course of action.

Senator Benner: if you want to discuss this one on one later we may, but I recommend it would be tonight.

President Mensah: I want to discuss this now because I see where you're coming from but I think you're confusing some of what I'm saying and you might have read it too quickly, but I

don't remember any part in that. If I'm correct this is the part you are referring to here, The resolution to enact the boycott was pondered over a great deal by myself and other senators, this still needs a grammatical correction, and had I not believed that this was the best course of action to get our voices heard I would not have signed the resolution. I'm saying that I would not have been in favor of this had it not been the best course of action. I was 100% supportive of the boycott. Does that answer your question?

Senator Benner: I'm still concerned of the extent to which you discussed the amount that you are happy about what we've gotten from this. We have gotten stuff from this and I want you to discuss that. I feel that the fact that we've gotten a lot from the boycott and the students are very satisfied about what we have and I would like to see you address that.

President Mensah: Address that more here or the fact that I've already taken the time to address it more in the written report as to the outcomes of the boycott.

Senator Benner: I want you to address it here.

President Mensah: It's already in the written. I'm not sure where in this you don't see that I'm in support of the outcomes of the resolution.

Vice President Maciewicz: Point of Procedure: Do you have a question?

Senator Benner: At the moment no. Just that I would like to discuss this later with President Mensah.

President Mensah: That's fine. If anyone has any legitimate questions for Speaker Chevrier, please go ahead.

Senator Caster: This was meant to be a point of information but I didn't receive this information. When we as Student Government allocate money to the Naked Bike Ride, we do not make the decision where it gets spent. It gets put into a pool and some of the SGA money was spent on Green Mountain Security and some of it was spent on Police Forces, and the Naked Bike Ride costs around \$5000 or \$6000 for one event on police forces. So, I would like this body to keep that in mind when have conversations on the Naked Bike Ride and what that is and what we do with that as a student body.

Senator Ravech: Point of Information: I have the information on how much the Naked Bike Ride cost was for Fall 2010 and Spring 2009. For the past spring it was \$5,718.08 for UVM police and \$5,950 for Green Mountain Security.

Senator M. White: Just wanted to bring up a Naked Bike Ride point, what are your intentions in these meetings about funding? What is your goal for these or is it just kind of to figure out where our money is going? You said you had a meeting about the funding of the Naked Bike Ride.

President Mensah: Yes, to see whether or not more costs can be cut down. Believe it or not, the cost over the years have actually been cut down with the Green Mountain Security. The number that we used to pay for Green Mountain Security used to be double but with conversations with SGA a few years ago we actually sort of promoted the use of student volunteers. And with the use of student volunteers to set up fencing and things of that nature, that has drastically reduced the costs of Green Mountain Security. The purpose of the conversations that I had with Annie was to see whether we could make more budget reductions because in all honestly, I think that for an event that runs for 20-25 minutes, the less amount of money, close to \$15,000 that we are using for this event is just preposterous.

COLA (1:58.26)

Chair Morgan: So hopefully we can get that behind us and move on to committee reports. I would like to officially welcome my new COLA people, Senator Rifken, Senator Sadek. I actually know these two from way back so it's going to be a really good committee, a really wholesome committee. We're going to get cracking on priority registration and after some guidance during the senate retreat I think we're going to get COLA moving in the right direction for that. We had those talks about wanting to do Coffee with the Cops last semester, and then that got scrapped. So now we're going to do like a police luncheon and that could be really sweet. I'll keep you updated. Look out for the Student Neighborhood Initiative Grant because that is going to sneak up behind you. Community Coalition is February 11, Friday 2-4 pm 12 Colchester Avenue, Pearl House. Yeah, I wanted to say something to Senator Bennington. Now that the bill is tabled, I guess, not I guess, I'm going to try to find someone from the city who is from an opposing viewpoint. Currently I don't know of any so I can't guarantee we're going to get somebody, if that makes sense. We will look into it.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:59.56)

Senator Bennington: If you'd like, I can give you some names of people I know who are opposed to it and who have been working on it.

Chair Morgan: That's cool. I was going to shoot for a City Councilor that I think is going to be opposed to it. Was it government level or was it just like, we can talk later.

Chair Monteforte: Can your reports have that much energy from now on?

Chair Morgan: nay

CODEEE (2:00.33)

Chair Herman: I have a meeting with Bev Colston tomorrow. She's the director of the ALANA Student Center to discuss the capital ranking proposal. I met with the President and VP of VSTEP yesterday at a CODEEE meeting to discuss the workshops. We have one group so far that has committed to doing a workshop with VSTEP, which is Black Student Union. That workshop will be March 16 just because Black Student Union is totally busy with Black History Month this entire month of February. They committed to doing a workshop. Marlee and Emmalynn, they are trying to compile a PowerPoint of different types of data to share with the students and groups on campus like composting, what is composting, recycling? Why is bottled water hazardous to use to the environment? So they're still compiling the PowerPoint and they are looking for input also. With that, they may possibly be coming next week to Public Forum to actually give us a demo, a small overview of what they will actually be doing with these workshops on campus. It's not set in stone yet. I'm going to Black Student Union's meeting tomorrow to actually gauge what they want to know as far as bottled water goes and what questions they have regarding recycling and things like that. We're also reaching out to Student Financial Services, different social directors over there, mainly Norma Craig who is on one of the Presidential Commissions with me, to compile a list for students having financial difficulties coming to the university so they can have maybe like a website that has a list of resources and places they can go to if they are running into financial issues and not to wait until the last minute and have to leave school. So that's something else we're working on. The environmental forums, both Steph Cesario and Senator Tepper will be on the environmental forum. Myself and Senator Vitagliano will be going to the American Red Cross sometime this week to speak with someone over there. Lastly, Dr. Elliot Nelson who at first reached out to Vice President Maciewicz about suicide prevention some time ago actually got back to him, sometime last week, last Thursday sometime. So I sent him an email and hopefully we can meet with him sometimes soon regarding suicide prevention on campus.

Student Action (2:04.18)

Senator M. White: To start off, welcome to Ian, our new guy. We're super excited to have him. As we know, as one door opens another door closes, we lost Doran, so again, just another quick moment of silence for our hearts. Student Action. As much as I usually disagree with *The Cynic*, they hit the nail on the head this week. "UVM Needs to Satisfy Late Night Food" was an article. You all should pick up copy this week and take a look at it. It's really just that a lot of universities like us have late night programs and we don't and it's "atrocious". Love it. Number 2, these are two *Cynic* folks, by the way, and they stuck around all night which is sweet. Number 2, Student Bill of Rights revamp slash going out real soon. Library next week, myself and Senator Benner are going to hit up some of the library late night hours. There's your next story. The clothing project. My fault, I didn't give the R... committee people enough time to put their request through for a table so we didn't have any tables for this week. So, next week, sorry to our two senators that were signed up. Third, month of service, thank you to Kyle, Mallea, and Benner for showing up for an organizational meeting on Sunday. It was awesome and things are going ahead as planned. Other than that, Jesse was sorry he can't make it but we can field any questions you've got. That is all. Oh, wait, I would love to yield the floor to Aliza.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:06.45)

Chair Adams: While I love that you cut out the *Cynic* articles, I'm wondering why you left your trash on my desk again.

Senator M. White: I'll take the hit for that although it was Jesse.

Senator Caster: I know I said this before, but as far as the bottled water ban and negotiations, has anybody been in contact as far as that and what our role will look like as far as negotiators and having a student voice?

Senator M. White: Beautiful. Bottled Water Ban, and I'm going to yield the floor to Alyssa in a second to talk about. Going on as planned, sort of taking a back burner until we can get water bottles and then schedule another big tabling session with the petition, getting the petition out there. Thank you. Also, Gavin has been an integral part of getting the water bottle ban out to students, getting it in every dorm.

Chair Adams: What's going on with the library?

Senator M. White: The library. I mentioned this last week. The meeting that was supposed to be scheduled for a week, they sent me a letter that said yeah, we'll get you in within a week. Then they sent me a letter saying, yeah, we'll get you in within 3 weeks. Now the three weeks is almost up.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: So, as the slide says, Walk a Mile, which is going to be a large part of our month of service that was so wonderfully conceived by Senator White. Basically, as it says, it's both a philanthropy event, a social event, and an educational event for our campus. A few statistics to review. One in Four college women is raped in her time as a college student. 3 out of 4 women who are raped don't come forward. Greek Life on most college campuses have particularly high instances of date rape and sexual assault because they are generally surrounded with events and social activities are generally shrouded with some form of secrecy and there is presence of alcohol. Walk a Mile in her Shoes, as I've said before, is basically an awesome event. It's very Relay for Life- esque in that it's similar but it's about half the length. It's going to start at 11:00 so please mark the date now. It's going to be April 9. Basically, we're going to open up to the campus and men will have the opportunity to buy for the event high heeled shoes. These are actually the sanctioned official shoes of Walk a Mile in her Shoes, worn by a woman, I think. Basically, that's the gist. There will also be shoes available for sale at the event but they will cost more. It would be better if you ordered the beforehand because it actually places less financial burden on the event. Basically, it's both an opportunity for men to show their support for the

cause, show their awareness, and also learn the things that we sort of slept through at orientation about consent law and about the fact that while it's estimated that there is a lot of the idea that rape is something that doesn't occur as much as it says, that there is a lot of subjectivity, consent law is very clear and a lot of the event will center around teaching. All of the funds raised will be divided between going to the National Rape Crisis Hotline, to our own Women's Rape Crisis Center and the Women's Center and also to anti-rape culture programming in the future since there is absolutely no funding even in Vermont as a whole for preventative programming. We will have a cat walk so you will be able to show off your shoes. It's going to be a huge event. We're going to have survivor stories, we've already got a few women who are brave enough to come forward to talk to the group. We'll have competitions. It's also really funny, you should come. It has been really successful on other campuses and at USC, I think they are the record holders, they raised almost \$100,000. It was a huge event, it was hugely successful. We've also talked to Leonardo's, they've agreed to donate pizza, and we've also talked to Dunkin Donuts about donating stuff. Hopefully local businesses will donate to allow us to additionally raise money, which comes down to the final point: we need money. To book the event, to get the license to hold the event because it is a trademarked event, to buy the shoes so they can be offered at the event and for general decoration. Like Relay for Life, it is kind of an expense where you have to put out money to make money. That said, we're having a bake sale on Monday, February 7 and then another one on the 24th, which is a week from next Thursday. I love you all very much, I will love you all even more if you bake for me. I'm going to pass around a sheet so you can sign up to bake. I'm also going to send out a sheet for volunteers because the event itself is going to require a lot of manpower. As much as I love Conference and Event Services, I don't think I have an extra \$1,000 to request manpower. Basically, I want to pass these around for you to sign up. Some final points.

Senator Vitagliano: Point of Clarification: You said it's either the 24th or a week...

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: oh no, there are two. Basically the ultimate cost for the event itself, it will be under \$1,000 probably around \$800 dollars, which can partially be earned by a bake sale. We're aiming to make about \$300. It's going to begin unfortunately at 2:00pm because the tables are booked from here to eternity but it will start I think at noon on the following Thursday. I will be at the table as early as 1:00, 1:30 at the latest if people want to start bringing food then. Just a few more things about the details. If you are interested in participating but if for any reason you can't or don't want to volunteer, individuals must purchase the shoes and then raise \$10 minimum. Groups and teams put together must raise \$50 minimum and they all must buy shoes, obviously. Women are encouraged to participate but we won't be selling shoes in your size.

Senator Ravech: For the shoes that are purchased, is the money a donation or where does the money to buy the shoes go?

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: The shoes, if you buy them ahead of time, you save me the burden of having to fundraise enough to have them available at the event. I am currently trying to get them. The headquarters is in Palo Alto, California so there's a 3 hour time difference I'm trying to figure out. Basically, they are going to give me a quota for the price of shoes. The number goes down the more we order. The more people that submit their orders at one time, the cheaper it will be and the less we'll have to fundraise to be able to have them available at the event. Basically, I'm going to have those numbers as soon as possible.

Senator M. White: Two things. First of all, after we use the shoes are they going to be recycled because I don't really want to keep them. And number two, as a strong advocate of women's rights, I think the proper word is people power.

Senator Tran: I have a few questions, first, who is the main organizer of this?

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Well there's Greeks Against Sexual Assault, which I'm now the chair of but it's a national chapter and we're opening up a UVM Chapter this spring.

Senator Tran: Are you guys partially funding for that for that?

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: We have no money. I'm meeting with Kim Monteaux to talk about grants tomorrow. She's the advisor of all Greek Life. As of right now, there are \$45 in the account for this.

Senator Tran: Ok, so a piece of advice. We work a lot with clubs and bake sales are probably the second to worst fundraising event. Clubs bake for like a year and get like \$100. What does work though is if you sell like grilled cheese on a Friday and Saturday night.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: We've gotten a couple of fraternities to agree to host them on their driveways.

Senator Tran: You probably are going to need to do a lot more than bake sales.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: We are going to do a lot more, it's just a leaping point.

Senator Caster: I like it a lot. I'm just curious if you have the exact cost and if you've gone to organizations like IRA who, and speaking from the perspective of IRA we have sort of a non-spending chair of our Community and Educational Programming and this is something that would fall under. Also, my second question, where is it happening?

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: The Harris/Millis circle. There is a rain date for the same day but in the gym on that track. I've been talking to Conference and Events services and we've gotten as many as 5 different quoted prices for that basic area but without any of the other stuff we have to worry about it's about \$150.

Chair Adams: Did you fill out a catering waiver?

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: No, I still have to do that tonight.

Senator Tepper: I really like this idea for an event but I was just wondering if the men have to wear heels because I don't wear heels so they're not in my shoes. It's this weird gendered stereotype thing.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Part of it is that in the workplace, it's commonplace in the business world and a lot more in the formal world that women are genuinely expected to wear heels. If you don't you're at a disadvantage if you even make it into the field. Generally, heels are considered sort of a sign of oppression. They were initially created with, well there are a lot of different stories for why they were initially created but when they were initially made they were seen as a means of separating women from men in attire and a further divide. Also, if you look out on Church Street and you see lots of first year girls trying to make their way down the hill in heels, who is safer? They guys in sneakers or the girls in heels? It's just sort of that comparison. Yes, it might be a stereotype but I think that ultimately it serves a purpose in its point.

Senator Bennington: I think this is awesome. As a male who fully embraces my right to wear women's clothing whenever I care to, I'm wondering if it's possible to give the money for the shoes to the organization without actually getting the shoes because maybe I have my own heels that I want to wear.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Everyone who walks the track will be expected to wear heels. There will be a whole cheering section. There's going to be a lot of stuff to do that you don't have to walk, but the walking is going to be the sort of center focus point.

Senator Bennington: I guess my question is, I want to walk and I want to walk in heels but I don't necessarily want to buy another pair of heels.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Oh, yeah, totally fair game. If you wanted to donate the money we'd be happy to take it.

Senator Caster: I don't know if you sent it out on the listserv and I just didn't see it, but once you sort of formalize everything, could you send it out on the listserv?

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Yeah, I have to wait until I officially book the space, which will hopefully be booked by next Monday.

Senator DeVivo: I don't know how to form this as a question, I am really interested in the UVM month of service. Is there like a group or something I can join on facebook?

Senator M. White: That is a really good question. Yeah, there is totally a group. Not only is there a group, there is a second organizational meeting coming up two Sundays from now at 12:00 in the Galaxy Space. Last time there were 9 people, this time I'm hoping for 18. 18 is a nice double of last time. Join the facebook group if you haven't already and come out to the meeting and help us organize this. Thanks.

Senator Caster: As far as the late night meal options and club preparations, selling that on campus, would you need a catering waiver to sell food on campus and if you don't I feel like that would be something to check out. I feel like, again, that would be an opportunity for Sodexo to say no to a student project. Secondly, I know that within IRA when we wanted to have an expanded conversation on the meal plan and I wanted to know if you guys are working on or wanted to collaborate, because this could be a subset of a larger conversation on restructuring the meal plan to be more advantageous to students.

Senator M. White: I guess it has been brought up that points don't buy you enough food, unless you're Trey, to get you through a semester. You have to spend 12 points a day to get through the semester and 12 points is like a meal and a half, speaking from a bigger man's perspective. You do have to fill out a waiver but I feel like that's not going to be a problem, hopefully, because it's not interfering with Sodexo's business to be open late because they're not.

Senator Caster: In the conversations that I had with IRA, the reason that they make you fill out a catering waiver is because of liability, and if a student gets sick off of food that is sold on university campus, Sodexo is going to assume that liability and deal with any law suits that pertain off of that. That was the explanation that was provided to me.

Senator M. White: Feelgood sells food all the time

Chair Adams: Point of Information: Feelgood has a contract with Sodexo that is heavily debated and argued about on a regular basis.

Public Relations (2:33.22)

Chair Monteforte: Hello. Good thing happening, PR is going in a good direction. A couple of things going on, we met with IRA tonight, Representative Sam who is their PR guy was there. We're talking with IRA making some links there, it's going to be pretty cool. I don't have any results for VSOP 3. We talked about it, we're still waiting for more questions so hopefully by Friday. I apologize for that, we're just trying to make it the best it can be. VSOP will be rolling out and that's going to be some great things, we feel very strongly about it. Continuing to inform the student body, looking for new ways to do things, we have some things coming up. We're going to be heavily involved, as Claire said, in elections coming out so that's going to be very exciting and if you have any questions, please let us know.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:24.20)

Senator Ballas: Do you know anything about ecoware or spreading that information to the students?

Chair Monteforte: I do not. I know that they are selling \$7.50 containers that you can buy at Wal-Mart for \$0.50 but that's about it. I'm sorry, that sounded really bad. They're trying to do a method where Sodexo is promoting that everybody buys a container and then you eat out of it so kind of getting rid of the waste but that's all I know of it.

Academic Affairs (2:25.11)

Chair Filstein: Good evening senate. In the world of AA, right now we're working with the Faculty Senate on advising the specific eval questions that we want to have made public back to students. That's some obvious progress right there. We're also working with Faculty Senate basically on, Kofi has mentioned this and I think I mentioned this last week that we've been pushing for syllabi and enhanced course descriptions and the solution that Knodell came up with is that next fall, professors are either going to make syllabi available or an enhanced course description. Right now Senator Alleger is working with Faculty Senate to find out what exactly that enhanced description is going to look like. Our strategy is basically going to be ask for as much as we can. Ask for the syllabi by another name. Ask for as much information in this enhanced description so that we're going to have as much as information possible. There's that and then we're working on the Email thing. We're also taking on a new topic, we're beginning to research the advising issue and we're going to be having some questions about students' perception of advising in the next VSOP. Thank you very much PR. Final note, after the BOT we're going to try to strategize with Provost Knodell on how to make some progress this semester on the eval thing. Basically, before the boycott evals were basically nailed to floor, there was no anything was going to happen. Now that we did the boycott things are happening with enhanced descriptions, things are happening with syllabi, things are moving. Basically we shook things up. We appreciate you in your report saying that we're happy that we did it and we're happy that they're making accommodations and be looking forward to getting more results and keeping the dialogue going. We're very happy to have a new senator Tess and we're sorry to lose Caroline to PR, but we know you will treat her well.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:27.09)

Senator Lovell: Not sure how to phrase this as a questions but congratulations?

Chair Filstein: Thank you

Finance (2:27.23):

Senator Tran: Hi, I would first like to thank everyone for passing the bill for Triathlon. We had a few supplementals today as usual. Also, budget hearings start this weekend and we'll be going for lots of weekends in February. I think that's it.

Student Activities (2:27.48):

Chair Adams: Hi friends. I'm the last one. So there's a club coming up for recognition, Demonin, and basically they're another literary type magazine. I don't know, it's a word that means like things associated with place, they'll explain it better than I can, so that's what's going on in that world. UVMtv wants to provide compensation to their ad reps. Basically people who go out and make them money will receive a certain percentage of the amount of money they bring into the club. *The Cynic* already does it, but in order for them to be able do that have to sort of grant them an exception to our financial policies. I'm pretty much in that club, kind of, so Chair

Mallea and hopefully Senator Calder will be taking that over and I'll pretty much stay out of it. Budgets, just along those lines, if you hear people stressing out about them, there was a weird spyware thing that prevented a bunch of club's budgets from going through to Finance. A bunch of clubs had to resend them, but it shouldn't really be an issue, it should just be resending them. Then we're hosting Fall in Love with Clubs the week of the 14th. If you're in clubs one, send it to me because right now 2 clubs have replied and the deadline is this Thursday. Basically what we're going to do is we're going to turn that around and do sort of a huge Valentine's Day theme, marketing advice. I don't know why I keep talking about catering waivers but it keeps coming up so perhaps that's something Student Activities Committee will be looking into in the near future. Club Point Allocation sheets, right now my lovely liaisons have submitted most of them, so those will be done by Friday and Finance will be able to use them in the budgeting process, which is really really cool.

Senatorial Forum (2:30.08)

Chair Adams: With regards to the bill since it is coming up again next week, we can talk about it a little bit now. I would almost rather see it presented as two really strong bills, in tandem. One on transparency and one on Lockheed Martin because there's no reason why we can't take a stand on both individually or collectively.

Senator Goodnow: I wanted to quickly just thank you for the mention for the Senator of the Week thing and that it's an honor to be part of this body and I'm really happy to be here.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: This one will be a lot faster, I promise. It's not a presentation, just something to follow up on for last week. To follow up on last week when we brought up Care Net and what was being brought up was inaccurate information about contraception. Basically, this is Care Net. Care Net is next to Trinity Campus. On the website, so basically even if you look at their webpage, you'll understand that it's essentially misleading and it's a site that was sent out. I keep now finding bits of Care Net information around my room because I picked it up with other flyers for clubs at fairs, which essentially makes it look like because these are SGA related events, we are an organization that is in some way supporting Care Net. I think that something we need to look into is who we are having at these events because even though as a public institution we have to open up free speech to everyone who is present and able to attend, we also have to look into what information we're providing to particularly new students. While they provide great services for some women, ultimately they are providing information to students in places that information may not be applicable.

Chair Adams: Point of Information: I believe what you're referring to is the fall Activities Fest which currently is hosted by Student Life, not SGA.

Senator Caster: This is completely unrelated to what just happened, but I think that there were some pretty interesting comments on the tuition increase and what that looks like and I would really like to see some kind of ad hoc or non-standing committee. Even if we were just going to have a conversation on this as to what it's going to look like next year for the Board of Trustees and maybe SGA could try not to make a blanket comment on tuition increases but rather a pretty in depth analysis and then resolution on how we feel the function of a financial model is which raises tuition yet does financial aid and is this going to be successful and do we feel like it's appropriate as undergraduates that they're doing these sorts of things and if we could sort of have a committee to draft a resolution and look more in depth at the history of our financial system here because I personally don't feel like I understand how financial aid works and how the university funds such massive infrastructure projects. I just don't know how that works and I'd be really curious to have SGA say something about it and to inform myself.

President Mensah: I just wanted to reiterate my gratitude for the students who have been keeping up on the debates going around on the tuition as well as being informed on my report the written report as well as the oral report. I also wanted to reiterate how my staunch support of this

body in your decision to pass the resolution calling for a boycott on course evaluations. I don't think that some of you are aware that the week after finals that David and I were in a very heated meeting where you could literally see the tension in the room with Provost Knodell and some other senior administrators that we have not really talked about. To think about questioning whether or not we were in support of something that would cause us to be looked at in such a way by senior administration and questioning our leadership I think is a little bit odd and misplaced, which is warranted if you read different parts of my report but you don't understand it. For future instances, I would appreciate it if you came to myself or Vice President Maciewicz and talk to us about the certain situation of things before things before you make a misinformed statement.

Senator O'Brien: As far as what Senator Caster brought up and this idea of creating an ad hoc committee on the budget, PR has some very valuable tools in the development of this committee and also getting the word out to students about this because I don't think we should move forward with any type of analysis and resolution when we're assuming that students know nothing about it and not even reaching out to them about it. Today we just talked about the next VSOP which will definitely be before the May Board of Trustees meeting and during the development of the ad hoc committee we can have some sort of analysis in the next VSOP have questions about the budget increase with unbiased information we can get student opinion. Also, we just passed this Constitutional Amendment having there be a referendum which today we just set some sort of timeline for about two weeks for it and that's going to be very valuable. With not only the VSOP but with the referendum to get students opinions because if we just move forward with the resolution without talking to anyone we can't say we're doing out jobs well.

Speaker Chevrier: I wanted to quickly respond to what Chair Morgan sent out on the listserv about Financial Aid and the projected budget increase is going to work with that. If the tuition goes up by 5.8%, a) the amount of people that are eligible for financial aid will increase. Also, the people that are currently eligible but never took advantage of financial aid will actually apply. I'm a senior and the class after me, so the class of 2012 was the largest they had ever seen and they started to cap it and the classes of 2013 and 2014 are about the same. So next year there's going to be the most on campus that there has ever been because my year will have graduated and it will all be the bigger amounts of students in each year. The idea that they're only increasing it for financial aid, the idea that each person is going to get more financial aid is completely untrue. It's just that more people are going to require it and so more money is going to be allocated towards financial aid but it won't actually turn out to people more getting more.

Chair Morgan: Point of Information: In the BOT materials it said next year's projected size is 45 students larger than this year is.

Speaker Chevrier: That doesn't make sense to the numbers that I looked at earlier today. So that's one thing. The other thing is I think it's really important for everyone to remember that we are supposed to be voicing the frustrations and the voice of the students. We're supposed to be representing the students and I really would doubt that we would find any student at this university who is in full support of a 5.8% budget increase, so I implore you President Mensah to include that in your Board of Trustees report, in the oral report and more so than what I've already read that's in it because it needs to be a staunch stance. I want to tell a quick story for those of you that are new. Last year, President Bryce Jones got Swine Flu and so Vice President Ash had to write a Board of Trustees report and we sat in exec and we tried to figure out what it was she was going to say. At the time, there was a proposal to create another fee for the students. So right now you pay the \$77 a semester for SGA and that huge one for the Davis Center that we always complain about and that huge one for athletics that we always complain about and they were thinking about creating a new one to fund a future big building to put all of the different Health and Wellbeing centers together in one localized area behind the tunnel exit near L/L. That was a proposal that everybody on the Board of Trustees was really behind. Whenever the people come to evaluate the university, when the accreditors come, the one thing the university always gets huge points off for is that you have to search for Health and Wellbeing around campus because they're in scattered locations. Everybody was really behind it and then Vice President

Ash got up on the Board of Trustees and said that nobody was for it and it was an awful way to fund things and that you should never take money from students to pay for something that they will never actually be able to benefit from and that students were sick of it and that people were no longer willing to pay these tuitions and they dropped it. They completely dropped it. Something that was about to happen stopped because of Kate Ash's words so I would really hope that we do the same sort of thing right now because I am really against the 5.8%.

Senator Rifken: I was on the budget ad hoc last year on senate and I think it's really important, not even to put out a resolution, although that is really cool thing to come out of that, but just to get informed. We also had a budget forum last year, which is cool even though not too many people came but I think that's really great. Richard Cate came and spoke and said there are only like 4 people on this entire campus that really understand how the budget works. I do understand that it's like his life's work, but I do think it should be more accessible to students to at least understand how their money is broken down. I've been looking at a lot of numbers and I know Lucas has and there's something about actually only an increase in 20 students for Fiscal Year 2102. And I have a whole binder of stuff here from last year if you are interested I have that too.

Senator Ravech: I have a question about the tabling for the Lockheed Martin. I was kind of curious, was the tabling to gather student opinion, more or less? I think I just got confused on that if we could clarify.

Chair Filstein: Point of Information: So I think the idea was that everyone seems to be for the call for transparency. The most controversial clause was the clause that said 'SGA thinks that Lockheed Martin is an unacceptable business partner' so my proposal was that we take the week to all do the research and make up our minds to see if we personally think they're an acceptable business partner. Looking at the history, looking at all the court cases, looking at what they build. Doing whatever you can because that's the controversial part and if we all come to some sort of agreement where we all say, yes they're an acceptable business partner or no they're not, then my opinion that we can have those two things on one bill. We're saying that we want transparency. I would encourage you all to actually do the research so when we come here next week the same thing doesn't happen.

Senator Ravech: Also with the tuition increases being at 5.8%, I really think that if you're confused about it, talk to someone who might know more about it like Kofi, or Pat Brown and I guess it would be good to have Richard Cate come in because there's a lot that goes into it and also we've had stimulus money from Obama. This tuition increase was supposed to happen 2 or 3 years ago and we'd already had one increase and we were supposed to have a second but then we got the stimulus money and that second increase didn't happen. So that's why we have the increase now instead of having it 2 years ago. There's just a lot that goes into it and I don't think we should necessarily be 100% saying that tuition increase is really bad and we don't want any of it. I just think everyone should figure out all the aspects of it.

Senator Caster: As Senator Ravech said, I feel like various issues are very nuanced and for some kind of ad hoc committee we could really sort of speak to these nuances and find out from the complexities these sort of terms like this is what's going on. We can deduct this and we have a ton of evidence and then in that case present it to the student body so we can go through and weed out all the jargon and get to the crucial points and inform people as much as we can. That would be the other goal for a committee like this, to inform students in a lexicon that is understandable.

Senator O'Brien: I'm curious to know in terms of method and getting outreach in terms of tuition information, if anyone can share briefly if you weren't on SGA last year and you went through the Davis Center and saw a huge green banner on tuition increase, how that struck you, if you got a little bit more informed of that and if it was effective. Very briefly just give us some feedback because that means that's one more route that we want to take this semester with the tuition increase. So if I could just get some feedback real quick.

Senator Bennington: Feedback for that, that banner made me want to be a part of SGA. I was like cool, they're doing stuff! That is really supportive of what students want. I think if your aim here is to see should we do a banner again? It's awesome. A lot of people really don't get the information. Building on what Senator Filstein said about doing research, also just like talking to other students because we really should pass something that is representative of the student body. The resolution that I introduced is representative of students that I talked to. I can't say that I'm representative of the entire student body. I can say I'm representative of students who I associate with and I think it would be great, the recommendation to have two separate resolutions, it's kind of like and ecological economics thing, it's two different policy for two different problems. I'm going to think about that a lot. I'm really excited that we had that debate. I haven't experienced a debate like that on senate yet and it was great. I hope that next week we can continue the discussion and pass something that is in full support of what student opinion might be. Also, if you want more information, City Council is going to be voting on two resolutions on Monday night. The meeting starts at 7:30 pm in Contois Auditorium in City Hall. There is going to be a lot of information given out there and it will be a good time to gauge what the City of Burlington and our elected officials think about this.

Senator Vitagliano: I want to make an announcement since it is SGA related that February 10 there is a retention study conference being conducted by the administration. February 10, there is 3 different times but the one open to students starts at 3:00-4:30 in this actual room. If anyone is interested in doing that and they want to let me know, I'm going to the morning one with all of the Deans and Senior VPs and all that fun stuff. I got access to that. Just to see if there are any differences if that happens to come up. If someone wants to step up and do that, that would be great, just get in touch with me.

Chair Adams: Really quickly, the Board of Trustees is also on Friday discussing internationalization at UVM which deals a lot with international students coming here, USPP students and sort of looking into the future of that. Just so you guys are aware, they are sort of hanging that meeting as really sparking internationalization programs here or kind of cutting them back which is interesting.

Senator Yeager: Just real quick, I was going to hold my tongue, but I decided not to. So when everyone sends out the resolutions and everything beforehand, the comments are really important, but I feel like the environment that we had today, everyone gains so much more and makes opinions based on what we hear, so I don't really like hearing people we should have done this beforehand because this is why we're on senate and it should be done now as well.

Senatorial Comments/Announcements (2:48.45)

Vice President Maciewicz: After meeting the meeting everyone, right here, picture for a thank you card for the Gormley family who all of you will meet at the end of the year is a long standing donor that pays for a lot of SGA projects that we do. We're going to get a group photo of all of us being happy that Kofi and I are going to send out.

Senator M. White: I would like to quickly respond to David's ultimatum slash demand on cleaning desks, there will be an ad hoc cleaning party downstairs of the student action desk following the meeting. We do respect your authority to tell us what to do.

Senator Rifken: Point of Information: Ad hocs can only be created by the President of SGA so you need to get Kofi's approval.

Senator M. White: Point of Information: Latin ad hoc, not our use of ad hoc

Chair Adams: If you clean up all the desks you actually used too that would be great. Shout out to Senator White for beating Senator Lederer-Plaskett at her own feminist game. Congratulations to Lucas for turning to 21, I know his reports are way more fun now. Also last Friday night, a

bunch of people came down to my place and it was really fun. We didn't get a lot of talking about senate done but it was definitely a fun time. If you guys want to come down this Friday and Senator Bennington made really awesome pizza with apples on it. If you guys want to come down we can have it as an informal get to know or we can talk about Lockheed Martin and tuition or whatever, so it can really be whatever people want it to be.

Speaker Chevrier: So speaking of the U.S. Sino Pathways Program, I worked with it over the summer and I thought it was the coolest job in the entire world. I can't do it next year but the people in the Office of International Education and Continuing Ed have asked me to try and find different candidates who might be interested in the job. So if anyone has any questions, it really was awesome and they're trying to look for one Chinese student and one person who knows a lot about the university and that could be you. If you're interested I can send you the application and talk to you more about it.

Senator Benner: For any of you in this room who are looking to quit smoking, come talk to me. I'm doing research at the Anxiety Health and Research and would love to stick some wires into you. Not really, but I'd love to help you, so email me. Also, if anyone is interested in taking a trip with me on Monday to Middlebury, Vermont, let me know. I will exchange your courtesousness with dinner.

Senator Tepper: I can't make it this Thursday but this Thursday is the Climate Action Day in Montpelier, so if you can make it down there to show your support against climate change, that would be great.

Senator Cesario: Not to plug the International Socialist Organization, but they're having an event tomorrow night, two of the guys who came to talk to us. Just if you want to know a little bit more about the international revolts that are going on or just the Arab revolts in general, and if you want to talk to some people, even if you don't agree with the general Socialist perspective, I'm sure they would love to spark some dialogue. I haven't heard many people talking about what's going on around campus but as student leaders we should be in the know about huge global issues. I didn't even say when it is. It's 7:00 tomorrow in Lafayette 311. I can see you're all writing that down.

Roll Call (2:53.13)

Finance: Senator Juaire, excused

Student Activities: Senator Moise, Senator Mason, excused

COLA: All Present

CODEEE: All Present

Student Action: Chair Simmons, excused

Public Relations: All Present

Academic Affairs: Senator Alleger, excused

Adjournment (2:53.30)

End Time: 9:54pm