



TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8TH, 2011
TWENTY-SECOND MEETING OF THE 2010-2011 SENATE

Call to Order (0:05.47)

Start Time: 7:05pm

Roll Call (0:05.51)

Finance: All Excused

Student Activities: Senator Mustacchi, Senator Lederer-Plaskett, excused

COLA: All Present

CODEEE: Chair Herman, Senator L. White, excused

Student Action: All Present

Public Relations: All Present

Academic Affairs: All Present

Approval of the Minutes (0:06.17)

From 2/1/11 - passes

Public Forum (0:06.31)

Vermont State Representatives Kesha Ram & Chris Pearson

Kesha Ram: So I'm representative Kesha Ram. Representative Christ Pearson and I both represent Burlington's university, hill section and Old North End district. Most of UVM's physical plant is in our district. I'm only telling you this because I see quite a few new faces. If you have more questions about the areas we represent we're happy to answer those. I came to just a little about some things we're working on in the legislature as they pertain to your interests as students and as young people who often care about a range of issues as is represented by some of the bills you're working on that have to do with labor, the environment, and other things. For those of you who don't know, I was the student body president at UVM 3 years ago so I'm very familiar with Senate and very happy to see a lot of familiar faces as well. So I'm on the General Housing and Military Affairs Committee. We deal with everything from labor to alcohol drug policy to tribal affairs and then to housing and military affairs issues. As some of you may know, we just had a large deployment of soldiers to Afghanistan return and that deployment has now ended for the Vermont National Guard, so we're now dealing with soldiers and their families, traumatic brain injury, taking care of their needs. So that's one of the things we're working on in committee. Other than that, I want to talk a lot largely about some of the issues that pertain the most to you, one of them being higher education. I was already talking to a member from COLA, Senator Rifken, about what it looks like for us to do budget and what UVM usually gets or doesn't get. We usually divide our appropriations for higher educations between the University of Vermont, the Vermont state colleges and the Vermont Student Assistance Corporation. The past couple years my understanding is we have level funded our appropriation to the University of Vermont and that hasn't been necessarily an increase. Although, one of the things we did try to make the commitment to increase funding for higher education and I would like to see that happen still because we are, in terms of higher education funding, almost dead last nationally. I have introduced, sometimes we try to find creative ways to fund higher education because it's not always possible to just increase the general fund appropriation. I'm introducing legislation to try to create state level work-study funding. As federal work study funding dries up a little bit or they

ask non profits and community organizations to share the costs of their work-study, that prohibits a lot of people from participating and causes a lot of people to lose their work-study position. When I'm not in the legislature I work with Women Helping Battered Women and I know we lost our work-studies for that reason. Some states have started to look at creating state level work study funding that would then fill some of that money and a lot of those students could then take those opportunities in the community which is a win win for the campuses and the community. This is something that I think is really important for investing in higher education and work force development. Another thing that my committee is taking on and sharing jointly with natural resources is household energy efficiency and I know that environment and energy efficiency are some of the projects at UVM that are really important to you all. Right now we're trying fix glitches with the PACE program also known as the Clean Energy Assessment District which a lot of you may have voted on in if you've been in Burlington for the past few years which basically allows households to fund new efficiencies to their home like solar panels or hot water heaters over a period of time. There's been a lot of federal glitches that have not allowed that program to happen, so both us and Natural Resources Committee are taking that on to make sure that can happen and to incentivize and create new programs for energy audits in homes so we can put people back to work and to save a lot of money in energy efficiency rather than just move to renewable energy efficiencies is the cheapest way to reduce our carbon emissions. We have a jobs bill that's coming out that the Governor proposed. A lot of what's in the jobs bill has to do with local foods from farm to plate, which I think is really exciting. A lot of the legislature is talking about this resurgence of young people being interested in agriculture, doing apprenticeships and even learning to do things like skilled meat cutting. That's been a big proposal on our table, really just trying to create new training opportunities and work force development. That's generally what I wanted to talk about in terms of legislative priorities. If I could just speak to a couple of things personally, I generally like to come out in front of things that feel imminent. In a couple of weeks the Legislature is going to be electing 3 new members of the UVM Board of Trustees. The legislature has 9 members on the board. So every 2 years they elect 3 members and they serve a 6-year term. Those are all staggered terms. I am running for the Board of Trustees this year along with 2 other people so there's 3 people running for 3 slots, so we'll know very soon if it's an uncontested election. It looks somewhat likely that I will be serving on the UVM Board of Trustees in a few months. I say that not only because I still want you to feel comfortable approaching me and sharing your thoughts and concerns but, my representation and advocacy on your behalf as my constituents is, I wouldn't say limited to the legislature, but that is where I would direct most of my advocacy on your behalf. The Legislature elects fellow Legislators to serve the Board of Trustees on behalf of the entire state and the best interest of the university as a whole. While I think hearing your concerns is one part of what I would be doing on the board, certainly we have to look at a broad range of interests and concerns and the strategic and financial benefits for the university as a whole. So please continue to use me as a resource, but know that those are different roles for me to be your Legislator in Montpelier while also serving as a Legislator Trustee on the UVM Board of Trustees. I actually, because I thought this might be one of the only times that we come before the senate transitions, I wanted to congratulate and thank President Kofi Mensah and Vice President David Maciewicz for what I think was an excellent job done this year as President and Vice President of the student government. I happened to see the paper today, the UVM *Cynic*, and what I saw was, to me, very disappointing for the Student Government. I think in a lot of ways it makes a mockery if what the Student Government is all about and whenever you all make decisions, I hope that what you are thinking first is, how does this benefit the student body? How am I helping in my role on the Student Government to make the university a better place? I think this really doesn't do a very good job of speaking to that role as a senator. For some institutional memory, up until 2 years ago, changes to the constitution of the Student Government only took effect the following year and I think that was an important safeguard that was in the constitution for decades. The constitution is about principles and the guiding ideas that make the senate function on behalf of the student body. It's not a place for small technicalities to be drawn out to the point that it's no longer helpful to the Student Government or the student body. The other think I would just highlight is that up until my year, the Board of Trustees report was not even written down. They asked me to start doing that because I was sharing a lot of information and then they started to put it in the board book. Up

until then the President would simply go in and share a little bit about what was going on with the Student Government. It's clearly a very important thing, but I think this level of scrutiny over things like that that the President does are really unfortunate and don't speak well to your role as senators to basically serve of students. I hate to end on that note but we're happy to take questions and I think that's really something I thought was important to share.

Chris Pearson: So my name is Chris Pearson. I also represent you all in Montpelier and I'm also a UVM alum. I graduated in 1995, so a little bit before you guys, obviously, but I've lived in Burlington more or less ever since and I really enjoy our community and certainly the university is a big part of that. I sit on House Healthcare, which is the center of a lot of attention this year. I'm also the chair of the Progressive Caucus in the House. There are 5 of us in the house, there are 2 progressives in the Senate. We are the only state in the whole country to have people elected from an independent 3rd party label, the Progressive Party. I'm proud of my role in that way trying to ask questions and exert a little bit of independent influence, especially now that the Governor, the House and the Senate are all controlled by Democrats, who I work very well with, don't get me wrong. I just wanted to go over a couple of things. Everybody I think here understands the role of introducing a bill and raising a discussion that way. There have been a couple instances in my experience in the past month where I didn't actually draft a bill but I was able to have some interesting discussions. During the campaign a constituent of mine over on Henry Street, I asked her what's on her mind and she told me this horrific story. She works in mental health. She had a client who had been abused by her partner repeatedly and she had been to the Emergency Room at Fletcher Allen 8 times in the last year all because her boyfriend beat the crap out of her. Nobody there had asked what was going on. To me that sounded like a real breakdown of the system for someone to present in the Emergency Room repeatedly in pretty short span. I asked folks who, Fletcher Allen has a presence in Montpelier every day. I asked one of their lobbyists, 'what's your protocol for someone who has been showing up in the ER who maybe has a particular break that raises question?' I could almost hear the emails flying around and the panic on their faces. I feel relatively powerless in Montpelier but this was quite the opposite. The whole institution was sort of afraid of what I might do and demanded that they find some protocols or have a mandate to ask everybody questions that are uncomfortable. Long story short, the hospital had me and some advocates in to talk about what do and I relayed the story. I just said, look, I'm not here to accuse you of anything but this is a problem, wouldn't we agree? Just yesterday there was a meeting of statewide meeting of Emergency Room directors, doctors and nurses who staff Emergency Rooms all over the state and they had a half hour discussion about the problem. They have already agreed to some simple steps that they can take. One of the challenges, in the case that the constituent told me about, every time she went to the Emergency Room her partner was with her. That makes it really hard even if somebody does ask do you feel safe at home, chances are the answer is going to be yes when he's sitting right there. Even a simple thing like having a sticker in the women's bathroom that says here's the 800 number to call. You can have the flyers in the waiting room but it's a little hard to quickly jot a note while your batterer is sitting right there. That's just a small example. Another one, during my campaign I proposed an idea around energy efficiency. My notion is that is a lot of us care about Global Warming Climate Change across the board young and old, all around the neighborhood and beyond. It's an overwhelming problem. We don't really know where to start. You guys are going to talk a little bit about that and the city has been doing some good work. What do we do with this huge problem? How do we make it a community problem instead of individuals what do I do, well I have the right kind of light bulbs and I turn my lights off and I turn my thermostat down. My thought was, you could have some kind of a competition where towns could compete and it would be a competition to see who can reduce their electric use the most per person in the next year and the winning town gets a solar array for their school or something like that. That was just an idea and I just talked to, in Vermont we have a lot of Town Energy Committees, and I was talking to a guy who coordinates them. I talked to him a few weeks and finally today we sat down and he told me that in Rutland County, south of here, there is a competition that is coming to the surface where they will challenge towns to see who can better insulate the most homes. If we can weatherize homes about half of our greenhouse gasses in Vermont leak out of our old buildings. Anybody here rent and old building in downtown Burlington? So you have a few drafts there and

you have to understand this is true everywhere. The economy of wrapping those houses is just clear. You save energy, you have a warmer more comfortable house and you just pollute less. It takes money up front and people don't have that. Already there's an idea out. I don't think they're related to my idea that I talked about in October but you never know, you sort of put things out in the universe. Lastly, I sit on Healthcare. Does anybody here pay for healthcare insurance? A lot of you have it through the university. I know everyone here is wildly healthy except for the odd accident you don't deal with this. This is an enormous problem in our society I would say in our country. In little Vermont we have about 600,000 people and we spend \$5 Billion on healthcare. It accounts for about 20 cents out of every dollar spent in our state on healthcare. It is absolutely unsustainable. We have about 50,000 people who are uninsured we have another 80,000 who are under insured. It's just a nightmare. It's not working for anybody. Progressives and others have long advocated for single payer healthcare. This is what is installed in every other advanced country in the world, basically. Governor Shumlin campaigned very directly on a message of single payer, so that's one of the things that prompted me to ask for the Healthcare Committee. I'm used to politicians, even ones I support and like letting me down, that's a fact of life these days. I've been watching, where is it going to drop out and where is it going to be well we wanted to do this but, and it's not there. I'm here to tell you today that we got the Governor's very specific proposal and it's the beginning of a very clear outline of how we get to single payer. It's an enormously complex problem that overlays with federal rules and state and on and on and on. The commitment is there and I'm really proud to be a part of that. The goal is to cover everybody, saving us all money. Not having to worry about I want to go to this job but they don't have healthcare over here. Not worrying about losing your job and still covering your family. The consequences are enormous. Vermont is poised to lead the nation and in a very small way I get to play a role in that which is a huge honor. That's about it for me. Please do come visit us in Montpelier. Today I had a young woman from Burlington, she shadowed me, I love doing that and I'm sure Kesha would as well. It's very easy. I won't be talking to you all day but you're welcome to see our life as thrilling or as boring as it is, we'd love to have you.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:22.58)

Chair Filstein: Thank you both for coming in. I read recently that the Legislature passed something recently looking to revoke personhood from corporations. I was hoping you guys could speak a little bit more to that and what the follow through is going to be with that legislation.

Chris Pearson: It's a resolution. We didn't pass it. The lead sponsor is a Senator, Senator Ginny Lyons, and it's a resolution, so similar to resolutions you do here it's really just a statement of the body. We haven't passed it, it has been introduced and it got some press. We'll be pursuing it. The idea is Hey Washington, Vermont thinks corporations and people are different entities and out to have different rights. It has a big impact on citizens as you know. I don't know what the prospects of that are, they probably aren't good. It's an important discussion to have, I've been involved in a lot of those, it's probably not going to pass but it's important to start.

Kesha Ram: And you should know we both support it and we see a lot of grassroots support from our community.

Senator Rifken: I know I was talking to Kesha before about this, but the governor proposed the finances for UVM and what kind of is the probability. I know he proposed level funding. What is the probability that it will be increased or decreased? Where does that stand, that balance there?

Kesha Ram: My hope and my belief is that it will be level funded this year. Like I said, I may potentially serve on the Board of Trustees and we separate those roles a little bit, but the chair of the Appropriations Committee served on the UVM Board of Trustees for 12 years. So a lot of Legislators get the problem that you can't invest in the next generation and you can't invest in the future without investing in higher education. I think there's a lot of commitment from a lot of

folks to maintain the level funding for this year and try to find a solution to increase funding in the future as we dig ourselves out of the economic downturn.

Chair Adams: I have a questions about you were talking about work-study. I was wondering if you were you talking about, so UVM's most likely switching, right now the part that's not supplemented by federal funds comes out of the general fund. Were you talking about the state allocating money to that because it's switching from coming from the general fund to coming from the individual departments or we you talking about sort of a separates state funded work study?

Kesha Ram: I don't want to misspeak to the technicalities of it but I'm working with work-study coordinators around the state including Sidney Viray who runs work-study at UVM. So she would better existing infrastructure at every college and institution to fund work-study in whatever way they do. We can use a pot of money that is by the Treasurer in the state to support that and let the universities use that to create opportunities in whatever way they will, but tailor it specific to getting students off campus and into the community. It wouldn't be as much on the departments and the academic programs, but folks who go out and work at libraries and non-profits.

Chair Filstein: I heard the Governor on the radio talking about the Healthcare thing and I'm really excited about Vermont on that. They were trying to ask him about what his proposal for paying for that is and he said we are going to worry about that afterwards. I was hoping that you guys had made a little more progress than that since I heard it on the radio.

Chris Pearson: The answer quickly is no. We haven't figured it out. There are a lot of you all familiar with the federal healthcare bill that was passed not even a year ago. That puts a lot of conditions on what Vermont can do. There's a lot of dates in there about when we can start doing certain things and when we have to start doing things. The key date is January 1, 2014. Anything my committee is working on is not going to have a dramatic impact in Vermont before that date. I think the governor wisely is saying any time you put out a proposal on taxes, the switchboards light up. The Healthcare Committee is probably not going to deal with how to finance it, that will go to the Ways and Means Committee, the committee on taxes. He's trying to say look, we're not going to give people anything until several years out and we can't ask people to pay for it. You might as well avoid the pain and misery of a lot of people in Montpelier saying don't you dare tax me this way. It's tough. At the end of the day, I will advocate for a fair system of taxation. There are a small number of Vermonters who are doing extremely well in the economy these days. Most of us are kind of seeing our wages stagnate. I think the financing system has to reflect that. It's a few years off. At the end of the day, every Vermonter would have healthcare, period. Not depending on where you live or how much money you earn or what job you have, you just have healthcare.

Chair Filstein: Something we're going to be talking about later, can guys you speak to the letter that Mayor Kiss signed with Lockheed Martin about a potential partnership between Burlington and Lockheed?

Kesha Ram: Well, I think Jennifer Green is going to speak for the Mayor's Office on that. I think a lot of us have been struggling to find the details of that in what the city stands to gain from this partnership. I still serve on the Mayor's Market and Energy Committee although there hasn't been a meeting in the past year. I remember proposals of low carbon diet and now this idea of a carbon war room, that alone I think is an affront to our values as Burlington and Vermonters and doesn't speak well to making this a unifying effort to our climate change as a community. I know funding is hard to come by for the city to do this work. It's frustrating that that would be attached to a company like Lockheed Martin and Representative Pearson wasn't present, but I voted against a resolution on the F35 coming to Burlington. I think it's troublesome that they're so connected, that Lockheed Martin helped build these fighter jets that may go to Burlington airport

and is also funding this initiative in Burlington. Those are my off the cuffs thoughts but we're hoping to see the details and really hoping that we do soon.

Chris Pearson: I would say, while I share some of the concerns expressed about the green washing potential here, we've got to deal with climate issues. We're late and if waiting for the perfect funding source means waiting for another 10 years I think that's a very important discussion that we have to have and that's a struggle for a lot of people. The person who knows a lot about this is next on the agenda. We can probably turn it over to her.

Jennifer Green, From the Mayor's office (0:31.04)

Jennifer Green: I'm a Ward 1 resident as well so I really appreciate the work of Representatives Ram and Pearson. They do a tremendous job for us and we're really lucky to have them serve on our behalf. I wear several hats. I work for the city, I'm also an adjunct here at UVM so I'm part time city and this semester I teach an ENV5 course. It's ENV5 183 it's Stephanie Kaza's Course, so if any of you have taken any courses with her, we love Stephanie. It's a privilege to teach her class. I think you want to know what's going on. I'm happy to answer any questions you have and I can bore you from, I'll take it back a year up to the present and let you decide. I think Chris ended on a really interesting note. This is an interesting time in history. Federal money, we are in a terrible deficit. Let me preface by saying I am no fan of Lockheed Martin. I can't imagine anybody here is excited about the prospect of Lockheed Martin as a company. They have an atrocious record. It's easy to see that when you Google it, it's easy to find the information. That said, they are a company of 140,000 people and they have an energy efficiency division. This is a small team. When I talk about Lockheed Martin I talk about the energy efficiency division, for the record. So, let me tell you first about some background work for the city. Burlington has, of my many hats, one hat is the Burlington Legacy Plan. I'm telling you this because it's important for folks to know we have a sustainability plan for the city. It was the first of its kind in the nation. It was ratified by the City Council in 2000. It embraces the 4 'E's of sustainability, so you all know what those are. Equity, Environment, Education and Economics. So the legacy plan is unique because it's the 100,000-foot view of where we want to be. There is very little to refute it and I think we all stand behind the principles of equity. We stand behind environmental stewardship and environmental management of clean air, a vibrant downtown economy and quality education for all. That's kind of the hat that I wear in overseeing this 100,000-foot view called the Legacy Project. We have several steering committee members representing the big institutions in town, including the co-chair who is from UVM and our former co-chair is Jane Knodell who you all know. My other hat is as an environmental specialist for the city. Some of that means working with Burlington Electric Department and others on ways we can reduce our energy use and our greenhouse gas emissions in particular. My first job when I started about 3 years ago was Mayor Kiss said here's the old Climate Action Plan, it needs to be updated. So the original Climate Action Plan, again very novel. We're special in Burlington. 10 years ago people weren't talking about climate on a national level, so for us to have a Climate Action Plan ratified 10 years ago is pretty unique. That said, it's 10 years old and we hadn't done a good job in tracking our data. I was charged to work with the City's Comprehensive Planner, a woman named Sandrine Thibault to re-craft the plan. The first thing we had to do was we had to look at all the data for both the community and the government on where our greenhouse gasses were coming from. We used a tool called the [inaudible] tracking tool, which other cities around the country use so we could compare apples to apples. It was a really interesting exercise and we learned that on the community level we generate about 500,000 pounds of greenhouse gasses annually, about 25,000 pounds on the government side. If you're interested in learning more about the Climate Action Plan I encourage you to Google Burlington Climate Action Plan and you can see the break up. Once we had that indicator data, we went out to folks. We talked to about 100 community members in 8 working groups to generate ideas on what we could do to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. It lasted maybe 6-8 months and we got over 200 ideas, everything from support Car Share Vermont to tap waste heat at McNeil Generating Plant and everywhere in between. We got a very rich plethora of ideas. At that time we were able to hire a local firm called Springhill Solutions. They had for a while an office on top of Stone Soup and we asked them to take these

200 ideas and help us figure out the cost carbon benefit of each of these various ideas. Springhill did that. They came up with 17 pithy projects that if we do, we still won't quite reach our target. We, humanity, have a huge task in front of us. As Chris said, we're losing ground. China, as you know, is putting in a new coal fired plant every other day. Their energy use has increased 400 times in the last decade. We're really ground. I have 3 children and I have to say I can get so depressed about the state of thing. It's really exciting to be working with, you're the next leaders. I'm almost 50, so I'm going to be retiring soon. Give me 15 more years and then I pass the baton. These are serious challenges we are dealing with. I hope you feel empowered and not hopeless. Now, let me tell you a little bit about the carbon war room. As Kesha and I were saying before, it is indeed an unfortunate name. Let me give you some history to who founded the Carbon war room and what it means. How many are familiar with Sir Richard Branson? He is an explorer, Virgin Airways, I was describing him to Kesha, he is the guy that always wears holy jeans and a white button down shirt. He was featured in *Outside* magazine recently, sort of a mover and a shaker kind of guy. His thought was there is a 20% return on energy efficiency and renewables. There are a lot of financiers out there that want to start making some money on energy efficiency. They have the money but they understand that to make that return investment it has got to be more than a light bulb here and a light bulb there. They need big projects. Cities are places without money but with good ideas. Again, I look to the McNeil Generating Plant. It's such a unique resource in our city, our biomass plant. You go down to the Intervale, even from campus, you can see the billowing flumes of steam. One idea is to tap that waste heat. It's a radical idea and we've had people from Copenhagen and Europe who are experts, Copenhagen is wired with waste heat, come and look at our system and talk to us about if this is even feasible. It is, but it is prohibitively expensive. I understand we're talking about \$30 million if we're going to tap into that heat. Again, cities have these big projects but no money, we've got some financiers that have money. Again, now you know Richard Branson so he's a Brit. He's also grew up just after World War II when the Nazis were bombing London. You know from world history that Churchill talked about the war room. This was his fighting Nazi Germany. Sir Richard Branson has a very visceral reaction when he talks about the war room and he refers to the carbon war room. He's talking about how the biggest problem humanity faces, our World War II of today is carbon emissions. As you know island nations will be disappearing if we don't take action fast. It is a serious dilemma. The name is unfortunate. I feel like it's pretty male myself when I hear it. So I didn't name it. Back a year ago, Sir Richard Branson decided to launch this new non-profit and he invited cities that might want to participate. We filled out an application and we were invited as well as Berkley California, Boston and I don't have them all but it think if you got to his website you can find it. Copenhagen, Birmingham UK, Atlanta, Fayetteville Arkansas. Some pretty big players. So Burlington is definitely the small fish in the pond. He put out this Green capital challenge. He said 'Alright folks. We've got some people with some money and you've got the ideas so I'm challenging you to get together and think of ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Lockheed Martin Energy Efficiency team was one of the groups that was there. As it so happens I struck up a conversation with Sam Yakulis or I think it was Jim Poulos who was there from Lockheed. I think there were maybe two Lockheed folks in addition to the other partners from other cities. I think there were probably about 60 there. I said you know, we have this Green Climate Action plan with some great ideas, but we have no money. I wonder if you guys would be interested in helping us recraft it in such a way that a financier would actually want to fund some of this stuff. That's how the conversation started. Then when we got back to Burlington we followed up. Just about that time Lockheed Martin had joined the Clinton Global Initiative. I don't know if you're familiar with that but this is President Clinton's idea to bring together big players and make them commit to making positive change. Lockheed Martin said, alright, we're signing on to the Clinton Global Initiative, we promise to work with cities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. They are very eager. They have this commitment to former President Clinton to take some action. In June, 3 or 4 folks from Lockheed came along with some of their partners. Two people from MIT as well as some members of the neutral group, which is an engineering firm also, working on carbon reduction. We had a talk and we showed them around town. At that point because they were eager to show that they were making progress on their Clinton Global Initiative they drafted some ideas on things they want to see. I should tell you on a personal note, just to make it clear to everyone, some of you may have heard story about 6 or 8

years ago General Dynamic was handing out books with their stamp in it. This was for the RIF Program, Reading is Fundamental. Many of us, I have children in the public schools, and my husband is a Burlington Public School teacher said no. That said, if you want to give selfishly, if you want to give us the books, I'll take the books. Indeed, the program changed, they gave us the books without stamps. We had to make a lot of noise. Sort of thanks, but no thanks. It didn't seem fair not to take the books because there were enough kids who don't have access to free books like the cadre of children in our public schools that do. That said, I am happy to say that I stood against General Dynamics and said we'll take the books but I don't want your stamps. For those of you who have taken Stephanie Kaza's class, we talk a lot about consumption and materialism. There's a really wonderful movie by Juliette Shore who is a Harvard Economist on the commercialization of children. It's very stressing with 3000 ads a day, the whole bit. This was a really important issue for me. Here we are, it's February and back in December Mayor Kiss signed this letter of cooperation. I have copies if haven't seen it. It basically says let's talk. Mayor Kiss is incredibly passionate about this issue, which is interesting because it's probably the issue that he's most articulate about. I remember that during an AARP debate when people were asked about what Burlington's biggest challenges were and we had people talking about jobs and people talking about healthcare and his thing was climate change, which is kind of unusual, really. That said, he's very committed to reducing our city's greenhouse gas emissions and is willing to talk to the Energy Services group. In terms of what a relationship would possibly look like, they are developing technologies that we could test in our cities for free that they could then take to other cities and make a profit it on. Wind, for those of you that have studied environmental science, here in Burlington, despite the lake, wind is not really a viable resource for us, the traditional windmill. There is a windmill that spins like this, it's kind of looks like a bottle brush, tiny little blades on a strip and people are interested in learning more about these windmills and trying them out. Personally, I'm curious about how something like that might work and how we could test that on the municipal level. I also know that having worked on the Climate Action Plan with Sandrine that one of the main projects is making our public buildings, our government buildings, more energy efficient. Burlington is a beautiful place and I love our housing stock. Our buildings are old and incredibly leaky and if we can put solar panels on our government buildings, I think that would be a great project to test. The interesting thing about solar is you can't just put it on any roof, you have to be very strategic about where it goes. One potential study would be 'Why would you do this roof versus this roof? Why would you have it face North versus South? Is there a height thing? Does it matter if you are closer to the lake or far away from the lake?' So these are all really interesting research questions that I think people are interested in learning about.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:47.42)

Chair Filstein: What are your thoughts about this issue in last night's City Council meeting and the immense outcry about it and the resolution that City Council passed?

Jennifer Green: I think there is no one, again, that would say that Lockheed is a good company. I think that may of us understood where the citizens who spoke last night were coming from. That said, I also think it's one thing to say no but I think it's important also to come up with other good ideas and while we have many resources here in Burlington we want to support local business but we don't have the muscle to put on solar panels on government buildings, for example.

Nate: Hi, Jennifer, it's great to see you again after taking your class a couple years ago. I have a few things to point out. I've actually looked over the Climate Action Plan and I think it's really interesting that the one solution suggested by the plan is the single most greatest impact in reducing our emissions is also the one with minimal cost and that to use the quote that you said 'it takes more than just changing a light bulb' it does require a paradigm shift and cutting down on vehicle mile travel is rough but I think if there is any city that can do it would be Burlington and I don't really see the need in hiring outside contractors, especially one, in light of taking environmental consumerism, one of the most consumptive entities in the continent, let alone the world.

Jennifer Green: What Nate's referring to is one of the main recommendations in the Climate Plan is to reduce single occupancy vehicles. Yes, that's a key element and we all need to work together on that. As you know in talking about a challenge we face in our community, in terms of building up and boosting our public transportation network. Despite the fact that we sprawl we don't have the density we need to make it cost effective, this is a challenge for all of us. How are we going to address our transportation issues in the future because that is, as Nate points out, the biggest single source of GHG. I just want to make a quick clarification. The hope, as I mentioned, is that Lockheed would test technologies here. Imagine if there was a new solar panel that we wanted to test out, using that as a hypothetical example. We would be able to hire a local company that would be responsible for putting it up, maintain it, keeping it, maintaining it, noting the analytical data, etc. We wouldn't be hiring Lockheed, so I think that might be a misperception. We're not talking about bringing Lockheed in and hiring them. We have an amazing cadre of local resources here that can put up solar panels. Our G system is one player. I know you're all familiar with Efficiency Vermont and the Vermont Energy Investment Corporation, amazing partners. Imagine if this windmill was given to us. We would be able to use with Springhill to track that data and monitor progress on the windmill. I should say I'm really proud that Springhill Solutions, this group has been meeting with MIT and the Carbon Neutral Group. When they came in June Springhill Solutions joined us. It's tough to make a buck in Vermont and they're really excited about the prospect about being able to do some of this work in town. Just a clarification, we're not hiring Lockheed. We want to test out some energy technologies here that can then be utilized in other cities.

Senator Bennington: Thanks for coming in, it's great to hear from you. You got a longer time than you did last night. That's really good. I guess going off that idea of using local companies, I've read the letter of cooperation a couple of times and it's very possible that I missed this, but has there been discussion in how it's been publicized that there are going to be assurances set up that local companies are involved and it's not just going to be Lockheed coming in and doing these projects for us and [inaudible].

Jennifer Green: Yeah, I think that's a great question and that's why these public dialogues are so important. That would be imperative. You being involved is really key in making sure that you hold our feet to the first and ensure that local companies are brought in. That said, again Springhill, **VPIC**, these folks are talking to the energy services folks because they really want to get in on it. I see a very exciting possible synergy. Again, because this is there is no money exchange, we haven't signed anything that commits us to anything. That would be a really important stipulation in Emma's resolution last night. That's the kind of thing that she would want to hear and I applaud you for bringing that up.

Senator Bennington: Can you speak to what you just mentioned, Emma's resolution, and how you see that impacting this process now with things like setting up standards?

Jennifer Green: I don't honestly know. Ken Schatz who is the city attorney was the one who drafted the, I guess the letter was drafted cooperatively between the energy services folks and the city and Ken did all the legalese on it. I don't really know other than I think it's an opportunity to have a community discussion about who we're going to invite to work with and who we're not. It brings up a really interesting sort of quagmire for us. I think it will peel back the onion and really make us see how tied in we are to what some might think are some pretty nefarious businesses and profiteers. I think the resolution is an opportunity to for us to think as a community where we stand and ask ourselves some really hard questions. I took a tour of IBM the other day for work to see, we have a Green team in the city that works on reducing waste, for example we compost in all the city buildings which seems like it should be easy job but I tell you that was like moving a house. We have this green team does things like that. I lost my train of thought. I went to IBM because they also have a green team and we were curious about what we can do. I didn't realize that IBM has contracts with DOD. So this is a pretty insipid, we're tied in everywhere. I understand that Mark Santos funded one of the UVM barns.

Senator Tepper: Hi, thanks for coming in. I was just wondering, you said something about funding for research before stuff goes into the city like solar panels and turbines and stuff. I was just wondering if there were any opportunities to partner with the university. I'm an Environmental Studies major and I have a lot of peers looking for internships and stuff like that and it seems like a good mutually beneficial opportunity.

Jennifer Green: In general terms, you're asking about is there a partnership opportunity and is UVM plugged in?

Senator Tepper: Also just, would that help decrease the need for lost of funding because you don't have to pay students who intern if it's for school?

Jennifer Green: Using student labor to help out? Sure. One thing we are doing with UVM is working with the Transportation Research Center. As you know, TRC hosts that Clean City Coalition which is a Federal project. They're funded by the Clean City Coalition up at TRC. They have a chunk of change to do what they call eco driving. This is working with businesses and municipalities to help them reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by helping them work more efficiently. They will need some of these trainings. It just so happens that one of these partners is the Carbon Neutral Group has worked with DHL. DHL as you know with delivering packages. One of their biggest overhead costs is gasoline and one of their biggest emitters, if you look at their carbon footprint is from gasoline consumption. They worked with DHL on how to minimize fuel usage in their vehicles. One of the things that they have realized is if they eliminate left turns and only do right turns, DHL can make a significant amount of savings on their gasoline consumption. That's a round about answer to yes, I think we really need to plug into UVM. TRC is one way. I personally work very closely with Gioia Thompson. We talk all the time and we're hooked in together. In general terms.

Chair Simmons: Thank you for coming in. You mentioned before that no contracts have really been signed yet and no money has been exchanged. If you were to speculate on what kinds of funds would be coming from the city and to the city, who is going to be spending that money and what the likelihood of it being Lockheed Martin engineering some of these projects versus local companies?

Jennifer Green: The letter of cooperation is very vague. It basically said let's talk. There hasn't been any conversation, as far as I know, about any exchange of funds. Again, the model would be that Lockheed Martin has this energy services division with technologies they want to test in Burlington and those ideally would be spun out to other cities where they could start to make some money. I'm not aware, there has not been any talk about exchange of money. At this point what I'm interested in is technical resources. For example, MIT and Energy Services folks have been working together on some climate adaptation modeling. They've put me in touch with MIT and University of Maryland. What I'd really like is for them to help me work on an adaptation plan, so money has not come up yet.

Chair Simmons: Sorry, just to clarify, Lockheed Martin, these technologies that they've developed, they'd just be giving it to the city of Burlington in order to test how it's going to work out?

Jennifer Green: That is how the conversation has been. They understand there's a 20% return on energy efficiency and EERE the hope would be that they could try some of these technologies out here. Forget the fact that it's Lockheed. There's this company that sees Burlington as a potential place to make this happen, it's small, 38,000 people. We already have a very green conscientiousness. We have been doing climate planning before most others cities in the nation. A company sees Burlington as a place to really hit the ground running to try some of these things out.

Nancy Welch: Actually, I would like to turn things over first to one of the CCTA drivers.

Bus Driver Scott: it sounds like you guys have talked about us a little bit already and we're talking a well. I don't know if you've heard about our rally this Sunday. If you all have time to take an hour out of your day, we're going to be meeting at noon down at city hall. It should last just about an hour, half-hour. It's morphed into this huge multi labor talking about how we can get back at the man. We definitely have some directives and things that we need to address. I'm dead tired right now. I just worked 12 hours and if I was forced to work right now, which is possible, that would not be a safe situation, however, my hands are tied. If I said no they'll discipline me. We want to change things like that where that won't be on my head but it will be on the company's head in terms of getting people home safe. I don't know if any of you use the bus, you probably have to. We want to put our best foot forward and by doing that is not being drowsy. Not driving up and down streets when it's slushy as it was today. A lot of stress is going on with a lot of drivers right now. Having the ability down at City Hall to get people educated about what our big push is. We would definitely appreciate your support on that. I guess the Old business was past resolution in helping this. that's one thing that we have gotten very easily from a lot of groups around state is their support. I think it's because they realize what's at stake, and there's a lot at stake.

Nancy Welch: I just want to say in terms of why it is that I have been supporting the drivers and hope to see the Student Government Association support the drivers is that I think that many of us are drawn to the University of Vermont because of the values of the region and the idea of being a model for the rest of the country. From the creation of green jobs to single payer healthcare, I hope saying no to a green washing partnership with Lockheed Martin and instead putting energy into making our public transportation system a model for the rest of the country, especially for regions like ours. The thing is with a change of just 10 sentences in the current contract for the CCTA drivers, we could have a model contract, a model public transportation system for the region. One that is good for the environment, one that is reliable, one that is safe for passengers, and one that treats its drivers humanely. By ending these 12 hours shift with forced overtime added onto the end so that sometimes you can literally have a driver behind the wheel at 10pm who first clocked into work at 5am that morning. CCTA management instead of putting their resources and their ingenuity into how to create decent schedules for drivers that don't have these split shifts, forced overtime, and 12+ hours days. Instead they're putting all their resources into GPS tracking, computer systems and so forth. Technology has its place, but this is a human business. It's humans riding the bus, it's human beings behind the wheel of the bus and we need to listen to the drivers on this. This isn't about wages, it's about safety and listening to the drivers ideas about what could create better, safer schedules. In terms of why it is that we at UVM should support the drivers with this resolution and support them by coming out to the rally on Sunday, I think it's just what's on the poster and what you all asked when Scott asked do you all ride the bus, we're on this bus together. It will make a very big difference for the drivers, for their families, for the CCTA board of commissioners, the more people who come out to say we want our region to be a model for public transportation and we believe that begins by looking at those 10 sentences in the contract and putting safety and humane treatment of the workers up front. I think that's what we'll have. Please do vote yes tonight and please do come out on Sunday if you can.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:06.33)

Chair Filstein: I was hoping that you can give a plug for the UA kickoff tomorrow

Nancy Welch: I can do that too in that in addition tomorrow United Academics is holding a press conference at 12:00 noon in the Silver Maple Ballroom. The basic theme of the press conference is to put the money where the students are and stop shortchanging academics. You may not realize but between 2005 and today UVM's budget has actually grown by more than 40%, the operating budget, but the share of that budget for academics has shrunk to less than 48%. When

you spend less than 48% of your operating budget on academics at a university, that means not enough teachers, bigger classes, being shut out of courses, things that I think a lot of students have been experiencing. As United Academics and faculty go into contract negotiations, our issues are this time, just as the driver's issues aren't wages, our issues aren't wages, it's we need more teachers. We need UVM to hire more teachers. That's our message tomorrow so come out if you can.

Josh Benes, Former SGA Senator (1:07.52)

Josh Benes: I see a couple new faces out there. Yes, I was on Student Government for a year and a half. For those of you that don't know me, I'm Joshua Benes. I have a couple of things I just wanted to talk about beforehand. First and foremost is use the center of this room. So many uses for the center of this room and you can really use it very well. I didn't notice that until the very end. Also, the Collaborative Campus Conference. Something that sort of spewed in my head right before I resigned, actually, was to bring students from all around campus. Student leaders all around campus, senators, heads of clubs, any student that wants to make a change at all at the university, and bring them all into one room and just tear apart the Student Vision. Look at the various sections. Those of you who haven't looked at the Student Vision before, it's all broken into sections. Academics, Student Representation, our relationship with the state, diversity, etc. I think it would be really cool if we have everybody break off into different sections of the room and have everyone looking into different sections of the student vision and looking at it and seeing what needs to be changed and then collaborating at the end and working together. If any senators are willing to take that up, I'm willing to help them out. The process can be as big or as small as we want, really. As long as we get a room, a time, a date and start a movement and get people going. That would be cool. Also. It says on the student vision "Vision without action is merely a dream. Action without vision passes time. Vision with action can change the world" I think it's really important that we do something like that. Also, something that was brewing in my head over winter break, having the SGA have the ability to have shared information. We always come up with different things, different ideas during the course of coming up with new idea or something to work towards writing a resolution or something, but sometimes you get halfway on a resolution or something and you think I really want this information to stay with the Student Government. How can I keep this information going because I'm not going to be a senator after so and so date. I think it would be really cool if some of you would start some type of document where it would just be compiled on the webpage or whatnot about research student that Student Government is doing. Just a little idea that I had. Also, I'm still representing the Clean Energy fund for Student Government and the Landscape Advisory Committee. For those of you who don't know, the Clean Energy Fund was created in September 2009 and \$10 of the student comprehensive fee each semester goes towards this funds to fund renewable energy projects throughout campus. It contains 5 undergraduate students, 2 graduate students, 2 UVM staff members and 2 faculty members. We all work under the Office of Sustainability. Money has gone to educational programs, feasibility studies, a virtual solar carport, small grid research of solar tractors at the forest research site. They just built them now. We're working on solar systems at the equine center and the University Wide Energy Display System so we can look at a big screen and see this building is using this much energy and this building is using that much energy and have a good idea about where we can start working towards. We're also planning on looking at the entire campus and seeing how we can look at individual sections and do a whole feasibility study of the whole campus and see where's best to put solar, wind, and what not. One of the ideas is at the UVM Greenhouse and that's one of the things we're talking about right now. If any of you have any questions or anything about the Clean Energy Fund, please shoot them my way. There is an outcry for some type of money going towards green projects at UVM. Having a UVM Compost facility, removing invasive species around campus. There are so many other green projects that the Clean Energy Fund is not focusing on and broadening the fund would actually, I feel, kind of disarray the fund in a way that would create less focus. It's such a brand new fund, it's still developing and I think would hinder it. If some of you were up to it, I would work with you guys on this too, kind of creating some kind of system where we can take away a dollar or two from the fund and position it towards a new fund that can go toward green projects such as

that, that would be great. If anyone has any ideas let me know. My email address is jbenes@uvm.edu. I'm willing to help you guys out in any way. 2 quick things. I just want to talk about time. Because I've noticed that Student Government time has been going up like this since I was a senator a year and half. I would maybe suggest if possible when asking questions or something like that if only 3 or 4 of you and you know the 3 or 4 of you would benefit from that question maybe ask the question afterward or in email or something like that. Just an idea because I've noticed that time has really started to increase. Last couple things I want to touch on. It's great for all of you what you're doing for the university and for everyone. Please do what is expected of you. Please forgive others and be sympathetic. Please work with each other and please use your time to do what is best for the students you are representing. If you have questions email me but if it's a big question for the whole group let me know.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:14.48)

Chair Monteforte: Are you aware that 4 other PR members that you used to be on are here in this room? Myself, Rifken, [inaudible].

Josh Benes: yes, exactly.

Jonathan Leavitt (1:15.25)

Jonathan Leavitt: So I spoke before the Senate last week so I'll try not to be too long winded, but at the same time, I didn't see too many of your faces in City Council last night and the City Council meeting went late into the night from 7:00 at night until the wee hours of the morning. Much of it had to do with Lockheed Martin and the resolution that did pass is very similar to the one that Senator Bennington is offering before you tonight. I'd like to agree with Jennifer. Lockheed is a terrible company. It's one of the worst in the world. I think it's really important to be clear though. Springhill Solutions doesn't employ anyone anymore. It's one person, he doesn't even have an office. One of my friends was laid off by them. The District Energy Project, one of the people that's been working on this for decades is completely opposed to the Lockheed deal, so when we're talking about piping heat from the woodchip plant in the Intervale into 2,000-4,000 homes in the Old North End and towards downtown, some of the people who have designed that and seen it every step of the way are totally opposed to the Lockheed deal for all the same reasons that 85-100 people turned out to City Council to oppose the Lockheed deal last night. This is the same reason that City Council in Burlington last night actually voted to oppose the Lockheed deal and nearly voted to end the Lockheed deal and almost voting to completely end the Lockheed deal, voting 7-7. Albeit it would only symbolic but it would obviously but the breaks on considerable. That all was somehow absent from Jennifer's comments, but I'm sure pressed for time it got cut. Further, I think it's really important when we're talking about Richard Branson, if wants to limit carbon being entered into the atmosphere, maybe he should start with his for profit space tourism that he sells for 200,000 a ticket. It's called Virgin Galactic. It's part of his corporate family. It's totally unnecessary. If he thinks he's going to come to Burlington, Vermont and put his brand on all of these solutions which according to Bob Kiss' own Progressive Party, the mayor of Burlington, is taking the good name of 20-30 years of climate solutions in Burlington and spinning them into so much gold for Lockheed. If Richard Branson is really serious about that, perhaps he should start with his own house. Perhaps Lockheed should start with their own house and get that in order. According to the BBC, the U.S. military is the #1 purchaser of oil in the world. It comes in the top 20 just in front of Australia. If what they're going to do in Burlington somehow obviates all of that catastrophic damage that they're doing, then let's talk, but somehow I don't think it's going to. I also have a copy of the letter of cooperation and it mentions specifically an elementary school in the Old North End in the last sentence. I don't know about you, but I'm not sure how 1st through 5th graders, the students at Lawrence Barnes Academy figure into the largest War Profiteer for the plant. I used to work for that school. I saw every day that General Dynamics came in, as Jennifer said, I saw educational outcomes be for corporate PR. I saw outcomes change for the worse and curriculum in an already failing school dishelved so that war profiteers could clean up its image. Administrators silenced

good teachers and good teachers silenced children and their concerns around this strangest of bedfellow. How that fits into Lockheed's profit margins, I have no idea. I think to enter into these sorts of agreements with no community standards, with zero standards whatsoever for partnering with it. Would you enter into an agreement with a city with no standards? Think about that. That's why the city voted to stop this deal last night. That's why it's voted to not move forward with it unless there is increased transparency, unless there are community standards. I see so many similarities between that resolution and the one that Senator Bennington is offering tonight that I would urge you to pass it overwhelmingly as well. As Representative Pearson was saying earlier, much the same way that the corporate-person resolution won't change anything in Montpelier, maybe this only is a symbolic resolution, but it's a real opportunity for the University of Vermont to play the historical role that it's often played in helping to lead a state, in helping to lead a nation. Just as Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis used to say, states are the laboratories of democracy. You all can help be the laboratories for democracy for Vermont. I'd like to close tonight with a little letter that the head of a local climate change for profit, Jeffrey Frost wrote opposing the Lockheed deal. The company's name is AgRefresh and the title is "Thought on Burlington and the Lockheed Mismatch". "Mayor Kiss, Council Members," this was addressed to the City Council last night, "friends and fellow citizens of Burlington, for the past dozen years my work has been directed towards the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and the fight against the impending calamities of climate change. During those years I've met and worked worldwide with literally thousands of smart, committed people from all walks of life, but have never observed Lockheed or its people taking a leadership role in climate change. On the other hand, dozens of Vermonters from a cadre of companies, small and large, have been playing leadership roles around the U.S. and the globe, have been working diligently on a variety of powerful visions, which criss-cross the spectrum. Like greenhouse gas reductions, renewable energy technologies and production of bio energy systems, energy efficiency, sustainable agriculture and forestry, local organic food supplies, district energy systems, healthful eating. And if you can see where Lockheed fits within that incredible Burlington, Vermont stew, wonderful. Determination, which I feebly attempt to capture in the short paragraph above, just speak up and welcome them to town to take our lives and our ways and passion and authenticity to camouflage their war machine. If you do not see Lockheed fit the Burlington mold, then I hope you will join me in asking that we terminate, disown, disavow, and aggregate the letter of collaboration. Respectfully, Jeffrey Frost."

Jennifer Green, Mayor's Office (1:23.05)

Jennifer Green: Unfortunately, Jon, I so appreciate his passion, I really do. We keep hearing this reference to a deal. There hasn't been a deal struck. There was letter of cooperation signed and I welcome you to look at it. The resolution was passed to create community standards. Emma Mulvaney-Stanak said in last night's meeting she's not against Lockheed Martin. She said that last night. What she is interested in is she wants us to ask ourselves what kind of standards we are going to lay down if we work with Lockheed Martin or any other company. She said I am not against Lockheed Martin. There is some erroneous information. Again, there is no partnership. We haven't talked about money. Lockheed Martin is a huge company with 140,000 people. They have an energy efficiency division that is interested in testing technologies here and then taking them on the road to bigger cities. Just a point of note, I'm not here to defend Sir Richard Branson but I will tell you his rocket Galactica burns hydrogen so it's water. Just a point of clarification there. I am sorry I have to go. I encourage you, if you have any questions please email me at jgreen@ci.burlington.vt.us. I'm happy to answer any questions you have. Let me just leave with my vision for the future is that companies like Lockheed don't need to survive making bombs anymore. My vision is a Lockheed Martin that says we're not creating those anymore. We're using our resources and our technical expertise to create energy efficiency and renewable energy. That is my vision for the future. We have a choice. We can pass it aside or we can say we're all in this together, we need all hands on deck. This is the issue of our time. So there are two ways to look at it. We can say no completely. We can look at this resolution which I think is a wonderful foundation for asking ourselves who we want to partner with and how. We can consider, if we look at this energy efficiency team, what do we want from them? So anyway, there is no deal, I

just want to make that clear to everyone, there is nothing signed, there is no money exchanged. Again, please call me if need, you have my email.

Jonathan Leavitt (1:26.01)

Jonathan Leavitt: So very, very briefly if Emma Mulvaney-Stanak who is a close friend of mine wants this partnership with Lockheed, I'm not quite sure why she voted to end the partnership with Lockheed last night, because that's what she did. You can look it up at CCTV.org and watch her do that on your internet as soon as you leave this room, or maybe if you have a cell phone you could do it right now. Those are the facts. There was an amended resolution last night, she offered the resolution, and she was one of the 7 councilors, I could give you all of their names if you want to sit down with me afterwards, who voted to end the letter of cooperation with Lockheed Martin. So unfortunately, Ms. Green is mistaken. If you'd like to see me and get involved in organizing to stop the letter of cooperation or whatever semantic difference you want to pick between deal and letter of cooperation, please see me afterwards. I'll help you get involved.

Amanda Calder (1:27.22)

Amanda Calder: I'm Amanda Calder, I'm a member of the community. I wanted to talk about climate change in general from some of the stuff that Jennifer Green put out there about how do we actually solve this problem. Basically, this is like having Philip Morris come in to try to teach kids about how to not take up smoking. This is one of the biggest polluters in the world, this is not who we want to have involved in climate change stuff. Companies do stuff like this so they can say they're part of the solution, not part of the problem. They only do projects like this if they think it will help their bottom line. The projects they do would not be without their name on it. They're not going to do projects in Burlington and say ok, we'll help them out but not without that mark on it. They are going to want to have their name on it and take credit for the stuff that they're doing here. It will basically make Burlington a Lockheed advertisement [inaudible] Lockheed solar panels and so forth. What I want to talk about big picture, there is a big fight globally about how climate change is addressed between corporations who have a big interest who want to keep business as usual totally uninterrupted. They want to keep coal, and oil, and nuclear energy as how we get our energy. They want to have unending wars for oil, they want to keep the economy controlled by corporations whose only concern is making money. These people are fighting against any meaningful climate treaties and they've been very busy figuring out how divert resources and energy into false solutions so corporations can make money on them but don't actually stop climate change. That's one side of the fight. The other side is the people of the world, all over the world who are fighting against these false solutions and fighting to keep corporations from taking over their forests for so called carbon credits, who are fighting against Biodiesel companies who are burning the forests in Indonesia so they can plant palm plantations to make Biodiesel to sell in the U.S. There's a ton of these false solutions and one of the main ones is corporate polluters doing green washing. People like Lockheed Martin, basically the upshot of what this deal would do is to help Lockheed Martin grow their involvement in the renewable energy sector. That is basically what this would help happen. The carbon emissions that would be reduced by doing are so small in the large scale and this is one of the worst companies in the whole world make whose basic role in the world is to make bombs and to make guns that are used to repress people and kill people in Iraq and Afghanistan. I think they built Abu Ghraib, that's one of the things I read about in researching this. These are not people that have any interest in actually challenging the status quo. That's basically what this would help do is to have Lockheed Martin be in control with the renewable energy sector. Like so many other parts of the economy that this huge corporation now has their hands in. Other things are processing the census, questionnaires to the IRS to everything. What we really need is to have a publically funded and controlled program to invest in energy efficiency and to have climate treaties. There is no shortcut to solve global warming. There is no quick fix. This is a big systemic problem and Lockheed Martin and people like that who are doing these green washing things are the main people who are keeping the system going the way its going. We need a publically funded program. Yes, there's not a lot of resources in the City of Burlington, that's not

by accident, it's because the money is going to companies like Lockheed Martin. We need a movement to actually demand these things and if the city wants to put pressure on the state, put pressure on the federal government, to put more resources into this stuff, that would actually be progressive. I wish that the original language in the resolution had been kept in about opposing the Lockheed deal and if people want to add it back that would be great. Students at UVM really matter in the world and in terms of what SGA does and in Burlington. I think this is a larger conversation that, at UVM we keep holding environmental events and we keep talking about this stuff, but the movement for climate justice is really where we need to go, not anything that involves Lockheed Martin or helps them get what they want.

David Ross (1:31.55)

David Ross: The man who got involved the last time I spoke because I really pulled some punches, I'm a pretty gentle person in most cases. There were a few little things I want to get out, I'm going to sling them and get out of here, I'm tired. I know Amanda and I probably put in about 60 hours this week with the stuff that's been going on. Jonathan, I guarantee that man's probably put in 80 hours. We don't get paid for this, we don't get paid to come do dog and pony shows for you guys. We're here because of what we believe in and you have to make the decision. Your future, we're here. I'm the dirty old dude, I ain't going to be around too long. One thing that came up was an argument about the airplane being a first strike weapon. I emailed a list of YouTube videos to make it real easy for you, some more technical stuff for you. The YouTube stuff, I think I gave him like 5 things. I don't know if you bothered to watch it. If you watched it, the one I had on the top was made by the Air Force and talking about real clear, it is an attack aircraft. It is a deep penetration, first strike aircraft that they won't even know hits them until all that's left left is hair, teeth, and eyeballs. I want to tell you about a wonderful movie starring Tony Randall, it's called *Circus of Doctor Lao*. This man comes into town and the town is struggling. It's having trouble. He makes them all sorts of incredible promises about wonderful things that will happen. All they have to do is go along with the flow, sell out to him. Actually he's the devil. They're making a bargain with the devil, they're going to get a lot of wonderful stuff but they didn't look at the contract carefully. I would caution people to be very careful to look at any contracts that they do with Lockheed. I'm not going to go over about their sexual exploitation, their age exploitation, their racism, it's all documented. Another thing that came up that, I guess someone sort of sniggered a little bit about being a military expert, which I don't claim to be. I will tell you, if you go David Ross on facebook, you will find that it's authored by me and posted there, you will find a disposition of every battleship, destroyer, and aircraft carrier this country owns. You will also find their state of readiness. I can show you how to disassemble and reassemble every basic infantry weapon. I can call in an air strike, I know how to do that. I'll tell you, maybe I'm more of an expert on this stuff than the people in the military. I'll guarantee that if I promised to build an airplane for somebody I wouldn't charge them 2.5 times as much. Maybe there aren't any military experts. What I mostly know about the military is what I saw from being in it. What I know from being in the military, which is something, I don't really care to talk about a whole lot, is what really happens. What you guys see in these combat movies is a joke. A friend of mine saw a *Platoon* and he said, Hey Dave, is that what it was like? Did you smell the hair burning? Did you hear the kid screaming as he collapsed during the [inaudible] M113 track, completely on fire, just screaming until he carboned up and went into that amazing twist? I asked him if he smelled all the piss and shit that's all over the place. No, never. People shit and piss all over the place. Arms and legs all over the place. I don't care if they're American lives any more than I care if they're Arab lives. I don't care if they're white, black, yellow, green, or purple. They're people. They live and love and grow and die just like we do. The racism in this country is another thing that I'm absolutely outraged about. The Vietnamese civilization is why I majored here in anthropology. I didn't get how we don't get it. When I went to Vietnam as a kid from South Burlington, I looked at Vietnamese culture and it made perfect sense to me. I worked with the Vietnamese. A lot of what I did was out in small villages with a doctor doing medicine. Those people are no different. I'll tell you something. I've seen airstrikes, I've seen napalm dropped, I've seen cluster bombs and I've gone into villages afterwards. You almost never find an actual weapon that belongs to a real adversary soldier. What you mostly find is a slaughter of

old women, children, babies. I've had to walk away from screaming dying kids because there wasn't time for me to do my medic crap on them. You get one vision of the military from your stuff on TV and the movies and all this crap on TV, our heroes. Once and a while you'll get someone honest like me or you'll get someone like John [inaudible] who talked down in Burlington last night. We'll tell you what war is. War is socially sanctioned technologically enhanced mass killing of human beings for political purpose, which is to make money. That's what we do because we're an empire. We make war, we're a war economy and right at the top of that pyramid is Lockheed Martin and your decision is whether you're going to find ways to feed world and save the world, or you're going to blow the crap out of it so you can take stuff away from people that don't even have [inaudible], they travel on donkeys and camels. If you want to support your living this way, you want to leave this kind for world for your kids. Lockheed is a corporation. We cannot separate the good part of that corporation from the bad part of the corporation. It's a business, it's like a person like. It's like the wisdom of Solomon, you can't cut the damn thing in half, you live with it. It's your decision if you want to live with that or if you want blood on your hands. I'm not here angry at you, I'm angry at situation I've been dealing with for 40 years.

Old Business (1:39.06)

Resolution Calling for Full Transparency from the Mayor of Burlington Regarding Lockheed Martin Partnerships (1:39.38)

Senator Bennington: I'm going to read it again because there are some changes [inaudible] coming in last minute so there are a few that I'm not sure if sent out. [*Reads resolution*]. So I'm going to try to speak real quick. I know this resolution is a lot different, I'm going to use the middle of the room, Josh, because it is a lot nicer, the resolution is a lot different. I tried to address a lot of concerns that were raised last week and I've put a lot of time and thought into this. I really appreciate all your concerns. First, I want to clarify some issues of contention that came up last week, maybe outline the resolution as it pertains to recently discovered information. Regarding standards for contractors, I referred to the Burlington ordinance. It's on municode.com. The citation is in the resolution, you can check it out. We do have standards for who we contract with, so it just makes sense that we adopt those standards for companies when we're not giving them money but we're working with them. What this resolution is calling for is the creation and adoption of a similar policy regarding partnerships. The Mayor's notion in a recent memo that he sent to the City Council that adopting standards like this would invite paralysis to city business is just absurd because we already have those standards. There have been suggestions that barring companies participating in immoral activities from partnerships is unwise and leave us working alone. To address those concerns, I point to the University of Vermont Board of Trustees Socially Responsible Investment Working group. In April 2009, the board adopted a recommendation of this group to divest from companies involved in the manufacture of cluster bombs and depleted uranium munitions. I'm not trying to get into a weapons debate here, it's kind of beside the point of what this resolution stands for here and now. However, while it is quite difficult to track the university's financial investments, the consensus of the students involved in pushing this policy through, which is Students Against War, is that Lockheed Martin is on the top of their list for companies that the university was invested from that were implicated in the manufacture of cluster bombs and depleted uranium munitions. As of September of 2010, the university no longer has investments in Lockheed Martin. It's really hard to figure out when and why the university divested from a certain company when we have 30 managers of our investments. They change these things all the time, but they are given these policies that are adopted by the board and they do follow suit. It's pretty clear that the university is moving in a direction of who it does business with based on ethical and moral grounds and I think this body ought to follow suit. Coming out of the City Council meeting last night, they adopted the resolution that I modeled this newer resolution off of and I referred to that resolution. So, just some really inspiring things that were said last night. 86 people, I think was the count, some people are saying up to 100 people, were there. One city councilor said it was truly democracy in action, which was really inspiring to hear. There were people coming out and speaking and the

City Council actually responding to what people's concerns were. As Jonathan Leavitt said, the City Council almost voted to strike down the deal with a 7-7 split, so that's pretty significant. What we're voting on is simply a request for more transparency, an insurance of public dialogue, and moving forward in our struggle against climate change. This resolution is not suggesting that the city outright disregard corporate partners in this struggle, or any partnerships, though I would consider any friendly amendments suggesting otherwise. If there is one thing that is clear in all this public discourse I've witnessed in the past two days, it's that there is not enough information being shared about this issue, which is a concern that a lot of people brought up. In the words of Councilor Ed Adrian last night, who introduced the amendment to strike down deal the deal, "this might not be the right time to turn swords into plow shares. To truly fight climate change, we need to change our entire system, our ways of thinking, the kinds of businesses we support and the lives we live. We can't focus on producing the same amount of energy from clean sources. We must reduce the amount we use and the scale at which it is produced and distributed. These are truly complex problems. While techno fixes such as the ones being offered by Lockheed Martin are enticing and immediately gratifying, they are part of the paradigm that created this problem in the first place." As Albert Einstein said and I horribly tried to quote last week "You cannot solve a problem with the same consciousness that created it. You must learn to see the world anew." To truly stand up and serve in the war that defines our generation, which is climate change, we must envision a cultural and economic shift that is based on compassion, equity, and an understanding of cooperation with natural system. We cannot achieve these goals in a world defined with endless economic growth and consumption, the only world where Lockheed Martin knows how to survive. I'm going to end with an image I often here from ecological designers and ecological economists and students and professionals alike. I think it was first put forth by Dan Meadows who did a lot of work on systems thinking and living in Vermont. There is a bathtub that is overflowing and there is mop and a bucket in the room. The ecological engineer, the systems thinker and the really technocratic person in the room. There is going to be two different approaches to this solution. The old school industrial technocratic solution is going to be get the bucket, get the mop and start cleaning the water up. The problem is, the water is still overflowing the bathtub and still spilling onto the floor. The ecological engineer, the ecological designer is just going to turn the faucet off. That way there is no more water flowing, problem solved, cut it off at the source. I think now is the time that we need to start turning off some faucets and a time that we really need to open up public discourse and dialogue around these pressing issues of our time.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:49.08)

Senator DeVivo: I think the changes you made are awesome and I'm much happier than last week. Just a couple of things I wanted to say, more so to make sure that I'm understanding everything correctly than trying to make a statement about something. To the best of my understanding, right now we're not making any investment in Lockheed, the school or the city, and I think last week we had it saying we were a business partner, but we're really not a business partner of any sort. We're kind of taking donations, and that might be wrong too, but the socially responsible investment committee would not really make an investment in anything, especially not at the university. Another thing, with that 7-7 vote, wouldn't that technically mean that 7 people voted to keep Lockheed too? I was just curious what the vote was for.

Senator Bennington: It was to adopt an amendment so it doesn't necessarily mean that 7 people were voting to keep the deal. It was also purely symbolic. The City Council doesn't have the power to strike down a deal before it gets a contract. I brought it up because it shows that it's been a divisive issue that our City Council is divided. Much more people, I think the final vote for the resolution that did pass is 11-3 which is pretty good support. You're right, we're not business partners per se in that we're paying them for a service but we're doing business with them. WE could just call them our friends or people that we're in company with.

Chair Adams: Friendly amendment to change CEDO to whatever stands for.

Senator Ravech: I just want to clarify, the bill is asking for transparency, so I'm kind of confused as to why there's some extra information, like there's two whereases like Lockheed Martin has allegations against them of racism and things like and I'm just curious as to why that's in there because to me it just sort of seems like a jab at the company saying that the bill is not against Lockheed Martin, we're just saying we want transparency from the mayor and that just seems like a secret little jab.

Senator Bennington: I put that in there as a follow up to the 'whereas the city does have standards' unless you were referencing both of those. I don't think it's necessarily a jab as much as it is put in there to provide support that in this case when this resolution was passed that we were talking about a company that had participated in certain activities that caused citizens to raise concerns about them and it kind of puts it in context. If someone's reading this once Lockheed Martin does transform into this amazing company and only produces green energy, that someone can understand why we passed this resolution pertaining to Lockheed Martin.

Senator Ravech: I still feel a little uncomfortable with it just because we should really have transparency from the mayor on everything and we shouldn't really need a reason as to why. Even though, yeah the whereas before 'the city has standards' you know, we already know that and that doesn't really affect the transparency. I feel like it's a given.

Chair Filstein: For the one right here that says the city has standards for who it contracts, I think that's an important clause because we're calling for standards for companies that even if we're not entering in a contract or buying a product or something, we want to extend standards to any company we do business with. I think it's helpful to the argument. It's not something that everyone necessarily knows. We're saying we have these standards with companies that we link to, we want to have standards for companies that we're dealing with in general. For your friendly amendment, Amanda, we're going to take it, we just can't change it right now because its view only.

Vote on Resolution Calling for Full Transparency from the Mayor of Burlington Regarding Lockheed Martin Partnerships - passes

Resolution in support of CCTA Bus Drivers and Mechanics Receiving the Fair and Humane Contract Offer that they Deserve (1:55.15)

Chair Filstein: *[reads resolution]*. Pretty straightforward. We heard from Nancy Welch, a Faculty Union representative and professor here and we heard from a bus driver about this issue. I sent out some articles about it so if you have any questions I'd be happy to answer them.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:56.52)

Senator O'Brien: Friendly Amendment to spell out Student Government Association in last be it further resolved.

Vote on Resolution in support of CCTA Bus Drivers and Mechanics Receiving the Fair and Humane Contract Offer that they Deserve - passes

Bill Allocating Funds to Triathlon (1:57.57)

Chair Mallea: I sent this out earlier this week and I apologize that you *[inaudible]* from previous allocations and forgot to change the clubs names. Sorry, UVM Squash will not be receiving the request. I will be, as usual, able to answer questions. *[reads bill]*.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:59.45)

Senator Ballas: What was the original request?

Chair Mallea: I believe the original request was for a little over \$3,000.

Vote on Bill Allocating Funds to Triathlon – passes

Bill Recognizing UVM Rescue as Club of the Month (2:00.23)

Chair Monteforte: Howdy yo. Hopefully this is easy. [*reads bill*]. They are in good club standing, they save people, they are a good club. They provide members with a unique club experience unlike any other. Through the recommendation by the Student Activities Committee that's what we came up with this month.

Vote on Bill Recognizing UVM Rescue as Club of the Month - passes

Acting Speaker/Vice President Maciewicz: Now we're going to move on to something completely different and I'm just going to explain it very quickly. Next we're going to debate the motion introduced last week by Senator White to censure President Mensah. I sent out the hard copy of this. It's not a bill or a resolution, it is a motion, but I thought it would be important since it's a new precedence to have it in writing since it is a new precedent and I'm sure he can read it when he is yielded the floor. It requires a simple majority to pass. Like all motions, it's in the constitution. For historical perspective, it's never been used. It was created in 2009 by then Speaker Ana Dru Ellis. It's much less than impeachment in that it does not remove you from office, nor does it have any actual effect, but it is an official reprimand by the SGA towards whoever is receiving it. It will be up to you in a few minutes to vote and it does require a majority vote.

Motion to Censure President Mensah (2:02.53)

Senator M. White: Alright, hi ya'll. We've been here a while so I'll keep this super short. [*reads motion*].

Acting Speaker/ Vice President Maciewicz: As acting speaker, I talked to Speaker Chevrier today and the Constitution Committee did endorse the motion to censure which is required by the constitution, therefore it is now up to your hands to decide whether the senate will accept the recommendation of the Constitution Committee.

President Mensah: Thanks Senator White for yielding the floor. The main factor in this censure, I wrote a few things out so I wouldn't talk too much. So the main factor as to why I'm being censured is that I sent out my report two days late. That's correct, there's no denying the fact that constitutionally I'm wrong. There was a full week in the constitution that was voted on a few weeks ago in mid-November, whenever the constitutional changes happened that stipulated that I should have sent out the report Friday instead of early Monday morning when most of you were all sleeping. Before you vote on this censure, let's put some things into perspective. If I sent out my report at 11:59 pm on Friday, I would have still been in the clear constitutionally, but would anyone have had the time to read it and give feedback? Probably not, because most of you were all sleeping preparing for the Senate retreat that took up most of your days on Saturday. You would have had a little bit over a day including after you let the retreat on Saturday and all day Sunday to read the report. I apologize for taking away your day and a half to read the report but I do think that the feedback that I received from Monday through Thursday was great feedback and enriched the report. The second thing is, if I had sent the report out on Friday, you would have received a little bit more than an outline. I was waiting on information to present so I could present as close to a final draft as possible. So when I sent it out to the senate listserv, I would have received multiple emails from senators presenting feedback that would already be evident in my report. I was waiting on information from folks in Waterman about the capital oversight project and about discussions pertaining to tuition. Supporters of this censure are really interested in following the constitution to a T, my questions is, why haven't motions been brought up to

censure before? Let me just present a few examples. If you look at the constitution in terms of Committee Chairs, in section C section 5, “chairs shall be responsible that any and all resolutions and bills pertinent to their respective committee are signed and followed through.” Section C Number 7 “shall be responsible for reporting the attendance of all committee members at committee meetings and reporting it to the speaker of the senate.” How many chairs since the end of April when we took office last year when we took office have reported attendance and then turned it in to Speaker Chevrier? Section B, Number 14 of the constitution states that “the speaker is supposed to send out meeting materials at least two days before a meeting.” How many times has that clause in the constitution been violated this term? I do understand that most of the time it’s not Speaker Chevrier’s fault that she sends out the agenda and meeting materials less than 24 hours before because she’s waiting on bills and meeting materials and resolutions from chairs and from senators here but that still violates the constitution because it’s supposed to be sent out 48 hours in advance.

Chair Mallea: Point of Information: I would also just like to point out that the nature of Finance Committee, a lot of times we don’t know two days in advance if we haven’t with them. I technically should be censured as well because technically, within the constitution I don’t send forth the bill in the correct amount of time because we haven’t met with the club.

Chair Adams: Point of Information: Speaker Chevrier’s attendance policy is that you’re supposed to report if somebody is unexcused from a committee meeting.

President Mensah: Well that’s not what’s stated in the Constitution, unfortunately. Section B Number 17 of the constitution says that “the speaker is supposed to be responsible for ensuring senators to sign passed legislation within 48 hours. How many chairs here and senators here have passed a resolution and you’ve taken more than 48 hours to sign that resolution. Sometimes Speaker Chevrier has to hound you down and send you an email telling you to come in to the office and sign a resolution that was passed a few days before. To conclude, it makes no sense as to why this is the first time a motion of censure is being raised all year long, and it seems pretty hypocritical that this censure was raised in the first place and it’s also hypocritical to be in support of such a motion when there have been plenty of instances as voiced by Chair Mallea that this could have been raised, but this was clearly a failure from the supporters of this motion to do so in the past.

Senator M. White: This should never have been as big a deal as it is. This is just a quick senatorial procedure that should have been so fast. I gave props to the *Cynic* last week for being on the ball. but this week they absolutely missed the boat. This should not have been front-page news. I’m so sad that its developed into that that Representative Ram came and commented on it. That hurt because I respect the hell out of her. So, do it or not, this is quickest of issues, or it should have been.

Senator DeVivo: As a member of the Constitution Committee, I do support the censure. Just to echo the sentiments of Senator White and Senator Caster in his email this week, it was kind of embarrassing as an SGA to see everything that happened as a result of this. I know that talking to Senator White’s intention weren’t this and kind of embarrassing and taking away some of our credibility as a body and reading the article and 6,000 *Cynics* and getting to see Kofi and David’s face all day. As a point of procedure, Kofi made some really good points about how many times we violate the constitution, which is pretty much every week. I guess I would just say don’t do that, but on this particular issue since it has been brought up, constitutionally it’s our obligation to approve this censure at this point. Anyway, most of the damage has already been done.

Chair Simmons: I’d just like echo that. I’m totally with you Kofi. I’m late with things all the time, as you know too well. I hope you know that this isn’t a condemning of who you are as a person or who you are as a president either. Knowing that the Constitution Committee already voted to support this makes me feel like it’s, I agree with Senator DeVivo, it’s kind of our obligation to go along with this. I regret that it got so big as well. I think it’s just kind of a

following the lead of the Constitution Committee on this one.

Senator Caster: I guess I would like to say thank you to Kofi as well and just want to make senate aware of the precedent that we are currently setting and the precedent that we now have to follow with both of our chairs and executive board with upholding President Mensah so that we don't look like hypocrites in the future. That seems to be my main concern, is that if we do this and in the future we don't hold the same obligations we will look like hypocrites because then there will be context that we have to defend that I'm not prepared to defend.

Chair Adams: Call to question

Vote to Call to Question – passes

Vote on Motion to Censure President Mensah - passes

New Business (2:13.35)

Senator Caster: Resolution on the Instructional Capacity for the Upcoming General Education Requirements

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Resolution Calling for the University's Stance as Related to the Delta Kappa Epsilon Hazing Incident

Chair Adams: Bills of derecognition for Students Against War, Campus Progressives, Chinese Literature and Language and Vermont Campus Energy.

Emergency Business (2:14.20)

n/a

Executive Reports (2:14.27)

Acting Speaker/Vice President Maciewicz: I basically sent out everything I really wanted to say earlier today. Speaker Chevrier apologizes for being ill. I hope tonight went smoothly. Give me any feedback in case I have to do this again before the end of the year. Vice presidentially, moving along with appointments, interview this Thursday if you can make it for one seat that's open. Please promote and apply for the President Student Advisory Council. I know a lot of you are interested and a lot of you would be awesome. Fill out an application, come talk to me. I really need good people so I don't look like an idiot in front of President Fogel. So please, tell your friends, promote the hell out of it. That's it for tonight. Have a good week.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:15.20)

Chair Mallea: Hi, with the presidential advisory board, do you want, I know I'm personally really interested but I'm also graduating, and I know that the board is just starting and with less than a semester left would you encourage seniors that are graduating to apply or younger members?

Acting Speaker/Vice President Maciewicz: I would just encourage people, I think seniors would be fine. It's obviously a board that is going to have a lot of turnover because student leaders come and go. I think people who really understand the issues would be just as well served as younger students.

Senator Rifken: I was wondering if a person can't make one of the meetings would that be a problem? Because I know that there's some of those proposed meeting times on there?

Acting Speaker/Vice President Maciewicz: It's not a problem. If you were going to miss one I don't think that's a problem but if you can't make two or more I would apply but since there's only 3 for the rest of the year it would be good to keep the conversation going. I think one would be fine, especially if you could send someone in your place.

President Mensah (2:16.30): I sent out most of my report to the senate body about an hour ago. It outlines most of the things I talked about previously and more notably in there is the students success and satisfaction survey that David and I have been talking about for a couple of months and this Thursday some of the consultants are going to present, they're going to have 3 presentations and from 3-4:30 is going to be the student open presentation, so I highly encourage you all to go to that. Lastly just wanted to say that I'm slightly disappointed by the vote on the motion to censure me. I do know that it was something that was approved by the Constitution Committee, but I don't think that trying to start the precedent when you've had the opportunity to start it all semester long, because I just gave some examples as to how and why there have been multiple ways for you all to raise motions of censure for multiple parties on this body, and the failure to do that just seems really hypocritical. More so, I sometimes don't mind so much what the *Cynic* is writing it because they are student new organization and they are here to report the stories that they all deem important to the student body but you also have to realize that when a few hundred students pick up a *Cynic* Monday evening and see that the Student Government Association is censuring President Mensah for being 2 days late in his report for the board with the intentions being that he was trying to make the report to be as close to a final draft as possible to provide feedback from this body to enrich the board during Friday, it really makes them thing what are senators discussing on Tuesdays? I walked downstairs to Brennan's with Kesha Ram and funny enough, one of the cashiers at Brennan's was like 'good luck up there' and I was like 'why?' and she was like 'because clearly you're dealing with this stupid crap up there.' I was taken aback by that because not only are students paying attention to this, but they see we don't have better things to focus on. We don't have a 5.8% tuition increase that might happen last year to focus on. We don't have late night dining options to focus on, but yet we're focusing on the fact that I sent out a report that was 2 days late that was to the benefit of this body. I just think that looks bad on senate. With that, I'm actually going to veto this motion. It's not a bill and it's not a resolution but it is an act by the Senatorial body, but it is something that I can veto. Any veto will be brought up in the next week in the following meeting. If Speaker Maciewicz or Speaker Chevrier wants to bring up an emergency meeting to discuss the veto then by all means they are able to do that. If you were looking to start a precedent I think this was the wrong way to go about that. With that, I'm officially vetoing this motion.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:20.01)

Senator M. White: I'm totally in support. Do what you have to. I'm not going to bring it up again. I think Mr. Caster is totally right and so are you. I am unwilling to hold the rest of us here to the same gold standard that I was holding you because I have a lot of respect for you as president and I still do. Actions like this really [inaudible] and I'm sorry that you're going through this, but I'm not going to bring it up again.

Senator O'Brien: Hey Kofi, I was just wondering, for future experience, oh, you won't be sending out another oral report, will you? So that answers my question.

Senator Goodnow: Kofi, I just had a quick question. Just as a new senator I feel like I was put in a really interesting kind of corner here with having to pass this censure because by violating the constitution and saying that we shouldn't censure because by the word of the censure you did violate the constitution. What I'm confused about is, because I don't agree with censuring you, like what would you have had us do? I don't agree with the censure being brought up, but at the same time, sitting here in my seat, I can't sit here and vote against the constitution. I was appointed to uphold the Constitution. I really agree with the remarks that you put forth but there were some points that you made that I was put in a corner. My questions is what would you have had me do as a new senators and the precedent that I'm setting for myself in hopefully a

continued career in Student Government. If I violate the constitution now, what am I saying there?

President Mensah: If you could clarify that for me, did you violate the constitution?

Senator Goodnow: I'm sorry, I tend to get confused if I vote against following the constitution. I realize the censure is kind of ridiculous, but what would you have had us do?

President Mensah: I feel that the best course of action in a situation like this would have been for me to formally recognize that it was two days late, which I did last Tuesday, and I gave ample reasons as to why it was two days late. A) I was waiting on information. I was trying to enrich the report before I sent it out to the body. I think a formal recognition of the fact that it was two days late would have more than sufficed. This censure would be under a completely different cloud if I had sent out the report like Wednesday or Thursday, but the fact that it was over a weekend period especially given the fact that, putting into light that when I sent out my written report and you weren't an appointed senator yet, over winter break, when Senators sitting around this room had ample time to provide feedback for my report I only received 2 responses back. I know that there was no stipulation in the constitution that says senators have to give feedback to the president when they send their oral report, but I think it was a little bit disconcerting that over the longest break that I have and when I send out my written report that is going to be read about a week or two before the Board of Trustee meeting, I only received two responses back from it. So again, that urgency that I guess I should have been sensing in trying to pull together the information from the offices and send the report as fast as possible wasn't there. Unfortunately, some folks sitting here didn't set that precedent in actually giving feedback over the winter break when I sent out my report more than two weeks in advance.

Senator Rifken: I have an unrelated question about Richard Cate coming in, is that going to be postponed until next week?

President Mensah: Yes, thank you for mentioning that. Two things with Richard Cate. David and I have a meeting with him tomorrow, he's going to update us on the budget. Because of the amount on people that were coming on Public Forum tonight and I know that some of you are going to have great questions to ask him next week, I actually asked him to come Tuesday at 7:15 and he was more than happy to do that. Pre tomorrow's conversation with Richard Cate, I will most likely be creating a budget ad hoc committee and I will inform the senate about that and invite you to join the committee.

Senator O'Brien: You said you didn't have enough time to gather some of the information or it was last minute. Not to say if you were going to go back in time but if you were to start off earlier with your research, but if you were to advise the next SGA President but if you were to advise him would you recommend getting started earlier and reaching out to these offices sooner rather than later?

President Mensah: Definitely. You have to understand too, a lot of what you want to present the board with as much up to date information as possible. Sometimes you can start out a month or a few weeks in advance with your report. The written report is usually a month before the meeting takes place but with the oral you can most definitely run into glitches in trying to get the last pieces together because you want to present as much up to date information as possible. Plus there's also whoever is taking this position next year has to scan through a lot of senatorial information to present as brief but at the same time as concise a report as possible to the board.

Senator O'Brien: Is it in your opinion that the system of the 7 days doesn't work and should we change it so it is as up to date as possible?

President Mensah: Personally, I don't think that one-week stipulation should be in there. It's a presidential report. In the past as Legislator Ram mentioned a few hours ago, initially when I was

part of this body, the Board of Trustees Report, the oral and the written report, was to the discretion of the president and they invited senators to provide feedback because it's a report that is going to represent the whole body. I've never really seen a complaint or an issue in the two years that I served on this body, nor last year when I came back from study abroad. Be it as it may it was a stipulation put in the constitution by this body, but again, it's one of those technicalities that as Kesha Ram was speaking to that in some cases might do more harm than good.

Chair Adams: I really didn't want to waste a lot of time with this. I want to commend you on your written report. I didn't respond because personally I felt it was very well written and I think that's probably the sentiment of most of the people in this room. However, there were some issues in your oral report that you and I were exchanging emails about up until Thursday midnight which I was really hesitant that the report given on Friday which turned out to be different was initially not going to be consistent with things the body voted on, specifically with regards to the ALANA student center. So given that we were exchanging emails up until Thursday at midnight, 2 or 3 days I think really does make a difference.

President Mensah: To answer to that, we weren't exchanging emails up until midnight, I was sleeping at midnight on Thursday. I left office around 9 with Treasurer Salsgiver and I'm pretty sure I answered your question about the change in my report pertaining to the ALANA resolution. To clarify, Chair Adams is mentioning a part in my report that I used the word new center instead of change in facility and per receiving the new resolution from Senator Vitagliano, I changed the certain part that you had brought to my attention to change.

Senator Vitagliano: Point of Information: I think the confusion came from was that the incorrect version of the resolution was posted online. The amended version was not the one that was put online.

Chair Adams: Those were all things we were talking about Thursday night, period.

Committee Reports (2:28.51)

CODEEE (2:28.53)

Chair Herman: I emailed my report out.

Student Action (2:29.00)

Chair Simmons: email

Public Relations (2:29.08)

Chair Monteforte: I'll stand up because you're supposed to. My report has already been emailed out.

Academic Affairs (2:29.19)

Chair Filstein: Check your inbox.

Finance (2:29.30)

Chair Mallea: I emailed out my report, but I have the best committee ever because they were here all day Saturday.

Student Activities (2:29.40)

Chair Adams: I emailed out my report but I will take any questions.

COLA (2:30.01)

Chair Morgan: I emailed out my report, but it's nice to know you love me.

Senatorial Forum (2:30.16)

Senator Caster: First of all, I'd like to thank you guys for responding to the initial email I sent out in response to the *Cynic's* construction of what is a simple constitutional proceeding. I would like to say that I plan on sending that out untouched as a student, but if there is anyone here who would like to sign it and sort of reconstruct it and send it to the *Cynic* as senators as sort of our comment on both what appears to be a Constitutional proceeding and like I said 5.8% tuition increase, instructional capacity, we're trying to finance 6 million dollars, where is that going to come from? and on the front page is a picture of Kofi and David looking distressed. I just don't understand the dissonance, I don't understand why this is happening. The reason that I even care is because our efforts are delegitimized when these things go out and our cause is delegitimized when the administration reads this and says 'thank god they are worrying about censoring and not taking us seriously, so let's get our business done while they're worrying about that.' That's how it would appear to me if I were the administration. We really have to go out of our way to challenge these connotations and the things that the *Cynic* are doing to delegitimize ourselves and say, 'hey you've got a job too and we're senators and we know what we're talking about and we really need to step up to the plate on this.' I'll send my editorial as a perspective from a student, but if any of you guys want to work on that with me as a senator then please do. If they don't take it as front-page news, then we should request that Kofi sends it out in his email. We need a response to this. They embarrassed Mike, I'm sorry, I'm getting a little personal. The way they construed that was among the most inappropriate things only to be juxtaposed with famous sex spots at UVM. I just don't understand the mission statement.

Senator Bennington: Thanks for passing the resolution. I just wanted to kind of apologize. I don't want to apologize, I just want to say I feel like one of the speakers who came in might have made some people feel uncomfortable, I think that was his intent. I in no way asked anyone to come in and make anyone feel uncomfortable. I'm stoked that we can have awesome debate here. I also get really troubled when people start personally attacking each other. It's just not productive and it doesn't lead us anywhere better. I think it's really awesome that as a body in my experience we have shied away from doing things like that so that really reflects well on all of you in my book.

President Mensah: In light of all the ruckus I forgot to mention who the senator of the week is and I'd actually like to give the Senator of the week to Senator William Bennington. He's been really vocal, especially in the past few weeks about presenting his views and his opinions forth. He got multiple people to come and speak to his cause and I think sometimes that's what the senate body needs even though sometimes it means we're here for a long period of time. It also means that there are community members and constituents that we represent that are actually in support of something that we are passing here. So I don't know if you have one of these spiffy UVM scarves yet, but congrats senator of the week.

Chair Rifken: Going back a little bit, I think it's a great idea if we move on if it had to happen. I just wanted to say I was really disappointed by the *Cynic* too. I didn't actually get to read the *Cynic* article until today because it wasn't online Monday night even though I searched online really hard. I am really disappointed by that article. I think it was ridiculous. I think the whole problems that we had with that censure brought up some really good points that we really need a different subset of senate. That is something that I'm sure now that you have all seen the process and something I've seen in the past, but some sort of committee and not necessarily of senators, but different people that can do these things so that senators don't have to censure themselves or don't have to censure other people they have to work closely with because that makes things difficult. It was just an idea that I've been thinking a lot about, maybe it's something the Constitution Committee can talk about. It's just something I've thought about a really long time for a while.

Chair Adams: I just wanted to explain why I called the censure to question. I really think it is one of the least important we will do this year and I really think we just needed to vote and move on, so I vote that we as a body put this behind us and move on to bigger and better things. I think

the Lockheed Martin bill is great and I think we spent the majority of our time tonight doing the right things.

Chair Monteforte: Hello. On a separate note, as I said in my report that you will read, elections are coming up, please advertise that. Encourage them to run, know about things. Election is going to be a little bit different this year. We have improvements, it's going to be exciting. Please pay attention to updates on that and focus on that because that's going to be one of our big selling points of the year and branding ourselves and just to get people on the body that really want to be here.

Senatorial Comments/Announcements (2:36.16)

Acting Speaker/Vice President Maciewicz: Chairs, send me your voting records

Chair Monteforte: So you guessed, I'm probably going to give a comment or announcement that is something related to UPB. David Ethan tomorrow. They're actually pretty funny guys. They're talking about college dating. They're just kind of like female orgasm but funny jokes about dating. If you're not doing anything tomorrow it's right here, come see a funny show.

Senator M. White: Hey everybody. UVM month of service organizational meeting 12:00 galaxy space Sunday. Be there if you want to be part of the next UVM revolution.

Senator Tepper: This weekend is the NOFA conference at UVM and I'm really excited about it and if you can go you should. NOFA is the Northeast Organic Farmer's Association Vermont. It's really going to be fun even if you're not a farmer, into farmer. There's going to be lots of cool workshops going on. If can get to it you should. I'm not going to say you should try to sneak into it because it's a lot of money but you should go.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: I just wanted to thank everybody who baked for the bake sale and came out in support of the bake sale. We made I think after my last total I realized I suck at math, I think we made 96 something so it was extremely successful. Thank you so much for support and there will be another one on the 24th so I will be calling on all of you to bake again.

Senator Caster: Do you have any cookies left?

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: If you want food I have food left after the meeting.

Chair Adams: Fun fact picked up is that 40% of UVM students study abroad, which is really cool, and we don't do a lot with it but maybe we should. I want to commend Chair Filstein because he did a really good job as did Senator O'Brien on it.

Chair Simmons: This announcement is exclusively to females on this body. If any of you would like to play soccer with my indoor soccer team we're in a perpetual need for women on the soccer team because you have to have certain amounts of both and I'd love to invite you all to come at 10:00 tonight.

Senator Juaira: Chair Simmons or Senator White come see me after? I have some questions for one of the two of you.

Chair Filstein: Like Nancy said, the Faculty Union tomorrow is having a press conference tomorrow at noon in the Silver Maple Ballroom to talk about their concerns about the contract and they could use our support. Also the bus drivers rally this Sunday, they really need our help too.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Walk a Mile, we're getting local vendors to come up to Walk a Mile on April 9 to sell goods and give us 10-15% will be donated to the walk a mile foundation. If any

of you are in any way connected to local vendors or makes something that like to sell, jewelry, knitting of any time, anything you'd like to talk to me about selling at the event, it could be really profitable so please talk to me.

Senator O'Brien: UVM Dining Services is conducting a survey right now until the end of February and if you fill it out the University donates something to the Chittenden Food Shelf, which is pretty cool.

Senator Ravech: Point of Information: They donate 25 cents.

Roll Call (2:40.13)

Finance: Senator Tran, excused

Student Activities: All Present

COLA: All Present

CODEEE: Senator L. White, excused

Student Action: All Present

Public Relations: All Present

Academic Affairs: All Present

Adjournment

End Time: 9:39pm