SGA Minutes
October 26, 2014
As corrected

I. Attendance

All members present; proxy for Senator Fisher

II. Acceptance of Minutes

Senator Chang: Motion to strike the words “and we showed it to Ian Rhee,” in Senator Chang’s quote on page seven.
Senator Jahan: Seconded.
All aye.
Motion passes.

President Custer: Motion to add to the minutes the names of the Senators who will be in the SGA Reform Working Group: Speaker Brady, Senator Sanders, Senator Fisher, Senator Vaughan, and Senator de Toledo.
Senator Jahan: Seconded.
All aye
Motion passes.

Senator de Toledo: Motion to accept the minutes as corrected.
Senator Gerstenschlager: Seconded.
All aye
Minutes accepted.

III. Announcements

President Custer: Hope you all had a good Fall Family Weekend. Welcome to everyone who is visiting today. I will now yield my time to Senator Fisher’s Proxy.

Senator Fisher’s Proxy: I’m Stuart Warren and I have a message from Senator Fisher that he asked me to read to you.

“Friends, Guests, and Fellow Senators,

A musical spectacle to your north draws me away from campus amidst this evermore frigid weather.

I regret that I cannot attend our meeting this evening, but I am confident that my proxy, Mr. Warren, will do an outstanding job representing the students of Ross Commons. He frequently comes to Commons Council with interesting and thoughtful insights. Know that I wouldn't send just anyone to take my place amidst my hallowed peers. (Stop and smile at everyone... if you read this part out loud it will be awkward.)
I have personally discussed this evening's agenda with Proxy Warren, and he displays full competency and understanding about these pressing issues. He understands the Madisonian model of democracy we practice here. Though he will feel free to express his opinions as a thoughtful member of our community, he understands his ultimate vote should be solely with the best interest of the Ross constituency in mind.

Thanks for your time and attention in my absence. I know you will all have a great meeting tonight, and I look forward to telepathically feeling the good vibes.

With the utmost respect for everyone in the room right now,

Zak Fisher
Ross Commons Senator”

IV. Committee Reports

a. SLSEA Update (Ian Rhee)

Ian Rhee: "Thank you for having me. I just want to briefly go over what happened on the October 15 Investment Committee meeting. It was very productive. Investure, our outsourced investment manager, delivered a presentation to the Board of Trustees, Virginia, and me. Our endowment broke the one billion dollar mark, which is very good. There are a few things about our endowment which are not worrisome, but are of note. The size of our endowment is not by any means larger or smaller than other NESCAC schools; we fall right in line. However, the growth that we experienced was lower than our peers, which is due to the structure of our portfolio. Investure manages 11.2 billion dollars and has thirteen clients. They believe they should be evaluated on three items. The first is: Can the college pay the bills? They set a benchmark so that the endowment doesn’t dry up and we passed that level this year. The second is: Are we getting paid for active management? Somebody else is investing money for us and our investment manager is giving us higher returns than the market. The S&P500 had a fantastic year, but we need to have a diverse portfolio with an endowment of our size, so we can’t have it all in stocks. The third is: Are we keeping up with like-minded investors? We aren’t performing as well as our peers. Hamilton actually did the best, but about half of their portfolio was in equities. The size of their endowment is also a third of ours so they are in a better place to take on more risk than we are. Our portfolio consists of so many things: equities, fixed income, bonds, private equity investments, real estate investments, etc. We can’t directly invest in some things, but if we want to invest in certain things or places, we can find managers in specific areas to give Middlebury’s money to invest. The last thing to take away is that we are set up well for the future. One reason that we didn’t perform as well as our peers is that our portfolio is structured to have less risk compared to our peers. Our portfolio is 75% in equities of all kinds, so our metrics are much less risky. It’s looking encouraging going forward with rising rates and uncertainty. We are in a very good place for the future. In regards to sustainability, the percentage of our portfolio invested in ESG investments increased from 3.6% to 11.3% and board members and investors have shown that they want to increase this more. That is a pretty
quick increase because there isn’t a lot of flexibility in the portfolio. They have to work slowly but they are working towards it, which is encouraging looking forward.

Speaker Brady: Thank you, SLSEA Rhee. Does anybody have questions?

Senator Vaughan: Did they talk about the difference in performance of the ESG investments as compared to other parts of the endowment?

Ian Rhee: They didn’t, but I can ask about that next time.

Senator Vaughan: If those parts of the investment are outperforming the rest, it could be a good indication that they are doing the right thing in increasing the percentage of those investments in our portfolio.

Senator Chang: I have heard students asking for more transparency in the endowment. What does the transparency look like now and what are the plans, if any, to increase the transparency?

Ian Rhee: Ideally, the outsource investment managers would publish their holdings and we want these companies to have ESG principles in mind and we’d want more information about the managers. There are so many outsource managers and it will be really tough to change their habits, but they are working towards increasing transparency.

b. Academic Affairs Committee (Director of Academic Affairs Cate Costley)

Cate Costley: Hi guys. I just want to provide a brief update on what my committee and I have been working on and field any questions or comments you have about academic affairs. Thus far, we have worked on the issue of getting online syllabi available before the start of the term and we have been polling professors on their opinions on that. We are trying to figure out how best students can voice their views to the faculty and specifically, the Educational Affairs Committee. The Student Educational Affairs Committee (SEAC) should be in contact with the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC). Two of the issues we want to gauge student opinion on are distribution reform and a reform of the First Year Seminar program. We will be doing on the ground research about what students are thinking and will condense that information so we can present it to the faculty. Also, finally the SGA Reform Working Group that you guys have been talking about falls into our domain as well because right now we can’t sit on the EAC, but it would be great to have a student on that committee and I’m excited that the Senate is getting that going.

Senator Hussein: Can you expand on the First Year Seminar reforms?

Cate Costley: The EAC can’t be really open and transparent about these things, so I can only glean so much from them and we are just going to go from there.

Co-Chair Bogin: Is the Honor Code on your docket?
Cate Costley: It has fallen into my purview to work on the installment of the cases of the signatures, but in terms of big ideas, the Honor Code Committee has been dissolved, so the Honor Code hasn’t been top of the list.

Senator Chang: I know that we have been talking about this via email, but I want to look into JusTalks for Professors. Everyone in our community should have exposure to JusTalks or something similar. I also want to take another look at our Visual Arts program.

Cate Costley: Thanks again to Senator Chang for reaching out to me via email. I definitely encourage all of you to reach out to me.

Senator Gogineni: Will bringing back the minor in Economics ever happen? I think that ended after the class of 2013. Has that been brought up?

Cate Costley: That hasn’t been brought up and I don’t know anything else about that. You are all also welcome to come to our committee meetings if you want to bring up ideas or discuss things with us.

President Custer: It is doubtful that the Economics minor will return because it forced minors to take a 400 level Economics seminar, but didn’t require them to take Statistics or Regression so half the students in those seminars would have the requirements (the majors) and half wouldn’t (the minors), which made them difficult to teach. I am very skeptical that it will come back.

Senator Fisher’s Proxy: I have heard from some of my constituents about the idea of completely abolishing grading. Has that been a part of your discussion?

Cate Costley: It has not, but everything is on the table. I am not sure about the methods of change in doing that, but we would have to set realistic goals and see how much students can really have an effect on that.

Senator Jahan: Currently, seniors have to fill out a form about their major at the end of their senior year. I think that they should have to fill one of those forms out halfway through their academic career as well.

Senator Chang: In response to President Custer, why didn’t the Economics Department make changes to the minor instead of taking it away?

President Custer: Part of the problem is that if you create more requirements for the minor, you very quickly get into a six or seven course minor and the idea is that you might as well be majoring at that point. To be honest, I don’t know much more about it than that.

Senator de Toledo: There is also an issue of popularity. Economics is the most popular major and with a minor on top of that, it isn’t good when you have twenty percent of the student body jumping to one department.
Senator Chang: I also want to look at the seating in classrooms and if it is set up in the way that people want it to be. Do we want rows of desks or small individual desks? Personally, I would rather have big tables for discussions. In regards to Senator Fisher’s Proxy’s comment, I think the question about abolishing grading would be a great question for the student life survey—just to ask if people would be interested in alternative forms of grading.

Cate Costley: That’s a great idea. The data from the Student Life Survey can really help make any proposal more concrete. Thank you everybody. Please send me emails with questions and ideas and come to our committee meetings if you want: we meet every other Wednesday at 5pm in Crossroads.

c. Community Council Update (Co-Chair Bogin)

Co-Chair Bogin: We are two months in now so I can give you an update on what we’ve been talking about in Community Council. One thing that has come up is the relationship between students and Public Safety. Lisa Burchard came to Community Council along with a student who is getting really involved in looking at this question. We didn’t come up with concrete ideas, but if anybody is interested in this or has ideas let me know. I know Senator Sanders mentioned that she was interested in taking this on. Coming up this year, we want to talk broadly about the Feb program. We are a very broad body so we can talk about a lot of things and the thoughts behind the Feb program. We might talk about getting more initial support for Febs or creating a Feb Dean position. Another thing that I keep bringing back to Community Council is the Honor Code and how social life can fit into that. This week I want to ask the questions: What sort of community do we want? Do we have it? How do we get there? Those questions are going to be in my head going forward. How is the Honor Code a part of the community we are trying to create? What is the role of hard alcohol on campus? Maybe that will be important and maybe not. Is social life sufficient? I hear from a lot of people that they have a good time but that they know a lot of people think it’s terrible. I have yet to hear from anyone who actually thinks it’s terrible though so it might just be a perception that the “other” thinks it’s terrible. I want to hear everyone’s thoughts on this but maybe not right this second. What can we do more of? What do people like? People will say that they want more places to dance so MCAB or Student Activities will put on a dance and then nobody will show up. There is a disconnect between what students want and what they say they want. What do we want our Friday nights to look like? That’s what’s on my mind recently. I can answer questions now if anybody has any.

President Custer: I also sit on Community Council and one of the things that we talked about earlier in the year was publicizing Community Council a bit better and strengthening the connection between the student body and Community Council because there has been a disconnect there. I would like to hear any of your thoughts about this.

Co-Chair Bogin: The minutes and upcoming agenda are available online and we have been working on taking better notes. Last year’s minutes from the meeting where tailgating was discussed were pretty bad, so we are working on taking more extensive notes, maybe in the style of the Senate minutes.

Senator Chang: I know you are doing work on a social Honor Code. What would that consist of?
Co-Chair Bogin: The social Honor Code came up last year when Senator Chang was on Community Council. The context is that the Honor Code we have now is an academic Honor Code. My idea is to not to create a second Honor Code, but to paste the Community Standards into our Honor Code. Logistically, we wouldn’t be changing much because the procedure would be the same. We have an Honor Code, and theoretically if we did what it said, everything would work. The change needs to be in the culture and not in the code. The conversation should be less about how we don’t cheat and more about how we want to live in this community. How do we see ourselves here? To change the Honor Code we need a two-thirds majority from the student body. We have some time to ramp it up and get people pumped about it before a vote. I was really stoked about this but I slowed down because I got feedback from Karen Guttentag and others that pretty soon there could be a significant change in the Honor Code. She thought we should wait and see what those changes will be before we tie in the Community Standards to the Honor Code.

Senator de Toledo: Who is in charge of these changes? It seems a bit nebulous.

Co-Chair Bogin: It is nebulous—nobody is really in charge. I have been meeting with Andrea Lloyd and the Educational Affairs Committee chair, Suzanne Gurland, and they are somewhat in charge. Anyone can propose a change to the Honor Code, but the students must approve it. The process for the change is written vaguely in many places.

Senator Gogineni: I already mentioned this to Co-Chair Bogin, but the IHC has been proposing a policy change on Thursday night party registration. Since we have classes on Friday, you currently can’t register a party on a Thursday night. A lot of upperclassmen don’t have class on Fridays so parties happen anyways and the campus will be safer if those parties can be registered and monitored.

Senator Vaughan: What could really help with the social Honor Code idea is that if a change won’t happen for a couple of years, we could put in place some guidelines of how we want it to happen. We could write out some different procedures like if we want committees or how we want to get student opinion about it.

President Custer: To Senator de Toledo’s point, the Honor Code was started and developed by students initially so any change to the text of it has to be approved by the student body. There is some flexibility: the Economics Department was proctoring some exams and there was no change to the Honor Code. Nothing can technically change without student body approval.

    President Custer: Motion to move up New Business item “Cabin in Memory of Ian Burgin” in the agenda.
    Senator Medina: Seconded.
    All aye.
    Motion passes.

V. New Business
Jack Kerby-Miller: We are here to introduce a project that has been in the works for three years that we have all become involved with. It’s a cabin in memory of Ian Burgin, Middlebury class of 2008, which will replace a cabin that was demolished on Mt. Worth. I have been really involved in design work on campus and worked with Solar Decathlon in 2011 and again in 2013. I am an avid outdoorsman and love interaction with the built environment.

Joseph Mutter: I’m a senior architecture major. I was also involved in the 2013 Solar Decathlon team on the engineering side. I am really interested in working on architecture, whether it be new architecture or the preservation of existing architecture. I’m also an avid outdoorsman and I love running ultramarathons, hiking, and skiing.

Sarah Kaelin: Like everyone else, I grew up with an appreciation of the outdoors and the Vermont biosphere. It has always been a passion of mine to share that with other people. I have worked in a professional position doing basically that and I have experience with fundraising and marketing.

Phoebe Howe: I am a joint ES-Architecture major. I have design/build experience: I took a semester off and went to Waitsfield, VT, to study and design/build a tiny house with other students and managed a $40,000 budget. Like these other folks, I am driven by a passion for the outdoors and an appreciation for what it means to create a sense of place in the wilderness environment.

Larson Lovdal: I was also involved in Solar Decathlon in 2013. My father was a custom home builder so I grew up working in construction and I continue to work in construction in town here. It is a big part of my life that I want to stay in touch with. I am really excited to have another design/build project on campus. I helped work on the pizza oven in the Organic Garden so I have experience navigating the Space Committee and funding. I feel a connection to Ian after getting to know him through his mom. He was also a wood worker and avid outdoorsman and I look forward to building something in his name.

Jack Kerby-Miller: Here is a photo of the Worth Mountain Lodge, which was constructed on top of the Snow Bowl Mountain. It was decommissioned between 2008 and 2012 and burned down. We want to reconstruct the essence of it near the Rikert Center. It was built and maintained by the Mountain Club and Ian Burgin was one of the students of the students who tried to repair and restore the cabin before it was deconstructed. It is a big part of his memory that we want to honor.

Larson Lovdal: There were some concerns from the Space Committee about safety with a location on the top of the Snow Bowl Mountain so we moved to a spot on the Rikert trails, which will be detailed in later slides. This cabin will function as a place that the Middlebury College community can come and enjoy the outdoors and it will function as a warming hut as well.
Jack Kerby-Miller: One of the major user groups of this cabin will be student organizations and individual students. Any student can check out a key and spend a weekend up there. It will be accessible to the typical student at Middlebury. It provides an opportunity to spend an overnight without the commitment of carrying a tent and winter camping. You get the winter beauty of the woods without the scary cold wet conditions of winter camping.

Joseph Mutter: This is our proposed site. The red square is where the lodge will be and there will be a bathroom attached by a walkway.

Jack Kerby-Miller: Where we are in the process is presenting a proposal to the Space Committee. We worked with them in the past and they expressed concerns about our previous site being too accessible to car traffic. There were incidences of vandalism and not being able to secure the building so people were staying there who shouldn’t have access. The new site is on college property so it will be much easier to control. It is really well situated for Rikert use as well. There is a nice short loop to the cabin site and it can also serve as a launching point for longer tracks along the backside. Our proposal is due next Friday to the Space Committee. Chief of Staff Zhang will email you the full 30-page proposal.

Larson Lovdal: We are very encouraged by this site. The Space Committee has been aware of us working on this and we have met with a few of them. There were some accessibility concerns with the first site we proposed but this site was suggested and there is a high likelihood of this being approved.

Phoebe Howe: Here are a couple images that serve as inspiration for the style of the cabin. It will be a simple backcountry shelter with no running water or electricity. The floor plan has been fairly well thought out but is still subject to minor changes. It will be modestly sized but will be able to have twelve people, which is the large end for a Mountain Club, Middview, or FOO trip. The key element of the design is a sheltered outdoor porch space. You can enjoy the outdoors but still might want some shelter. The porch takes up about a third of the footprint. Inside there is a gathering space and an eating space. This could potentially be a lunch spot for skiers. We are also hoping to incorporate a woodstove into the design and will work with Space Committee to make sure that it is safe. Another feature is a loft for additional sleeping space, which will cover about half of the interior.

Larson Lovdal: The 30-page proposal is comprehensive and we have considered every aspect. We have talked to the Health Department, the Fire Marshall, and the Director of Rikert. The idea originally came from Ron Liebowitz and Ian’s mom. The proposal to the Space Committee is about making sure that the space is safe and accessible and that there won’t be any liability concerns.

Phoebe Howe: We also want to communicate that the project originated from student interest. It isn’t something that the Mountain Club or Middlebury Outdoor Program started. This is something that we are taking on ourselves. We want the cabin to serve students and we want different groups going out there. The key sign out and everything else will go through Student Activities.
Jack Kerby-Miller: Part of our proposal involved judging student interest and reaching out to student organizations that would use the cabin like Mountain Club, Skiga and Free Heelers. Based on talking to student organizations, half of the weekends during the period that we have school would be booked through those student organizations. It will be open to all individuals in the Middlebury College Community—students, faculty, staff, etc.—for the rest of the weekends. If you guys are all interested in this, we will come back with a proposal for funding. We are reaching out to several places for funding.

Senator Hussein: Who will be in charge of maintaining the cabin?

Phoebe Howe: One of our driving principles in this project is that it is for students by students. We want students to carry on the legacy and we anticipate that students will want to be involved in the maintenance of the cabin. We would also want to set up a maintenance fund that will be maintained by the college or one of our other funding sources. The Mountain Club will go up to the cabin one weekend per semester and use the maintenance fund to do repairs and make sure that the cabin will last.

Jack Kerby-Miller: It’s important that the maintenance isn’t just about physical repairs, but about making sure that there is a legacy and that there are students going out to the cabin and maintaining ownership of it.

Senator Toy: In the winter, is it only accessible by snowshoes and cross-country skis?

Jack-Kerby Miller: You could walk, but you wouldn’t want to. You can drive out further when it isn’t winter but it’s about 2.5 miles in winter and 1.5 miles not in the winter to get out there.

Phoebe Howe: We wanted to situate it so that it would be accessible and it isn’t too intimidating to cross-country ski or snowshoe out there. We want to engage a larger part of the student body.

Co-Chair Bogin: Assuming that everything goes well, what is your timeline for this project?

Jack Kerby-Miller: Ian’s family wants the cabin to be completed by his birthday, which coincides with Commencement this year. May 25, 2015 would be the goal assuming everything goes well.

Senator Hussein: Have you been in touch with the Commons and Res Life about using the space?

Larson Lovdal: I have discussed this with Senator Chang actually. When we were looking for funding for the pizza oven, we went to Commons Councils and the first offer we got was $20 and eventually we got $100, but we were looking at a budget around $3,000. Our rough budget for this project rather exceeds that and this cabin won’t apply to any specific Commons. I don’t think that any of the Commons will be in a position to fund a sufficient portion of this.

Jack Kerby-Miller: We will definitely look into seeing if the Commons or Res Life would be interested in using the space.
VI. Old Business

a. Student Liaison to the SGA on Endowment Affairs (SLSEA) Improvement Bill (F2014-SB7) (Senators Chang and Vaughan)

Senator Vaughan: I know we spoke about this exhaustively last week. One concern that was brought up is that a portion of this bill says that they will provide a summary which will be given to us, posted on the SGA website, and relayed to the student body. This was in an effort to increase transparency and make sure that the information that Ian gives us is relayed to the student body. I spoke with Dave Donahue and he suggested that we should send the summary to the Chief Financial Officer, Patrick Norton, to be checked for proprietary information.

Speaker Brady: But he thought that the Board of Trustees would be fine with it?

Senator Vaughan: Yes.

Senator Jahan: I would like to make a Friendly Amendment to say that the summary should be checked by the Chief Financial Officer within two weeks.

Senators Chang and Vaughan do not accept Senator Jahan’s Friendly Amendment.

President Custer: My opinion is that it should be one week.

Senator Jahan: Motion to make a Formal Amendment to say that the summary should be checked by the Chief Financial Officer within two weeks.

Senator Gerstenschlager: Seconded.

Ayes: Senator Jahan, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Senator de Toledo, Speaker Brady
Nays: President Custer, Senator Sanders, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Vaughan, Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Co-Chair Bogin, Abstentions: Senator Brook, Senator Hussein
7-8-2

Senator Jahan’s Formal Amendment is defeated.

Senators Chang and Vaughan amend the bill to allow one week for the Chief Financial Officer to check the summary for proprietary information.

Senator Vaughan: These meetings happen at a weird time of the year so if we gave the CFO two weeks, it would allow some feelings to settle before the information is released. It wouldn’t be fair to the students because they wouldn’t be able to give their feedback to the SLSEA in time.

President Custer: We don’t have the authority to say that the CFO must report back to us within one week. We’re just saying that he has one week to check it before we make it public to the student body. I think one week is plenty of time because it won’t be a thirty-page document. The CFO should be able to look at it quickly and tell if it is in or out.
Chief of Staff Zhang: So there is a meeting and then the SLSEA will write up a summary. Is there no timeline for that?

Senator Chang: Do we want to give the SLSEA a certain amount of time to write the summary and send it to the CFO? SLSEA Ian Rhee, do you think a week would be enough time?

Ian Rhee: I think that a week would be sufficient.

President Custer: I don’t want them to have to wait a week before sending it, and that is how it is worded now. We want more flexibility for them to do it more quickly if they like.

Senator Gerstenschlager: This is nitpicky but I would like to make a Friendly Amendment and say that the SLSEA should send the summary within a week and then will send the summary to the Senate upon receiving it back from the CFO.

Senators Chang and Vaughan accept Senator Gerstenschlager’s Friendly Amendment.

President Custer: One technical point. As it is written now, if the CFO doesn’t send it back, the SLSEA can’t send it out. I want to make a Friendly Amendment that says we can still send it out even if the CFO doesn’t send it back.

Senators Chang and Vaughan accept President Custer’s Friendly Amendment.

Senator Hussein: Motion to close debate and vote on F2014-SB7.
Senator Jahan: Seconded.
All aye.
Motion passes.

Vote on F2014-SB7.
Ayes: President Custer, Senator Jahan, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Sanders, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Senator Judy, Senator Brook, Senator Sohn, Senator Vaughan, Senator Hussein, Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Senator de Toledo, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
Nays: None.
Abstentions: None.
17-0
F2014-SB7 passes.

b. MiddSafe Bystander Intervention Update (Senators Jahan and Gerstenschlager)

Senator Gerstenschlager: We met with Doug Adams on Friday and clarified some things and moving forward, Barbara McCall is working on a new program. We met on Friday with Noreen Pecsok and Barbara McCall to have a discussion about this. Other than that, no major updates.
Senator Jahan: We did get some positive feedback from the administration. We are excited to get this done this week so we can vote next week.

Senator Chang: Did you talk to Erin Quinn?

Senator Gerstenschlager: We are waiting until after this meeting. Doug Adams raised some good points about how we word the bill because we don’t want to make it seem like we are targeting athletic groups.

Senator Fisher’s Proxy: On behalf of Senator Fisher, he is in support of this bill. Some of the opinions I have heard from my constituents about this issue have raised questions about what to do about the athletic culture at Middlebury. There have been a number of people suggesting to me that it might be useful to intervene in athletic culture and the rape culture by stopping the recruitment of athletes and getting rid of some of the funding for athletics. These are not my personal views; I am just communicating the position of my constituents.

c. **LaundryView Resolution (F2014-SB8) (Senator Toy)**

Senator Toy: There are a couple of edits that have been made since it was sent out to you, but it says the same thing. If there is major debate about this, I am happy to table this until next week. There isn’t a time limit on this. This bill just shows that there is support for this issue, even though it won’t happen until next year at the earliest.

Senator Toy: Motion to close debate on F2014-SB8 and vote.
Senator Gerstenschlager: Seconded.
All aye.
Motion passes.

Vote on F2014-SB8.
Ayes: President Custer, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Sanders, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Vaughan, Senator Hussein, Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Senator de Toledo, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
Nays: None.
Abstentions: Senator Jahan, Senator Brook
15-0-2
F2014-SB8 passes.

**VII. Adjournment**

Senator de Toledo: Motion to adjourn.
Senator Jahan: Seconded.
All aye.
Meeting adjourned.