I. Attendance

All members present; proxies for Senator Judy (Proxy Allis), Senator Hussein (Proxy Sinks), and Senator de Toledo (Proxy Carpinello)

II. Acceptance of the Minutes

Nick Warren: A proxy represented Senator Chang during the last meeting and that was not in the minutes.

Senator Jahan: Motion to amend the minutes to say that Senator Chang was represented by a proxy.

Senator Gerstenschlager: Seconded.

Ayes: President Custer, Senator Jahan, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Proxy Allis (for Senator Judy), Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Vaughan, Proxy Sinks (for Senator Hussein), Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Proxy Carpinello (for Senator de Toledo), Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady

Nays: None

Abstentions: Senator Berlowitz
16-0-1

Motion passes.

President Custer: Motion to accept the minutes as corrected.

Senator Medina: Seconded.

Ayes: President Custer, Senator Jahan, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Proxy Allis (for Senator Judy), Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Vaughan, Proxy Sinks (for Senator Hussein), Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Proxy Carpinello (for Senator de Toledo), Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady

Nays: None

Abstentions: Senator Berlowitz
16-0-1

Motion passes.

III. Announcements

President Custer: Welcome to some new faces. Senator Berlowitz is back from abroad and Proxy Carpinello and Proxy Sinks are here and they will be sitting with us for all of J-Term. We look forward to your contributions and please let us know if you have any questions about parliamentary procedure.

President Custer: Motion to move up Bill Burger in the agenda.
Senator Gerstenschlager: Seconded.
All aye.
Motion passes.

*Update on the New Middlebury ID Design (Bill Burger and Senator Toy)*

Bill Burger: Hello, I’m Bill Burger and I’m the Vice President for Communications and Marketing here. I’m here because Karina (Senator Toy) sent me a message in early December bringing to my attention a concern of many students about the ID cards, which was a concern I was familiar with. This concern is not limited to students. Two years ago when I got my ID card, I walked away thinking, “this is the worst ID card I have ever seen.” My picture is almost disappearing from the card. I was wondering why this is, so it ended up on the to-do list. We had a good conversation and a lot of ideas and we took those ideas and went to designers. It wasn't clear initially why the quality of our cards was so bad. We knew the design was bad, but why was the quality so poor? Is the equipment out of date or do we have a processing problem? We looked into all possibilities. The good news is that the equipment is fine. It was both a process issue and a design issue. The cards need to be laminated for them to be more durable. There are many permutations for these ID cards: faculty, staff, students, all the different schools, and temporary cards. There are about 30 or 40 different permutations. We wanted a design that we could use for all of these cards with only minimal changes. One of the things that was requested was an expiration date, which surprised me a little bit. It wasn't a high priority for me. Your cards are the only ones that have date of birth on them, for good reason. One of the good ideas that we had was to put a lot of info on the back of the cards like "if found, please return to" etc. I'm passing around some prototypes and this is where we are right now. If you get out your current card and compare, you will see quite a difference. The quality of print and color are great. This is a real improvement and it won't be turned away at a museum in Paris. I’m in favor of everyone being issued a new card but there is a cost aspect to that. We are also discussing moving where they are produced out of the Public Safety office but we still need to figure out who is going to operate the machines.

Proxy Sinks: Will you be issuing them to the new Feb class?

Bill Burger: Yes. Monterey will have new students even before our Feb class gets here so we will have new cards for them. We'll be ready there, so we'll be ready here.

Senator Jahan: Have you thought about adding a cash account into the new cards?

Bill Burger: Yes, we have thought about that. The discussion of a smart card system requires more than just the card though. It brings up questions about meal plans and all kinds of things. The smart card makes sense but we are at least a year away from making a decision on that.

Senator Vaughan: Public Safety seems like the best place to go to get a new card because they have to let us in if we lose our cards.

Bill Burger: One of the advantages is that they are open 24/7. We want to house the card making in a more central location. Either here in this building (McCullough) or in the Service Building where Student Financial Services is. It would be operating during normal or maybe slightly
extended business hours. Public Safety will still have the capability to handle emergency situations and let students into residence halls.

Senator Chang: Was the fading issue resolved?

Bill Burger: Yes, because they will be laminated. You can't even really tell that they've been laminated. It's an extra step in process but it will make cards last longer and the color will hold.

Senator Chang: Will the new cards have an expiration date?

Bill Burger: Yes. It’s on there now. The reason I would put it on the table is because increasingly students take what we call a non-linear path and don't necessarily finish within 4 years.

Senator Toy: A lot of places like museums won't accept your student ID card if it doesn't have an expiration date on it.

Senator Berlowitz: What about a 6-year expiration date?

Bill Burger: It's definitely a possibility, or at least a 5-year expiration date. That would capture 95% of students.

Proxy Carpinello: Will there be a change in how much it costs to replace cards?

Bill Burger: No. How does it work now when you replace a card?

Proxy Carpinello: It costs about $20 or $25 to replace.

Bill Burger: I don't see that changing. It's my understanding that some people have needed their card replaced due to it breaking and I would hope that lamination would help with that issue.

Chief of Staff Zhang: The expiration date is really important. I was just at a bank recently trying to extend a student bank account and I had to explain why my ID card didn't have an expiration date.

Bill Burger: What about a 5-year expiration date?

Chief of Staff Zhang: That would be to the advantage of those who have graduated.

President Custer: Another idea would be to just have a 4-year card and you can renew it if you take a non-linear path.

Senator Berlowitz: Going off of what Chief of Staff Zhang said, in Turkey we had 6-year cards and I knew people who had graduated and still had the card and the worst thing that they would do with it was renewing their bus pass at a student rate. Nobody is going to something terrible if they have a valid student ID after they graduate.

IV. Committee Reports
a. Community Council Update (Co-Chair Bogin)

Co-Chair Bogin: It's funny that you brought this up because we are also doing some work on ID cards in Community Council and I can answer questions about price. I have asked Lisa Burchard in Public Safety about this and I haven't heard back definitively. I did call Customer Service at AWID, the company that makes our ID cards, and heard from the person I spoke to that they only make IDs to last a year with the intention that school will reissue them each year. That was just one person at that company who said that though so it may not be correct and many people's IDs last a lot longer than that. I clarified that Public Safety's policy now is if your ID does fade, they will give you another one for free. It also seems likely that they will institute a policy that if it breaks, they will replace for free. The fee now is $20 but they are thinking of reducing to $10. I think that's what it was originally and then they increased it to $20. So there will potentially a reduction in the fee. I have a laminated card and it is holding up just fine. We did also pass the CJB proposal about the reviews that we want to publish. It was passed unanimously with one abstention from a proxy, so I'll let you know in March what result of that will be. This week we are talking about early arrival for students outside of some geographical boundary. It would be nice during J-Term to get in on Saturday instead of Sunday. We will also be talking about the move-out process and some ways that could be better.

b. Confirmation of Nan Philip as SGA Director of Publicity (President Custer)

President Custer: Nan Philip was on the Publicity Committee and Robin Loewald was the Director of Publicity but she is going abroad. Nan designed all of the MiddCourses posters for that campaign and she seems to have a good handle on the committee. I think she has done a great job. Does anyone have any questions?

President Custer: Motion to confirm Nan Philip as the Director of Publicity.
Senator Gerstenschlager: Seconded.
All aye.
Motion passes.

V. Old Business

a. Student Life Survey Update (Chief of Staff Zhang)

Chief of Staff Zhang: Nan is in Florida right now so I'm working with the Publicity Committee on a campaign for the Student Life Survey that I've been talking about. I spent the afternoon putting the questions into the software we are using and it produces a really beautiful report. The survey has changed quite significantly since you last saw it. I won't go through every change. The Health and Wellness section is missing right now because I sent questions out this week to different stakeholders in the community to make sure that they were worded correctly. I got a lot of good feedback and the Health and Wellness section got the most constructive feedback. I will be sitting down with Barbara McCall and Gus Jordan on Tuesday to figure out the exact changes we want to make. One question that was very hard to word and that I'm still not satisfied with is the question on AAL. I think we are beyond the point of assessing whether or not we are satisfied with the current scheme and I want to get into proposals. I want this to be straightforward but also nuanced. I am happy to rework it if you have suggestions.
Senator Gerstenschlager: To me, the word scheme has a negative connotation.

Chief of Staff Zhang: What other words would you suggest? Plan? Model?

Senator Fisher: I really like the word scheme.

Chief of Staff Zhang: I'm trying to streamline this as much as possible. We will have to make some cuts because it's getting too long. Any open-ended question is optional. ESG and real food definitions are in there now. I incorporated most of your suggestions from the fall. In terms of timeline, the big launch will be on Wednesday and the survey will stay open for the rest of J-Term. There will be a lot of posters. Hype this up to your constituents as well. I expect every one of you to take this survey. I have a list of prizes. A couple of them aren't set in stone yet. We are going to talk to Co-Chair Bogin about getting Dolci tickets. A lot of these came from your suggestions: a massage suggested by Speaker Brady, an Amazon gift card suggested by Senator Fisher, and we added some restaurants that weren't in the last survey. Are there questions, comments, or suggestions? This is the last time you'll see it before it goes live.

Senator Toy: Two small things that I have noticed so far. You wrote one $50 gift cards so it should be say gift card. Also on the AAL question, it took me a long time to figure out what the "-4" meant.

Chief of Staff Zhang: I'd like to hear from somebody who hasn't been a part of the AAL discussion and see if it makes sense to them. Proxy Sinks? Proxy Carpinello?

Proxy Carpinello: It's pretty clear. I'm familiar with scheme.

Proxy Sinks: The conversation has been going on for a while so if you've been around long enough, you'll know what the discussion is about. The answers are verbose but I think that might be necessary.

Senator Chang: I'm not sure about this. If I were a first year, I might think there should be no requirements. Also, I wouldn't feel comfortable quoting this question in a report to the administration because of the way it is worded. There isn't enough time to really read through all the options. I know that Suzanne Gurland would like to see a question about AAL and what our requirement should be like, whether there should be no requirements, or a scheme like Brown has.

Chief of Staff Zhang: I can add an open-ended question about that after this question.

Senator Chang: I just think it's likely that a lot of students will choose the easy option.

Senator Berlowitz: I agree with Senator Chang. In the question about First Year Seminar professors, I think you should be able to pick multiple answers. I could choose multiple negative ones about my First Year Seminar professor and I would have trouble narrowing it down. I also think you should split academic programs and resources.
Senator Fisher: Two brief comments about the AAL question. I thought that the "-4" was just a computer thing that I didn't get it but now I understand it. Seeing as four is the number and shall remain the number, I don't think the "-4" benefits us. These things are confusing and messy but that being said, I have every bit of faith that Middlebury students will take this seriously. I have faith in the students. I commend Chief of Staff Zhang for wording a difficult question as well as it could be worded.

Senator Jahan: Have you looked at different ways to lay out the answers on the AAL question?

Chief of Staff Zhang: I will try some other things and see how it looks.

President Custer: It is complicated, but it's a necessary part of this issue. By picking the easiest answer, that means you don't think this is an important issue and I don't see that as a killer for this question.

Proxy Sinks: I think it's possible that the student body will be split among 4 or 6 of these answers. I think it might be easier to see the general consensus by consolidating but maybe we do want to see the split exactly.

Chief of Staff Zhang: I did look at how to consolidate it and one idea I had was for them to just select which locations should we have to study.

Senator Brook: If you do that, include Oceania!

Senator Chang: If you do it this way, you should use the three letter abbreviations for the ones that already exist. If you're looking for questions to get rid of, you should get rid of the question about if race should be a part of admissions process. The Education Studies Department has been talking about this and the answer they have is "yes". I think that question is less important than a lot of the other ones we are asking.

Senator Berlowitz: There should be an option to have no preference. Liking the current scheme is different than having no preference or not being qualified to answer.

Co-Chair Bogin: I was also going to suggest being able to select multiple.

Senator Fisher: In response to Senator Berlowitz's suggestion, I think that students should have to answer this question. If you are taking the survey, you should have an opinion about what you should have to study. You should just choose which of the options you think is most appropriate.

Senator Berlowitz: I think it is completely fair to not have an opinion on this question. There are some issues that I care about and some that I don't. I think it's totally acceptable to be more invested in some issues than others or to just not feel qualified to answer certain questions. You might not have a serious opinion on what we should or shouldn’t learn and I think that is fair.

Senator Gogineni: I agree with Senator Berlowitz. If we want to compare the current scheme versus other schemes, then we are counting those who don't care in with those in favor of the current scheme.
Senator Fisher: I don't agree with your response, but it has a valid point, certainly. This is important to a lot of students and I don’t know whether the fire matches the magnitude of students who actually care. I think it is worth talking about and every student ought to care seriously about their education. We should think seriously about what we are studying and what we should study. I don’t think there should be an option to cop out. If you are a student here, you ought to have a preference about what you are learning.

Senator Chang: To force people to have an opinion will skew the results to the current scheme. Not caring about the issue and keeping things the way they are two different things, but this would lump them together. I wish they would care but if they don’t, then I want to know that. Where we are with Suzanne Gurland is that if they change the distribution requirements, it isn’t going to happen in the near future. The discussion might start in the spring and could last for years. I think we should ask a question that involves the timing of it, like how soon you think that the AAL requirement should be changed. Should next years incoming class have a different set of requirements? I don’t know how to phrase it.

Senator Berlowitz: We can also ask the question: “How much do you care about this issue?” and that could give you a more accurate result. If you are going through survey quickly, most people won’t spend a lot of time on each question and will just choose the easy answer.

Proxy Allis: Something that Senator Chang said about time limit made me think about when exactly the administration is going to deal with this. It seems like it’s perpetually in the future. Wasn’t it pretty overwhelming that there was satisfaction with our current requirements? Is it worth it to keep asking the question if we don’t know when the administration is going to deal with it. I’m wondering if the best thing that this body can do is to keep asking these questions and show solidarity or if we can actually deal with this issue.

Chief of Staff Zhang: Are you referring to AAL? Last time, a majority said they were satisfied with scheme. Part of it probably had to do with how it was worded, and this might be a more productive way to get students to think about it. It’s better than a yes or no question. I hear what you are saying about time and I would love to talk about this later if you want.

Speaker Brady: Are there any newer issues we want to discuss about the survey?

Senator Toy: Are we going to do the recall thing?

Chief of Staff Zhang: No, that was never on the table for this survey.

   Senator Gerstenschlager: Motion to table the Student Life Survey Update and move on.  
   Senator Jahan: Seconded.  
   All aye.  
   Motion passes.

b. *Ease of Individual Party Registration Act (F2014-SB18) (Co-Chair Bogin)*

Co-Chair Bogin: So from our discussion last time I made a few changes. The first is that the SGA will not give the $5,000 to anyone, but that we will remain in control of it. The amount of
money is the same. The individual will still be liable for same amount of damage but the individual will be able to appeal that amount down to a minimum of $0. If you make every effort to yell at that kid who was pouring his soda on the speakers, then the amount you have to pay could be drawn downwards. If you know who poured the drink, however, they should be paying for all of it. I am happy to make amendments and I am not wedded to the $300.

President Custer: I like the idea but there are some issues with it. I don’t think it should be a pot of money we give to a part of the college that we cannot control. That’s an amendment (and is already included in Co-Chair Bogin’s most recent version of the bill). I don’t like the idea of just throwing out an arbitrary number for someone to be liable for. I know we want to reduce the risk but I am more in favor of a SGA committee that you can appeal to and then they can decide how much you should be responsible for.

Senator Berlowitz: Who would you see on this committee?

President Custer: Six or seven students. They can be from the Senate or the President could appoint them. It should be students and their purpose is just to see if the person in charge really made an effort to stop the damage and from there decide how much we should pay.

Senator Gerstenschlager: I like the idea of keeping the money under our control. I do worry about how the evidence will be represented without having a party host at the party to validate any claims. That should be a provision in the bill.

Finance Committee Chair Aborn: Is this specifically for individuals?

Co-Chair Bogin: This is just for individuals. The current version of the bill says that the money will be held by the SGA. It makes sense to have the Appeals Committee handle this, especially since they aren’t doing a ton right this second. I would love to not have to create another committee.

Senator Fisher: I have an internal struggle between two points that argue for either side. I think this is a miraculous wonderful solution, but still think that $300 can be a disincentive. There are a lot of students for whom having to pay $300 could affect their ability to go to Middlebury. This process could be solution but I know that rightly or not rightly, the amount of bureaucracy involved to register a party is perceived as being overly complicated. I hesitate to bring an amendment about another committee and another process that can make it even more confusing. I would vote for the bill like this, but I do think we need to consider how social life is entrenched with bureaucracy. This is a solution, but it also adds to that bureaucracy.

Senator Vaughan: What about smaller groups of individuals who want to throw a party together? Is there a way we can change it to be an individual group that registers a party? $300 is a lot for one person, but if it were split between four friends, they might be more likely to do it. Also, are these parties in suites or houses?

Co-Chair Bogin: To answer your second question first, no, this is for registered parties and you can't register parties in places like that, which is another problem but much a more complicated one and I didn't want to tackle that with this bill. Back to your first question, you could host a
party or hold a party with a group, which is actually a great thing to do because that way there is more support and more eyes on the ground. There just has to be one contact person for us to hold financially responsible but you can make an agreement with your friends to all chip in if something happens and the contact person is held responsible.

Senator Vaughan: I know we have to have a point person, who would be the main contact. And if you throw a party with your friends, you might say that if something happens, we are all going to chip in, but I would be worried that they would bail out. If it's built into the system that way, it's not something people could bail on.

Co-Chair Bogin: Can you register a party with multiple people?

Doug Adams: You can have two separate party hosts. We hold the host responsible for any damage and beyond that, they decide who is responsible.

Co-Chair Bogin: Senator Vaughan, would it be okay if we changed individual to host so that it is consistent with the terminology used in party registration?

President Custer: My trouble with this is that they are liable for $300 and we are on the hook for the rest of it. If somebody punches a hole in the wall and it costs $2,000 to repair, this binds us to pay the $1,700 which is why I would change it so that it is up to the discretion of the Appeals Committee.

Co-Chair Bogin: You would only be held responsible if nobody could point to who punched the hole in the wall.

President Custer: If there is no discretion involved, we are just bound to pay it. Imagine a scenario that costs a lot regardless of whether or not they did it responsibly. I would hate to see one thing get broken and the entire fund get used up.

Senator Gerstenschlager: There has to be a party host present at any registered party, correct?

Co-Chair Bogin: Yes.

Senator Gerstenschlager: That person could be responsible for providing evidence.

Co-Chair Bogin: Evidence is pretty vague in these situations, but I don't know what else to do.

Senator Gerstenschlager: It will be hard to say no to someone if they say that they really tried to prevent damage from happening, but if the person giving the evidence has gone through the party host training, that might give them more credibility.

Senator Berlowitz: I agree with President Custer about $300 being arbitrary and I can see how deciding who is held responsible can get tricky. Are you responsible if you were the one who punched the hole in the wall or if you were the host? If I threw an out of control party, it should be my fault. The Appeals Committee has no had no training on how much things cost. I think that there should either be a separate committee that has been through training about this and how much things cost or we should rework the Appeals Committee.
President Custer: You could have the Finance Committee do it. It's less about what the costs are, and more about finding someone who can objectively do this. That’s going to be a very imperfect process and it might not work as well as you want it to. This is a privilege that we are setting up now. I don't think we should let the fact that it won't be perfect stop us from doing it though. Whether it be the Finance Committee or the Appeals Committee, I think we can get to a reasonable assessment. If insurance companies can do it, we can do it.

Senator Fisher: I think we are beating a horse on its last few breaths. My internal struggle is resolved thanks to President Custer’s suggestion. I think the Appeals Committee can handle it. If they cannot handle an appeal then what the hell do we have an Appeals Committee for? I think we should scrap any number and leave it to the discretion of Appeals Committee. That’s a Friendly Amendment.

Co-Chair Bogin does not accept Senator Fisher’s Friendly Amendment.

Co-Chair Bogin: If you want to vote on this, then I won’t scream or throw a tantrum. I think it goes back to what Senator Fisher originally said. If you create that much red tape, you run the risk of no one wanting to throw the party at all. I worry we will have a great program and no one will use it. There should be some security for people who want to throw parties. We are providing very little security if we leave it up to the Appeals Committee. This is a pilot program and if it doesn't work we can scrap it. I don’t want to say that $5,000 isn’t a lot of money, but we have a lot more than that. I would really like to try it and maybe it seems too risky, so if you want to amend, we can do that. It’s true that we have to consider the worst case, but at the same time, registered parties usually go exceedingly well. The last time I checked, the dorm damage number from registered parties was very low and it presumably still is. Registered parties work with Public Safety. If something goes wrong, there is a large chance that the party host or Public Safety will know who it was.

Senator Fisher: I hear what you are saying. No one hates red tape more than me. It haunts my dreams. It is cleaner to not include a number and just have the Appeals Committee take care of it.

Senator Fisher: Motion to add the following Formal Amendment: “The host will be liable for an amount that the Appeals Committee deems appropriate. A typical amount after these proceedings would be approximately $300.”

Senator Chang: Seconded.

Ayes: President Custer, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Toy, Senator Chang, Senator Fisher

Nays: Senator Berlowitz, Senator Vaughan, Proxy Sinks (Senator Hussein’s Proxy), Proxy Carpinello (Senator de Toledo’s Proxy), Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady

Abstentions: Senator Jahan, Senator Medina, Proxy Allis (Senator Judy’s Proxy), Senator Sohn, Senator Brook

6-6-5
Motion defeated.

Senator Vaughan: If our goal is to help people out, it seems like we are almost favoring the people who do greater damage. What if we say that we will pay 25% up to $300? We won’t go
over $300 and they can petition if they want us to pay for more of the costs. If it costs $100, we will automatically pay $25. Even the little $50 or $100 charges can add up for people and discourage them from throwing the party.

Senator Berlowitz: The host should have an option to make an appeal to the Appeals Committee, who can then agree to pay all or some. If the cost is $50 and they can’t pay it that could be discouraging. We should have the option of paying for all of it. The Appeals Committee should have more discretion.

President Custer: It won't change anything, but I just want to reiterate that to take on unlimited liability over $300 is just a bad policy. It's a risky position to be in.

Proxy Sinks: The purpose of this bill is that if something goes wrong, the party host is not necessarily on the hook for everything. I agree with President Custer's proposal to have the Appeals Committee handle it and to not have $300 specified. I don't know how the senate can pick that as a normal amount. Dorm damage from parties varies from broken light bulbs to broken windows. From my perspective, if there is damage, it makes the most sense for the host to appeal to us and we can work it out with them.

Senator Vaughan: I think we should say that we will pay 25% of the costs up to $300 and after that you can appeal how much you have to pay. If we just give you 25% up to $300 there doesn't have to be a process unless you want to fight back how much you have to pay. Should say that the SGA will pay for 25% of the damage, up to $300 automatically, because nobody has time for meeting with every individual who throws a party. That’s a Friendly Amendment.

Co-Chair Bogin does not accept Senator Vaughan’s Friendly Amendment.

Co-Chair Bogin: I don't think that it's a terrible idea, but it doesn't make that much sense. If there is $1,200 in damage, we will pay $300? If this passes as a Formal Amendment, I'm happy to make the change.

Speaker Brady: There are a lot of different opinions, so it might be more beneficial if you schedule time to meet with Co-Chair Bogin this week and we can come back next week and have more concise voting.

    Senator Fisher: Motion to table F2014-SB18 and move on.
    Senator Gerstenschlager: Seconded.
    All aye.
    Motion passes.

c. We The Middkids Update (Chief of Staff Zhang)

Chief of Staff Zhang: These keep getting pushed to the end. I just want to give you a quick update because I haven't talked to you about these four new ideas. There was a proposal for a Johnson Ball Pit, which was started by the same group of students who started the moat petition. Second thing is when we should have to pay for a new Midd ID and it looks like Co-Chair Bogin is working on that. There was also a petition about why the prices in MiddExpress are so high. I
actually ran into Dave Cannistra at the 200 Days Party and I guess he checks We The MiddKids and he was wondering if anyone had taken this up. I will meet anyone who is interested or you can contact Dave Cannistra about it. He told me briefly some of the reasons that the prices are where they are but I’m sure he’d be happy to speak to any of you about it in more detail.

Senator Medina: I contacted the people who wrote this and I know Dave, so I figured I would take this up and I can work on it over J-Term.

VII. Adjournment

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