

# MCSG LB Minutes 4/21

Tuesday, April 21, 2015  
6:54 PM

Meeting begins 19:01

01	IC: We have a lot to do today so we're going to get started. First up is Lucy.
	LW: Hi everybody, I just want to give a quick update on the Resources and Planning Committee. This semester the main thing we've focused on is developing ways to communicate the budget and finances for the surrounding community. We've developed some presentations that we've shown to department chairs and met success, we'll show the rest of the faculty at retreats later on in the year. We won't give a presentation to the students until the fall. That compiles a lot of presentations from different departments into a PowerPoint that will be pretty interactive.
04	IC: Thanks Lucy. Everyone make sure you show up on time next time. Next is Cole with the Classroom and Learning Facilities advising committee.
	CW: Thanks. We've been working on collective learning and interactive learning. The best example of this is a class room in Jwall that can be adapted to different teaching styles. We've also been talking about classroom media infrastructure, a common problem is defunct media platforms. We're going to replace some of these platforms with better ones. That's about it.
	IC: Any questions? Alright, next is old business with SSRC.
06	SLK: Yeah the sexual assault forum is getting pushed back to next Thursday around lunchtime. We approved 320\$ with Facing Forwards from the cHest, we also approved 1200\$ for Model Minority Monday.
	CP: I move to approve this request.
07	SM: M2Q 20 for, 0 opp, 0 abstain
	SLK: We finished the Zines, we'll distribute them tomorrow. I'll also pass around a few copies for you all to see.
08	SN: On behalf of PB and Maseca, we got an angry email about shifting the forum. Please have better communication...
	SLK: I wasn't in charge of that but thanks for letting me know.
	RD: Can we take one of these?
	SLK: Yeah we have over 600 printed.
09	KF: Can we get a copy over here for Rothin?
	IC: Thanks for the updates. Next is... Will's Bills.
	WT: First is the Transparency bill. The three main things of the bill: Create a timeline for staff to get stuff online, creates a MCSG binder for all our bills and bylaws, creates a system for the staff to send the bills and information to the Mac Weekly. I move to approve this bill, 0008.
12	TV: Just on the Mac Weekly, why can't they look at the Org Sync? I'm concerned about them seeing documents and not attending the meeting.
13	JL: Because... section 1 and sec 2... because sec 2 has already been done, I move to amend the bill to remove sec 2 and reword the doc accordingly.
	IC: We will know discuss this amendment.
	JL: This section has already been completed, it doesn't need a timeline. I move to question.
	18 for, 3 opposed, 0 abstain
	IC: Amendment passed.
15	WT: TO address your concerns Tess, they often don't feel like a clear line is open. I am more willing to go the extra step for the mac weekly then the rest of the body. Meeting the Mac Weekly where they are now is great, if they want to come in and go to meetings then that would be great. We should try to be transparent. I think if Mac Weekly receives the stuff in advance they are more likely to send a reporter. Having that open line will actually encourage them to come.
17	IC: I move to amend sec 2 and remove it. I don't think the staff should give a report for every meeting, we don't need more unreadable bylaws.
	WT: Why didn't you tell me this earlier.
	IC: Not relevant. I didn't see a need to come in a talk before this.
	JL: I agree, I was going to make the same motion. It is in the bylaws that the pres. handles the staff so the pres. should take care of the enforcing. I m2q on the amendment.
	WT: I object
	4 for, 17 against, 0 abstain
	WT: One of the most frustrating things is that there aren't open lines between execs and the rest. I have faith that the staff will do the jobs they need to do but someone might come along that won't do their jobs. Its always nice to have an extra layer of accountability.
	RD: We don't need an extra layers, it's a bureaucratic mess. There is a lot in the bylaws already, you're conflating different issues. Communication may be slow but that doesn't stop holding the staff accountable. The alternative is that people can see something missing and tell the chief of staff to put it up.
	IC: We have appeals coming in soon and have the budget. Diego.
21	DT: Its important that we keep this section, it makes the LB keep transparency open. Many times the specific job of an individual is the Pres. telling the staff what to do, we should have the ability to tell the staff we need things done directly.
	JL: Those systems already exist. We don't need every clause with accountability. I don't believe this is accountability, this isn't teeth. Its just saying they need to come before every meeting and tell us what they did. The staff is intelligent, we shouldn't micromanage them.
24	RD: I move to question.
	IC: Any objection?
	17 for, 4 opposed, 0 abstain
	IC: The amendment passes. Discussion is now on the bill as a whole.
	JL: I M2Q on b0008.
	15 for, 6 opposed, 0 abstain
25	IC: Bill passed. The appeals process will be quick, after each appeal an LB member can make a motion and second. Don't feel obligated to motion or second if you don't want. Later I'll motion to bring the budget back on the table with the amendment that will change the 50% to 30%.
	RD: We should vote on the amendment.
27	IC: Any objections?
	11 for, 10 opposed, 0 abstain
	IC: It passes, the amount is now reduced to 30%. We will now return to the budget.
	CD: Do you have the number calculated for 30%?
28	JK: No. I'll manage though.
	JG: Don't we need a number to approve the budget?
	IC: I thought we'd have the number after the amendment.
	JK: I'll do it right now.
29	RD: We should just come up with a number now... If the cut is reduced, that means more money is spent. Now there is less money...
	JK: I mean pre-slash
	RD: Did we go over the amount we wanted for additional allocations?
	JK: We'll see...
	CD: What was the amount of money in the operation fund last year?
30	JM: About 258k...
	IC: Should we just start with appeals?
	RD: I think the Mac Weekly budget is pretty straightforward, we should tell them not to come...
32	IC: Is anyone else ready to go?
	RD: We could just table the Mac weekly convo if it goes over time
33	AH: WMCN is ready to go
	LW: Aren't only 2 orgs affected by the cut?

	TV: I know that the Mac Weekly wants to be here, Joe is pretty adamant.
	RD: I think that the LB will remove the cut once we know what the problem is.
	WMCN: Basic operation costs, our studio engineer is 10.5k and he keeps us going. Insurance and licensing is about 7k. We have after the cuts over 7.5k that we need for additional allocation. These are funds we require for operation and we're not confirmed to get this. Everything we're asking for was approved before the cuts, we're just asking for 15,151\$ total.
	RD: The reason why we're doing this is for orgs to keep track of their money. If you use all your money and record it in checkbook then I can guarantee you that you'll receive the full amount.
	WMCN: We can't take that risk.
	WT: I move to approve the full amount.
	LW: It seems like you recommended less than 15k, 13k before the cuts. In that case with the change it brings it up to 9k... The things that wouldn't be afforded was covered in the cut.
38	JK: We this semester funded their microphone processors. I'm going to disagree with Rothin, we can't guarantee anything.
	JL: If we're going to cut some orgs we can't pick and choose. We can't discriminate on broken rules.
	IC: We're seeing here that there is a greater need for these orgs for this money. Even if they were cut.
40	WMCN: I guess I misunderstood what this was about. We've had so much miscommunication in the past about the budget, we know now what is on checkbook and we're going to take it seriously moving ahead.
	RD: The reason we need consistency is we can't keep money in track. Even if everyone brings in their books at the very end. There is no way next year to hold you guys accountable for using it if we don't do it this year. Our hands are tied. I would prefer if you guys take the cut and come back for more.
	IC: I think we should move to question to approve the WMCN budget 15,151\$
43	RD: Point of order, this amount ignores the other recommendations made by the FAC.
	9 for, 12 opposed, 0 abstain
	RD: I move to approve the amount approved by the FAC, 13,382\$.
	JK: We took out booms, processors, stuff we can get through additional allocations.
44	WMCN: I came in without what WMCN needs to budget for. I got in touch with the FAC about amending the budget and never got a response. This stuff is the money we need to operate.
45	JM: There is a discrepancy, the reason is the assumption that the advisor gave us the wrong amount because they forgot the engineer didn't get paid over the summer.
	IC: So the FAC won't cover the expenses.
	JM: Yes, they voted on the budget that doesn't cover the summer fees.
	RD: I would say we all m2q and reconsider the previous motion.
	CP: Can we amend?
47	LW: Can you pay just the summer and fall in one amount and then pay the rest in the spring.
	IC: I think we should do what Rothin says.
	SD: I m2q
	0 for, 21 opposed, 0 abstain
49	WT: will 15k cover the costs you need? I motion to amend the budget ...
	JK: I motion to reconsider the 15, 151\$ budget.
	IC: Ok, now we have the full amount back on the table.
	NE: I m2q
	IC: Any objections?
	18 for, 3 opposed, 0 abstain
	IC: Motion approved. I have James...
	JL: The reason we should allow this is because its an operational cost, we shouldn't give exemptions if they don't need it.
51	IC: Fresh Concepts is here.
	FC: The whole org wants to apologize about the process, we've resolved to take responsibility about this. Two main appeals, we are responsible to book groups for familyfest in the fall. It really advertises the comedy groups. We don't have a coach or mentor in the group, we rely a lot on the two workshops in the spring to help with our techniques. We depend on those to set the climate for the rest of the year. We plan to do workshops for students next year.
	IC: Thanks, for all these appeals Jennie can you say all the numbers for appeals?
	JK: I can do that right now.
	JK: 3715\$ is how much we recommend.
	CD: A lot of people came in, they don't know what happened with the 30%.
	IC: I can inform, before this process started, the 50% cut has been reduced to 30%. Remember we're on fresh concepts right now.
55	SV: You're appealing the cut right? I make a motion to approve?
	IC: You want to reflect the full amount?
	SV: Never mind I got confused.
	SLK: What is the amount they requested?
	JK: We didn't fund pizza or sweatshirt.
56	RD: If you want to amend it, do it.
	JK: I move to amend to 3,715\$.... 5,308\$ I mean.
	IC: Is there a second for this?
57	JM: If we approve the 30% cut then someone can appeal the full amount?
	LW: I echo what James said, we shouldn't override every org for their cut. We trying to create a consequence and valuing this org above everyone else. Its not fair and its not enforcing.
	SLK: If we don't fund you the full amount and give you the cut amount what will you miss?
59	FC: The people we get for family fest and the workshops. Its hard to anticipate the costs for groups coming in.
	JK: M2Q
	IC: Any objections? All in favor of voting?
	4 for, 17 opposed, 0 abstain
	IC: We will continue discussion.
	JL: The question Seth had is misleading, it's a different situation than WMCN. You can begin the year with this money and allocate additionally accordingly.
	RD: M2Q... never mind
02	Sam: I made a sheet of what orgs put down for need-based funding.
	RD: M2Q.
	2 for, 18 opposed, 0 abstain
	IC: The amendment does not pass. Jennie do you have all the numbers?
04	JL: They are done. I already made the changes to what's on the table.
	IC: We should hear all the numbers first, including reasons why the cuts were made.
05	NE: I think this has been communicated, the orgs can use the money they block budget for whenever they want.
	CD: Can you screen the numbers?
	RD: One more thing, we should mention that we're backed up for time.
	IC: I apologize for all the orgs, it's the nature of the beast. So now we have Mac Slams.
08	JK: Mac slams wanted 10400, we rec 7400, we didn't rec the honorarium for their coach and their December poet.
	MS: We want to request the full amount. We got cut for the honorarium for our coach, this comes from a miscommunication for our group. We need to mirror the structure of other competitive orgs in order to remain competitive. Here is the breakdown of what our coach gets. They spend a lot of hours working on this org and setting up the slams. The main difference between our coach is that he is always here.

	IC: That's two minutes. Please elaborate.
	MS: It attracts students from across the world. A lot of students on Mac Slams are in the group because our coach is so good. We perform a lot of collabs with other groups and this is a result of our coach. Orgs that don't have a coach are worse off. That's why we want the money for the coach.
12	SM: I like to approve the budget of \$9200. FAC: We reason we didn't fund it first is because we thought the coach was just for the traveling team. JG: M2Q
13	22 for, 1 opposed, 0 abstain IC: Amendment approved. We now have MacPIRG... I mean Sitting. Go ahead and introduce yourselves.
15	JK: We did not recommend any amount, they put it in the wrong section. We realized this after we went through. RD: What is the amount then? And what's the rec? JK: We don't have a recommendation, they requested 4,850\$. IC: The FAC has no rec then? There is nothing... Without a rec then I don't feel comfortable choosing a number. I can't make an amendment to look at this budget. I would request additional allocation...
18	S@M: Thanks for meeting with us. We are the only org that is about meditation practice. We have the highest rates of sign ups, we have a lot of people that come in and out. We've gotten a huge bump in interest. Mac has been sending money out to teach meditation nearby. This is our first attempt for making a budget. RD: I'm going to disagree with what Ian said. We shouldn't punish them for what they did. The only amount that would be in question is an honorarium fee. Do you have a specific amount? I encourage the full amount minus the honorarium.
21	S@M: It is a loose estimate. WT: How much of the 4,850\$ is honorarium? S@M: Three speakers for a total of 2500\$. FAC: There are 3 amounts. The one Rothin is talking about is the full one.
22	IC: I move to amend the budget to 2350\$. AH: I recall having questions about donations and if it fit under bylaws. We should look closer into the budget. SV: M2Q AH: I object CW: Do we have the budget available? 1 for, 23 opposed, 0 abstain
24	LW: I remember that there was travel grant stuff in there as well...? JZ: We don't do donations right? I think that was under a block budgeting things, the cost of the retreat was the donation one right? S@M: What is donation referring to?
25	RD: DO we know what the donate amount was? S@M: These are costs associated with the retreat, that means we paid for spaces for stuff near campus that doesn't require travel funds. There is also cost associated with having a leader go to the retreat. RD: What are the donations? S@M: I don't know how it got introduced? JM: You're thinking of something else there is nothing under donation in the budget.
27	NE: I would be more comfortable if there was a way to get a recess and then a recommendation? IC: I think that would be a poor choice. The FAC should say something if they have an idea. AH: I'm talking about the budgetary presentation. It may not be budgeted for so I don't feel comfortable...
29	JK: They submitted this to the wrong section and so we didn't look at it. CD: We only fund publicity for 12\$ so I recommend that. For the honorarium, we would prefer an additional allocation. IC: What I think would work would be to vote down this amendment and save this for next week. That could be an option. RD: I don't think that's an option. I think we should vote and make a fresh motion. They need to understand that we're trying to be helpful. I move to question on this amendment. 0 for, 23 opposed, 0 abstain IC: The amendment does not pass. SM: I move to amend the budget for a total of... 2317\$.
32	RD: Jennie do we need to remove this amount? S@M: I don't know where the word donation entered in, the only way I see if it came in is the way the rental fees we're discussed. Regarding the conduct of the FAC, we would love to have advice. We've been talking with the FAC about the budget and appeals. We haven't been supported at all. When we first submitted the budget, I made the mistake, it was a very difficult thing. We made a note and a title about it, I spoke to Dan Yee who said he had looked at it. You told me it was not in the right tab... since that time of budget it has been confusing. RD: I apologize for all that. I move to question.
36	23 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstain IC: Motion passed. I motion to suspend the bylaws and extend the meeting to 9:30pm.
37	RD: We should do this now. M2Q 21 for, 2 opposed, 0 abstain IC: The bylaws have been suspended.
38	JM: We need to keep focus on the appeals at hand. FAC: We did try to get in touch with them through email, it fell through. IC: Mac Public health is here now. MPH: I respect and support your decision for the cut, our mistake was a result of a more complex thing. We had a bunch of money that was left over that comprised our main expenses. We used the cost of MMSG for subsidizing a MN Aids project training. I collected the money and gave it back to the school and never received a receipt. That being said, I didn't have any conformation that money was in question. It's an accountability thing that was between us and the school.
42	JK: They wanted 2250, we recommended 2150\$ by cutting some decorations. We have 1505\$ recommended. NE: I move to recommend \$2150. JK: I'll wait. RD: I'm sympathetic to orgs that aren't given receipts. We need to figure that out. We should give them the money. M2Q IC: Any objections? 16 for, 7 opposed, 0 abstain
44	IC: Outing club is next, then MacPIRG. Jenny will give the numbers after a quick introduction.
45	JK: they requested 13k, we approved 2620\$. Most of the stuff that was cut was capital. We decided gear repair materials was to be recommended and into the wild, master chef needed food, the first aid course and shelving materials are all things we recommended. We cut most of the capital because there was an inventory that needed. Most of it was off campus and travel related. Basically a lot was day trips. FAC: The biggest reason why we cut capital request is because we got a big request for capital during the year. OC: I'll go through both the gear and events. We created an inventory for all of our gear. The estimated cost for replacement has been included. We have about 6 weather appropriate sleeping bags and we need 40. Lots of things on campus uses this gear. This gear is expensive and needs to be spent on. We gave Joan a tour of our stuff, as for travel grant money we've talked to Joan about this. The costs of guides was not included in travel grants. Same thing with ski rental. We would appreciate getting this funded. CD: Instead of amending the thing piece by piece we could go through each item.
50	IC: That would take too much time. LW: I think outing club needs this stuff. They can also get a lot of allocations to fund this. Waiting, going over the inventory is a good idea.
51	OC: A lot of the gear we need for macward bound, that happens before MMSG begins. We've struggled in the past to supply stuff. We've tried to get together with MMSG to go over this stuff but we couldn't. IC: I'm restricting talking to 30 secs. CW: Outing club is a model org. They put in a lot of work, it should be rewarded. I motion to approve the amount of...

	OC: There was one budget item that could fall under the travel grant, so the final amount would be 13,100\$
	CW: That's it. \$13100.
54	JK: M2Q 18 for, 5 opposed, 0 abstain IC: Motion passed. Next is MacPIRG
56	JK: They requested 12k, we rec 7211. We took out funding for the on campus organizer. MacPIRG: We got originally cut for 10k, there was further cuts made later with Joan to 7k. It will not allow us to fully implement our group. They cut our taskforce hours and doubled our open hours. We don't just train, we act. We want to address the concern about these hours not being open to all students. These meetings would be important for getting many ideas off the ground. RB: these guys have faced an onslaught of budgeting, the campus feel wants these guys to continue. Because they have made a good faith effort to try I hope we can pass a decent budget that accounts for the organizer. WT: I would rather give them the full amount because this organizer has the same role as the Mac Slams coach. These guys are an exemplar orgs and we should fund them
00	RD: Doubling the hours is much more fair, the Mac Slams comparison is not fair. There is no equivalent organizer for taskforce hours across the board. IC: I need clarification, there have been talks about whether these hours conflict with the financial code. Where does this stuff fit in?
02	JM: This is where contracting for hours and time as an advisor comes in, we don't want them to be an employee. For Mac Slams its much more defined. The organizing hours are much more undefined. It is also more than we would give to anyone else. MacPIRG: We have weekly training hours, all of these will contribute to learning and acting. I'm confused how this is not open to anyone, it is open like a meeting is. I've tried to work with Campus Activities, this advisor is a person with concrete skills. We would be happy to keep track of information for this organizer.
04	Cory: Part of this cut came from it was connecting to the state-wide campaigns, also we questioned the need for every meeting to need an advisor. WT: I would like to see you guys have this organizer here, but openness is a good idea. What if we give you the money to categorize in the open consultation. Cory: You can't do that since the wages would be different. MacPIRG: It would not work out for the same amount of time. What you have suggested could be a possibility though.
07	RD: I don't see this as an survivability option. We don't have to fund all the parts of this thing for it to work. MacPIRG: We don't just train, we create action. We need those hours to be focused on planning. As a reminder, in our charter it was written for us to keep up this relationship with our state org we need a certain amount of funding. RD: The student orgs should be providing services to the campus, not for the state organization. We're no longer interested in that relationship. All these hours and money need to be proved to be useful for everyone on campus not for maintaining a relationship with the state org.
10	CW: Unless we can prove that this isn't exactly what we avoid, which we can't, then we should fund it. What was the fee for this organizer? LW: This is a big problem for MCSG for MacPIRG to do something for the campus. Other orgs do tons of stuff without an outside organizer. They can be effective without this guy. WT: I move to approve the original 12371\$ amount. IC: There is not a second.
12	JM: I yield to Jim. JH: The question is about the amount of hours paying one person. We need to be careful about getting a person to come in and do stuff on campus for money. CD: I move to approve 10691\$, the original FAC recommendation. IC: now just the amendment. WT: I think we should M2Q. CP: I object. IC: We now vote on voting. 4 for, 19 opposed, 1 abstain
14	MacPIRG: Every hour that is budgeted for will be working with students. Cory: How we came to the original 10k number came from a misunderstanding. The 7k one came from a lot of discussion. RD: we should not consider the 10k one. The FAC has said it's a bad figure. We should vote it down. JL: It comes down to the college for the money. If both faculty here have said it's a bad idea, we should listen.
16	CD: The FAC vote was not unanimous. RB: This is a contentious issue. Who draws the line, we should err on the side of students voices. RD: That's a naïve position, we understand the role of the organizer, its to continue the affiliation with the state. M2q 18 for, 5 opposed, 1 abstain IC: We're moving to question on the amendment. 4 for, 19 opposed, 1 abstain IC: The amendment does not pass. I move to suspend the bylaws to extend the meeting to 10pm. RD: We don't need to go to 10pm.
20	WT: It would be impolite to extend for the people who have stayed. IC: M2q 18 for, 5 opposed, 0 abstain MacPIRG: To clarify, the organizer isn't just there because of the state org. He works with us and gives us the training we need. Is it important for us to get our goals? Its up to you.
22	JL: You're charter states the opposite. DT: The discussion is overwhelming all of us. I think we should motion to amend the budget for the second approval of 7211\$. IC: That's what it is, we don't need to change this amount
23	RD: If its just being able to organize, there is a lot of places to go for that. We should stop conversation on this. MacPIRG: State-wide MPIRG does not determine our taskforce. No other state wide org has gender taskforce. SLK: We shouldn't question intent.
24	MacPIRG: We reached out to campus activities before our budgeting, we had a hard time communicating. We we're declined this based on "special treatment" IC: If someone's going to make a motion then make it. If not then don't.
25	JM: I met with MPIRG many times, we haven't not offered to meet with you. MacPIRG: I was referring to the rules... JM: We've discussed that many times. MacPIRG: We've tried really hard to get our information out but time stopped us from getting out what we need. We'll be back next year for additional allocations.
27	JL: There is a big difference between not hearing what we want to hear and misinformation. IC: Next is MacACLU. JK: We rec \$0 for all of it. For the speaker we want an additional allocation. ACLU: We want to apologize since we messed up with some procedures, we are a pretty new org. However we think we need money for our food events as it helps us plan for next year better.
29	CD: Do you need money for publicity? ACLU: Yeah and we're happy to use the \$12. Cory: we were just hesitant to give you money for speakers that are unknown. ACLU: We imagine that we need 275\$ for two honorariums, a different one could be from 800\$, and the last could be 600\$. JK: I amend for 970.20\$. It is the cut plus stuff you need for starting up next year. LW: I M2Q
32	19 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstain IC: Next is Mac Weekly JK: 13774.02\$ requested, we rec half for checkbook reasons. Now its \$9641.81 with the 30% cut.

	MW: I want to apologize for our snafu, there was an abrupt transition of leadership halfway through the year. The only expense we have is the contract to the printer. Those expenses are directly to campus activities. I am aware we have our add account and our printing account, I'm trying to figure out where this money comes from. I request the full amount be reinstated.
	RD: I think its not their fault. I move to approve the full amount of 13k.
	IC: Discussion.
	JZ: M2Q
	IC: Any objections?
	19 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstain
	IC: Motion passed.
	RD: I move to question on the FAC recommended 2015-12016 budget of... \$153,489.48
37	JM: If we take out for a bunch... that will leave this budget of 27k for additional allocations not counting if we have a rollover.
	18 for, 1 opposed, 0 abstain
	IC: Budget is passed.
	JK: Motion to reconsider, I forgot the flexie.
	IC: You can't. I will motion to reconsider.
39	20 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstain
40	IC: The budget is back on the table.
	WT: I make a motion to approve \$177,489,48...
	RD: It doesn't matter if we said the wrong number, we approved the full amount of the budget.
	WT: But we reconsidered.
	RD: Yes. We should move to question.
42	JZ: Looking at some numbers, 4,975\$ before rollover for additional allocations.
	JM: also new orgs will require money in the future.
	RD: I motion to table the budget and allow...
	IC: I try to keep my cool, I am very frustrated right now. I think tabling the budget is the only option. When I made the amendment to change to 30%, I was working with incorrect numbers.
43	CD: I think tabling is a good idea, we'd have to do cross-cuts. If we said more number for what we want for next year?
44	RD: That is a discussion that the FAC should have. I agree that a transition from a 50% to 30% makes things hard.
	LW: Motion to table.
	IC: Discussion tabling the budget until next week.
45	JZ: That figure was calculated for where the money went last year. The money we're adding on should be fine as its coming from MPRIG.
	IC: I want these numbers to be correct
	JL: This money we're looking at is...
	JM: No it accounts for that. But you did point out something...
	LW: I think any ambiguity should come back clear next week.
	DT: I move to question to vote on tabling this budget
	17 for, 2 opposed, 0 abstain
	IC: The motion has been tabled.
	JG: I don't want to silence wills bill. I motion to end this meeting and address Will's bill next week.
	PM: Will what do you think?
48	WT: I'm not ok with that. I would like to discuss it and get it over with.
	RD: I spoke with the guests too. There isn't a lack of time next meeting. I move to question.
	WT: I object
	IC: All those in favor of ending discussion
	11 for, 7 against, 0 abstain
	IC: We continue discussion.
	WT: I think we've had it for a week, I would like to discuss it already. If issues come up I'd like to hear them but you all had a week.
50	DT: A lot of the members have left, have some patience when everyone is here. I move to question on adjourning the meeting.
	13 for, 5 opposed, 0 abstain
	IC: Meeting adjourned.

Meeting ends 21:52