I. Call to Order/Roll-Call/Quorum

Quorum was met and the meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

II. Swearing in of Representatives

None

III. Singing of the OSU Alma Mater

Representative Stuart: I move to forgo singing the Alma Mater.
Representative Rosoff: Second
Representative Stuart: I feel like we have a lot to talk about and I’d like to stay business and not get sang songy.
Representative Struthers: We have guests can we sing for them?
Speaker Hatlen: When was the last time you heard the Alma Mater.
Angelo Gomez: I don’t think I’ve ever heard it.
Representative Stuart: I move to forgo my movement.
A voice vote was taken to forgo. The motion failed.
Representative Setzler arrived at 7:04 p.m.
Speaker Hatlen: Well done. Thank you for sharing in the experience.

IV. Approval of Minutes from Wednesday May 2, 2012

Representative Brantley: I move to approve.
Representative Robb: second
Representative Vanderwall: Third
Voice vote to approve the minutes. The motion passed.

V. Standing Committee Reports

Representative Struthers: I need to see ways and means. We have some budget request changes including increasing the pay for government relations assist for DC trip and OSA travel fund request.

VI. Joint Committee Reports

Joint Committee of Congressional Correspondence
Representative Robb: Yesterday senate met and they passed unanimously the ASOSU HSRC separation act and that will be going on to the president for signature.

VII. Delegate Reports

Representative Rossoff: We’re in the process of making a woman’s coalition ally group. We’re focusing on gender and equality at this point we’re looking at inequality in every sense. I’m just
saying this to raise awareness and extend the invitation to the early organizational meetings. They’re Wednesday at 5 right now in Stag 111.

Speaker Hatlen: Where our class is for AHE 410 is.

Representative Rosoff: Feel free to drop in.

VIII. Old Business & Second Readings

HR-03.05 “Campus Survey”

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I move to forgo second readings.

Representative Setzler: second

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I don’t think we need to hear it read aloud again.

Speaker Hatlen: Dissention? Hearing none we’ll move into discussion.

Representative Struthers: I guess I have a question since we have guests here we didn’t read this but it’s asking for transition plan December 31, 2012. If I could yield to them, is that feasible?

Angelo Gomez: We have a contract to assess the entire university and they started last summer the purpose is to do this comprehensive plan to make the university as accessible as possible. The idea of having an evaluation plan done this year is actually completely impossible. They started last summer with external environment and just got the report and put it on our website it’s taken health complication in the people in the firm it’s taken a long time to assess the external environment. If you’re talking about all the building on campus that’s a tall order. The firm will tell you they can’t do it in the period of time. It’s very expensive to assess the entire campus if they asked for and hold up to $2 million to assess all the building we think it’s not the wisest approach. A wiser approach might be to figure out the areas of greater need. We might produce data we may never get to it too much data for buildings that aren’t used that much. The better use might be to prioritize, the comprehensive plan is under way but will take several years to get done.

Representative Struthers: Could you introduce yourself with the position. What would you say is a good timeframe for when the evaluation could be done by?

Angelo Gomez: Director of Equity Inclusion, I guess I’d have to rely on the input of the firm to tell us that they see this as a several year project at a minimum a few years to get this done. This talks about a self-evaluation and transition plan. The university did a transit on plan as director by the ADA act in the 1990 we have records showing that. It’s helpful for you to know that the transition plan has a limited focus we have a much broader focus. Transition plan was designed to help entities in the early 90’s help give them time into transition into ADA accessible. The plan was supposed to identify the instances to make the program accessible was to do a physical improvement to make the program as accessible and going way beyond that. We’re accessing the buildings not just those areas where we can’t move a program we’re making the campus as accessible as possible. It’s a much larger undertaking than your easing.
Representative Setzler: I’m confused by what you say with paying and working with people evaluating campus you wanted to evaluate the places to be accessible and on the other hand you want to make all campus accessible I’m confused by the two ideas.

Angelo Gomez: We want to do the entire campus but we can’t do the entire campus by December 31, 2012. We want to strategically do it in stages and where we need to do improvements and not use all the money to assess all buildings all at once. Rather use some of the money to access the buildings now and fix the things immediately as we identify rather than use all the money now.

Representative Davis: Please excuse me I’m not alter abled but if you do the survey previous and found there are non-ADA building why weren’t they fixed and made compliant? The second survey is long overdue having it done by the 31 should happen because it should’ve been done.

Angelo Gomez: The transition plan was not to identify every accessibility issue it was to identify those instance where the only way to provide program access was to do physical improvement. The program was physical access not every building must be accessible that’s the ultimate goal it did not direct you access every building you must identify where the program access is to do physical.

Representative Davis: I remember an email that if a building has to be accessible doesn’t that mean there are classes and office where people with alter abled situation have to visit them as a program. It would make sense that all buildings would have to be accessible back in the 90s.

Angelo Gomez: The ADA recognized us that it was virtually impossible task to expect all public entities to make every building fully accessible that takes a long time.

Representative Davis: Why not buildings that are accessible.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Is that germane to the resolution?

Speaker Hatlen: Let’s focus on the assessment and transition plan.

Angelo Gomez: This is a several year process and we’re trying to be strategic about it and to do improvements as fast as possible.

Representative Setzler: I yield to Jeffery Evans.

Jeffery Evans: This concept of g programmatic access came out of section 504 that did dictate the programmatic access the ADA was passed because pragmatic access was failure because universities used that term to not make it accessible the ADA passed in 1990 required any entity to complete a self-evaluation in all programs and facilities and to develop a comprehensive plan to transition to compliance. Now that’s a complicated subject because transition agreed you can’t do it all at one time especially dealing with capital won a 7 year timeline. It was recognized if you meditated on a certain date and didn’t allow that time where capital can be modified. That was the focus of the transition plan the university has conducted a plan is true. The fact is that I was inadequate I have a copy of about 8 pages it was not adequate then and is not adequate now. It requires comprehensive plan to be done by 1992 not an incremental plan which is what they’d like
to do. The argument is that 2 and a half mill dollars is also misleading at this current time we are building a 15 million dollar track and field stadium before we know how to take on this campus what needs to be done we need to find out what needs to be done we can’t do that if we piece it a at time. I understand the desire to take time, the problem is what are the most important areas of campus are we going to say Kidder is more important than MacGruder hall. That doesn’t apply to the student that wants to get a doctorate in vet medicine who can’t function in MacGruder hall. Who’s to say that’s less important? The plan of the assessment is that we can modify what is going to apply of a period of time and to address the funding question. For example if we were to go to the legislator and say we need this money to modify building and say 5 years later and we need more money our fear is that legislators are going to rebel and say much is this going to cost. We have to prioritize what comes first and what comes second we can do that unless we know what’s wrong with this campus. We have to make choices for example if you need an accessible classroom and that’s not necessarily feasible we have to have other alternatives and we don’t know what those alternative are. Until we know what needs to be done in this case. The university doesn’t want to do the long term assessment because they’re embarrassed by the extent of the report they just released. Its extensive it involves building that just opened. It involves buildings that accessibility are not compliant themselves. So of course the university doesn’t want to develop a plant that will identify 25 thousand additional violations. That would be an embarrassment and put the university in a bad legal situation. It has gotten this bad because in action indifference failed priorities etc. You know it drives me crazy because we complained to the governor’s office in 2009 and Angelo wrote us a letter saying we know of no instance in which this campus does not comply with ADA. Now we have a report that we have because of the ASA that shows there are 5,500 in the external areas how much worse is this campus and do students with disabilities deserve to have the same opportunity to education as those who don’t have disabilities? 20 years ago this plan was supposed to have been done and all readily achievable and fixed accomplished by 1995. That’s the bulk of my comments Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I think after hearing a lot of communication and Angelo Angelo Gomez: offering insight. We all want the campus to be accessible but that can’t happen. We’re looking for a specific date where the university but a communication between the students and university so we can see transparency so us a students know the administration is working toward something up until now you’ve enlightened us to a lot of thing we didn’t know about that. Representative Phou: I interned for them and helped produce the survey for the campus over summer. People are thinking that something isn’t ADA compliant it has to be universally compliant that is a hard thing to say as long as the building has one path its useable for that. To say it’s universally compliant it really tedious to do that. This bill since there are different groups of people working for the groups on campus there’s Mike Blair in the university facilities office. There’s Gabe and Angelo working for this. It’s going up to a
construction crew and saying fix some pot holes they’re already doing something it’s a big process not only do you have to identify all the barriers on the sidewalk but how you’re going to fix and that itself is a task right there. You can’t say that’s compliant and you have to make a plan and cost estimate for it.

Representative Struthers: I wanted to thank Mr. Gomez that the time frame we put in wont work I move to amend this resolution of the first Be It Hereby resolved that it read “The ASOSU request that the University provide to the ASOSU Speaker of the House and ASOSU President a timeframe when the consultant believes the self-evaluation end transition plan will be completed, by June 1, 2012.”

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): Second

Representative Struthers: I believe it was Dunn who was talking about students involved in the discussion on that process the date we have on there if the consultant t says December 31 is too soon our resolution is wrong, if we can be involved in that discussion we can help them stay in that timeframe that’s the point of our student government here we’re working with the university on student issues and this is a student issue saying they have a hard date when a consultant says it’s impossible its best. I know things take time especially on a university this big. It’s going to take time. I’d like to see the day the consultant would have this done by.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): I think this does go well with increasing discussions with the university and us I want to make it clear that they provide us with a timeframe by the end of the current administration.

Representative Stuart: I’m curious if Mr. Gomez thinks we will have a date for the completed resolution from which we’re not trying to get a concrete.

Representative Struthers: It’s not asking the date it’s the timeframe I would see the consultant would be able to complete. It. It’s not the exact end date.

Representative Stuart: But if we’re not trying to do a comprehensive evaluation and it could take decades and decades because we’re not trying to do a comprehensive because you were saying it’s unrealistic.

Angelo Gomez: The goal is to do a comprehensive evaluation plan. I like the idea of getting the youth in the consultant. And working worth ASOSU and coming back. ASOSU has a seat on the committee. ASA has a seat on that committee, three seats. We’d like to engage with you on and see input on. The goal is to have a comprehensive plan.

Representative Stuart: Does it seem realistic?

Angelo Gomez: I think so. That’s exactly what we want to do we do want to do a comprehensive plan we share the goal.

Representative Rosoff: June 1 that’s just how long from now?

Representative Struthers: I can speak that’s the date the new administration comes in if they get sooner or around then that’s the old administration to the new administration.

Representative Stuart: What would you like to see happen if we aren’t satisfied if with the data you receive?
Angelo Gomez: I’d like to be as aggressive as possible on this I’d like to see there would be discussion between us and I could tell you what’s realistic and what’s the most we could shoot for and get your support to make it happen. I’d like to be collaboration to get as much done as we can.

Representative Struters: I call to question on the motion to amend.

Speaker Hatlen: Dissention? Hearing none we’ll go on and vote for the amendment as restated by Mr. Struters

A voice vote was taken to amend the main motion. The motion passed.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Call to question on the resolution.

Representative Struters: Dissention.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): I move to amend the final be it hereby resolved that The University consult with the ASOSU on the matter of completing a comprehensive assessment and transition plan, as well as provides the ASOSU with an overview of how they plan on prioritizing assessments and improvements.

Representative Robb: second

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): That’s to see how we feel about your methodology.

Gabe: I work for Angelo I can speak to that right now we’ve had a lot of conversation what the best approach would be we created the scope of work to include the exterior and that’s on the website they recommended to get the best as quickly as we could.

They’ve told us maybe we need to assess the residence hall one thing they’re trying to do is come up with the best practice and go far beyond what is minimal according to ADA. A lot of the recommendation are things the report the more kinds of building they can assess the more practices we’ll get in the university. That’s more important than the number of buildings maybe we only need to assess a few buildings. The more diversity the better that shows we’ve thought about the next round to assess.

Speaker Hatlen: Any further discussion? We’ll move to a vote on the amendment.

Clarifications with that?

A voice vote was taken on the amendment. The motion passed

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I move to end discussion on HR-03.05.

Representative Brantley: Second

A voice vote to end discussion. The motion passed.

A roll call vote was taken on HR-03.05. The motion passed. 8-2-1

HR-03.06 “Accessible Housing”

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I move to forgo second reading.

Representative Brantley: second

Speaker Hatlen: Dissention? Hearing none we’ll move into discussion.
Representative Struthers: The first hereby resolved by ASOSU says by May 1, 2012 we’re obviously past that date I have no idea what we should put for a date there but we need to discuss that.

Representative Setzler: I was going to raise the same issue.

Representative Robb: Since the entire thing has to do with housing I guess something done over beginning or middle of summer June maybe July 1?

Representative Phou: Have we had contact with anyone in UHDS yet?

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I’ve received contact from UHDS. They have specific response and I’m going to read them I tried to get them to Miss Wolff but there was mix up and it didn’t happen. I spoke with Dan Larson the associate director of UHDS and spoke on behalf of Truman.

Representative Stuart: I’d like to yield the floor to Jeffery Evans.

Jeffery Evans: Fact, I don’t know of any residence hall that complies with the ADA which put the student with disabilities at a disadvantage that necessitates to looking off campus there’s nothing for students off campus to identity appropriate housing. Some argue that should be the student responsibility. If you were to call as residential apartment manager or any facility commercial or resident and ask if they comply with the Americans with disabilities act that falls on the student to travel to the facility that’s lie that not accessible to determine if its accessible some who have disabilities that could be a daunting problem we are looking at how should we say equal opportunity here and sometimes we have to go above and beyond to have an equal opportunity what we’re looking at is that some response for this and for the organization on campus most responsible for housing it’s appropriate for housing there are other universities that do this can’t name them off hand but I think what you need to do is ask yourself it’s this a problem yes or no. And then ask yourself do we went to take responsibility to find a problem that may or may not be the way the res was written if members were concerned about being too old perhaps it might be appropriate to create study group through the accessibly affairs task force director for having a couple interns to take a look at the case. It’s a problem a serious problem. I’m concerned that housing and dining seems to think they don’t have a part in the solution and if it’s kind of incumbent on the body to give direction to see what direction to go.

Representative Alvarez arrived at 7:45 p.m.

Representative Setzler: While I love the idea of housing being more accessible to students I have recently talked to RHA and they’ve told me that UHDS does make accommodation to student with disabilities and I’m aware there is a student living in Hawley Buxton that is blind.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: That’s antidotal evidence regardless in my opinion. We can’t say UHDS is ADA compliant because of one student.

Speaker Hatlen: There are accommodations being made but no referral service that this resolution is being talked about.
Representative Setzler: I believe that this is a need for this and the reason I was bringing that up because I talked to RHA and it’s relevant to how students are living on campus.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I agree a referral system would be amazing however UHDS clearly states for lack of a better term it’s no their job but they’re willing to help us. But the bulk would come from the task force director or somebody in ASOSU.

Representative Phou: I think it would be beneficial if we had we only have two groups that say UHDS should report to that. We should add COSID and the AUAC to this bill. UHDS reporting to us I don’t see a point none of us are CAPS certified.

Speaker Hatlen: There’s no reporting lines its working in concordance with.

Representative Phou: COSID has to do with the program accessible on campus. AUAC they work with the build structure and campus. It would be a great idea. I move to add be it hereby resolved that they report to those committees. To add more, I move that we add be it hereby resolved by the ASOSU that the ASOSU request that with the ASOSU, COSID, and AUAC.

Representative Vanderwall: Second

Representative Phou: it would be beneficial to have that perspective since both COSID and AUAC work directly about this subject.

Representative Vanderwall: I agree.

Representative Robb: I wanted to make sure this was anew be it hereby resolved.

Representative Stuart: I yield to Jeffery

Jeffery Evans: If its left to COSID or the advisory committee, chances are it won’t be done because COSID has been around for 30 years and accomplished nothing. The advisory committee hasn’t accomplished much I suggest.

Speaker Hatlen: This would be in addition to the other two groups it would add a couple new partners rather than dictating it all to COSID and AUIC.

Representative Setzler: We as a body earlier this year did pass a resolution saying we didn’t agree with the COSI or AUITF because they don’t have enough people with students with disabilities or people trained on it.

Representative Alvarez: That’s I don’t think I would support that sort of amendment with what happened to COSID and AUITF.

Representative Stuart: I would like to yield the floor to Emily Colvin.

Emily Colvin: Your bill condemning the COSID coup you pulled ASOSU representation out of both of these boards this wouldn’t do anything for you. We aren’t represented there anymore.

Representative Brantley: We already have representative on as mentioned in this bill the point of it is to try and get more people on campus involved in this whether they have something to bring to the table or not. It’s that other people with opinions or knowledge and to bring them to the table or not help but let them be involved in the process.

Representative Alvarez: I think that bringing the additional people it would be a viewpoint that would be slanted and wouldn’t help any negotiation because it would be tilted
towards the administration’s view of the compliant issues I don’t think it would be beneficial.

Representative Phou: Can I refer to Gabe and ask him who the members of AUAC. What students and faculty?

Gabe: AUAC has staff faculty and students on it with or without disabilities. The caveat to that we’re in the process of changing it now we plan on inviting members it’s not set in stone at this point. We have regular attending members three students with disabilities, one faculty member a number of staff members, I could get more specific numbers if I thought it through.

Representative Stuart: I yield the floor to Jeffery Evans if that arrangement is enough?

Jeffery Evans: No it isn’t.

Representative Struthers: Is this germane to the amendment?

Speaker Hatlen: The amendment is to if we should add COSID and AUAC as contributors to the contribution of this referral service. Be as specific as possible.

Jeffery Evans: Currently we don’t participate in the advisory committee we would be sure if the students vote will be heard as loudly as possible.

Representative Stuart: How would you like to see this bill changed or properly amended?

Speaker Hatlen: We can discuss that when it comes to the main motion this is just as to whether or not add the two groups.

Representative Alvarez: Call to question

Speaker Hatlen: Is there dissention? Hearing none we’ll go to a vote to add a new be it hereby resolved that would work with COSID and AUAC.

A voice vote was taken on the amendment.

Division.

A hand vote was taken. The motion failed. 4-6-2

Representative Struthers: I have a small concern I’m in favor of the intent but my concern is if the cost will incur. If I’m not mistaken I’d ask Dr. Roper UHDS is an auxiliary of the university they have to pay with what they raise in revenues students live on campus. I have a concern if this will incur a lot amount of money that cost will be passed onto UHDS. I lived on campus for 5 years, go ahead and laugh, so I know how much it can cost to live on campus. I’m concerned what this will increase for them living on campus. Without seeing actual cost to create and maintain this will have to check and new places if they come up I love the intent, my head can’t wrap around the cost is a big thing and for this to effect students I couldn’t vote in favor without knowing how it would affect students.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I agree with what you said this is directed at UHDS and said that they would not head up a referral service and would be willing to help with that and possibly even sponsor it if they have the means if we pass this it’s not going to do anything.

Representative Davis: I would like to make sure we agree that civil rights before money I agree with what Representative Dunn just said finding a organization on campus but I don’t think when talking about civil rights we should put money first.
Representative Stuart: I yield to Jeffery Evans.

Jeffery Evans: To go back if there’s concern perhaps this be referred to the task force director for this investigation because honestly it will involve a cost and would need to be as self-sustaining as possible is this important is there a need and if the body wants to take some action.

Representative Alvarez: I agree with Representative Davis with civil right issue. Even if UHDS did say they would not do it its still good to voice what needs to be said and there’s the desire by people to get this done.

Representative Robb: Over the last few comments about this the need for this is important Rep Davis said it succinctly when it comes to it civil right issue the rights itself comes over the dollar amount but the issue of who to do this having ASOSU task force possible looking into that and other organizations to get this ball rolling and really the way I see this doing bring this up with discussion possibly tabling this and rewrite this and get an outline to the task force get it going and then continue on next year.

Speaker Hatlen: Do you think the organization of some referral service would be able to be absorbed by the task force next year?

Emily Colvin: The position would have to be reevaluated a little but there may be supporting issue in the branches to help a single person couldn’t pull it off. It could be taken on by students.

Representative Struthers: I first want to address the comment, I wasn’t trying to attack anyone’s civil rights I was just trying to say students accessible to higher education bringing up the issue of cost. The speaker stole my question. I would ask to table HR-03.06 and to put it at the end of old business if they want to work on amendment and readdress it then.

Speaker Hatlen: Table this until the end of old business and come back to it.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Second

Representative Robb: This is a good idea w have the base for this and getting the wording correctly.

A voice vote to table HR-03.06 to the end of old business was taken.

Division

A hand vote to table HR-03.06 was taken. The motion passed.

HR-03.08 “Intercollegiate Wheelchair Basketball Program”

Representative Brantley: I move to forgo second reading.

Speaker Hatlen: Is there dissention?

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Point of Privilege. May I use the restroom?

Speaker Hatlen: You may. Thank you for asking do you want the hall pass?

Representative Stuart: Last thing I heard about this we were going to try to discover if people want to play on our program do we have movement on that?

Speaker Hatlen: I have no new knowledge on that.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): I believe Dunn was supposed to look into that.
Representative Setzler: I contacted the athletic advisory committee to see if they were help us out because it’s not an NCAA sport they can’t help us on that.

Representative Alvarez: There’s a wheelchair club team. Does anyone know if they were talked to?

Representative Robb: I yield the floor to Gabe.

Gabe: I would suggest talking to the wheelchair basketball club about the interest.

Representative Alvarez: I move to table this to next week so we can figure it out.

Representative Stuart: I yield the floor to Emily.

Speaker Hatlen: I’ll come back to your motion Brad.

Emily Colvin: The intent of this resolution is that students support there being another option at this point you can’t have someone on the basketball team there is a conversation to have this its come to Ed Ray’s attention if students say they believe in this it would be the beginning of the conversation. Its does Oregon State want to be one of the schools to push for this to happen.

Speaker Hatlen: There was a question asked did you talk to anyone about this resolution?

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: No.

Representative Alvarez: It would be helpful to get their input on this tabling would be beneficial.

Representative Vanderwall: Second

Ravi: It might be best to assign someone to see who’s in charge of the club so next week you don’t have to retable this.

Representative Brantley: That would fall to the writer of the bill which would be Terra.

Representative Setzler: In the last thirty seconds I gave my contact information to Gabe and he’s emailing me as we speak.

A voice vote to table HR-0308 to next week with the understanding that Miss Setzler will find out more information was taken. The motion passed.

HR-03.09 “Parking Equality Act”

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I move to forgo second reading

Speaker Hatlen: Dissention?

Representative Brantley: What was the reasoning behind tabling this last time.

Speaker Hatlen: We tabled this because Jeffery Evans couldn’t be in attendance.

Representative Brantley: I’d like to yield to Jeffery Evans to speak to it validity.

Jeffery Evans: There’s not enough disabled parking on campus and persons with disabilities are required to pay the same amount as staff and other students who have a much larger choice of parking spaces we estimate it about anywhere from 2000-300 times its not equitable for people with disabilities to pay a premium for parking and all we’re saying give us equal ratio of parking the same fees. It’s not fair to charge the same fees

Representative Stuart: Could I yield to Mr. Gomez or if he or Gabe had anything to add to this question.
**Angelo Gomez:** We presently have the assessment data from the firm that did parking and talking to Gabe the committee should take up its very next meeting the question how we use that data and identify where we move forward as quickly as possible to improve parking what really that solve this issue is address the parking and do it as quickly as possible. We have a proposal in to put censors to assess the utilization. Gabe The censors will give real-time information to a smart phone user or website. To tell them where the closest spot is.

**Representative Setzler:** The issue is making more accessible parking but because that’s not going to happen immediately we lower the cost of the service because people are paying proportionally more.

**Representative Stuart:** I’d like to yield to Jeffery Evans.

**Jeffery Evans:** Follow up question, would I hear in what you’re saying the university may be willing to exempt people from parking fees or prorate it substantially in the meantime.

**Angelo Gomez:** I think that’s something we could look into. I don’t know the implications we would have to talk to taps we could look into it parking is not controlled by our office.

**Speaker Hatlen:** if that was a conversation with taps would that be something your office would sign off on in the meantime that inadequacy of parking?

**Angelo Gomez:** I would say we would pursue it I don’t know the ramification its hard for me to commit to if we need to improve parking for people with disabilities we’ll look into whether we can reduce or eliminate the over a period of time or increase.

**Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy):** I have a question for Mr. Evans the time more to park it seem your taking the number of disabled spots by the total number of spots is that as good as comparing the ratio of disabled student to the students?

**Jeffery Evans:** We don’t know how many disabled students there are. We’re not sure those figures are correct we’ve gotten four different parking total and we’ve asked of that information.

**Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy):** What would be a fair ratio of disabled space to not disabled spaces. The logic in the bill is for space.

**Jeffery Evans:** There are approx. 9400 parking space on campus give or take best as we can determine no more than 30 comply with the disabilities act.

**Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy):** I agree there are more parking space but the number here make it more feasible.

**Jeffery Evans:** Based on the information we had that’s the best we could do.

**Representative Alvarez:** Gomez seems to believe more should be done to help with the people with disabilities than what this bill is in support of this belief and adds student to the belief that more should be done it would be fair to pass this

**Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy):** The bill the only real action is that we suggest it university provide free parking until more equitable parking arise. That’s very unclear as to what that means
Representative Setzler: As far as I know it means we don’t control how taps controls its fees so we can’t do anything about that. The reason is its big issue because campus is so inaccessible to people need to use a car to get around campus and when there isn’t parking it makes it that much harder.

Representative Struthers: I haven’t been listening 100% I want to know if it’s been addressed, the university is moving parking away from the center of campus but keeping ADA parking in the center I hope those would be free. Could you address how the parking moving away from the central part of campus to have the accessibility parking.

Gabe I can say that we’re advocating that when we remove parking we replace the spaces we can’t remove ADA spaces when the student experience center is built we need to replace those spaces somewhere on campus.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I agree with the overarching theme of the resolution sends out there is a issue on campus however I think the majority of the statements are grossly exaggerated due to the fact that there’s an extreme ratio of disabled students to abled students and that’s why I’m not in support of this.

Representative Alvarez: Perhaps we could table this a week to work on the be it hereby resolved aspects we could specify taps in it to say the university they are more the ones with control marking. We can try to reach out to taps to see if we could get more specific information. We should definitely try to pass and if this body thinks that the hereby resolved is too unclear or blows out of proportion.

Speaker Hatlen: I would offer a compromise we could specify taps in the last hereby resolved an strike any whereas that might seem the factual information may or may not be correct the idea of the bill stays intact there’s a lot of support but we don’t pass a res that doesn’t provide factual resolution.

Brant I’d like to table this until next week with the intent that we’ve brought up problems with pretty much very part of it.

Representative Robb: Second

Representative Struthers: Call to question

Speaker Hatlen: Dissention?

A voice vote was taken to table HR-03.09 until next week. The motion passed.

Representative Davis: I move for a five minute recess.

Representative Struthers: Second

Representative Davis: I think everyone is getting restless. It would help everyone calm.

Voice vote for a 5 minute recess.

Division

A hand vote was taken. The motion passed.

The body recessed for 5 minutes.

Speaker Hatlen: Thank you for staying on topic and cutting the chit chat. Thank you thank you you thank you we’re onto 03.10

HR-03.10 “Accessible Communications”
Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I move to forgo second reading.

Representative Brantley: Second

Speaker Hatlen: Dissention?

Representative Brantley: The first and fourth whereases seem to say the same thing.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: I’d like to yield to Gabe for insight.

Gabe: When I read this I was really enthusiastic about it this is my expertise areas I would offer any of my assistance about having conversations about making documents and websites accessible on campus.

Speaker Hatlen: Thank you extending your services. And being enthusiastic too.

Representative Davis: Call to question

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Dissention

Speaker Hatlen: Good try though!

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Last time there were discrepancies about what was required and how we were failing those requirements in the ASOSU website and I can’t speak to that. As far as I understood the last time we talked about this we are in fact pretty much in compliance with standards. But I obviously have limited experience with this.

Gabe: So I couldn’t speak to that without reviewing the materials I’ve seen the website whoever does that it’s the university system for website and that’s pretty accessible thing and the website looks like it’s in good shape. If you go to the accessibility website we have an it accessibility policy a whole year of developing it and what standards to follow section 508 is a thirteen year old standard it was built for technology that existed years ago. I suggest the wcag that’s the one the university website should follow

Speaker Hatlen: This pertains to ASOSU and the document.

Representative Struthers: I’d like to amend to this resolution the addition of be it further resolved that the ASOSU executive shall work with Gabe Merrill’s office of equity inclusion to get the website up to standards.

Brant second

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: A friendly amendment can we say to make things as accessible as possible? I’d like to make a friendly amendment not only we make them accessible to ADA standards but as accessible as possible because we can make them more accessible.

Representative Setzler: There’s no such thing as a friendly amendment.

Representative Struthers: I’ll accept the amendment.

Speaker Hatlen: Is there unanimous consent? The amendment is so changed.

Representative Struthers: Be it Further Resolved by the ASOSU That the ASOSU executive branch work with the office of equity inclusion to make the ASOSU documents ADA compliant.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: And as accessible as possible.

A voice vote was taken for the amendment. The motion passed.
Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: So with what Gabe has enlightened ups with many of the whereas statements are subpar in regards to the last be it further resolved we should have the authors work with Gabe so it better fits a model that will represent the actual resolution? The resolved parts. And I would like to make that a motion.

Speaker Hatlen: Did you put a timeline on that?
Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: No and I don’t want to. I move to table this resolution so the authors can work with Gabe to make it sound better.

Representative Phou: Second

A voice vote was taken to table HR-03.10. The motion passed.

**HR-03.06 “Accessible Housing”**

Representative Struthers: I move to amend the resolution as stated

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE ASOSU THAT:**
The ASOSU Congress directs the ASOSU Accessibility Task Force Director to work with UHDS to create a referral service for students with disabilities that certifies ADA-compliant, accessible housing in the Linn-Benton Area.

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE ASOSU THAT:**
The ASOSU Congress requests that the Task Force Director work with the Able Student Alliance in the creation of said referral service.

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE ASOSU THAT:**
The ASOSU Congress requests that the Task Force Director work with the ASOSU Senate Student Academics and Activities Committee in the creation of said referral service.

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE ASOSU THAT:**
The ASOSU Congress directs the incoming ASOSU Accessibility Task Force Director to continue the work of the current task Force Director on said referral service.

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE ASOSU THAT:**
The ASOSU Congress directs the 2012-2012 Executive Administration to provide support to the ASOSU Accessibility Task Force Director where possible.

Brant Second. I think that’s a very good job to saying what we want to accomplish and take the burden off. It sounds good.

Speaker Hatlen: Does anyone need clarification on what Mr. Struthers said?
Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Is this removing the current be it hereby resolved?

Representative Struthers: I reworded all the herby resolved and added to.

Speaker Hatlen: Further clarification before Dunn confused us all?

A voice vote was taken on the amendment. The motion passed.

Representative Struthers: Call to question.

Speaker Hatlen: Dissention?

A roll call vote was taken on HR-03.06. The motion passed. 9-3-0

**IX. Other Old Business**
X. New Business & First Readings

I move to change the order of the agenda so HR-03.12 is before HB- 03.03.

Representative Struthers: Second

Speaker Hatlen: These are in first reading. Is there any dissention?

HR-03.12 “Accessibility Mediation”

Clerk Wolff read HR-03.12

Representative Struthers: Point of Order. The be it hereby resolved needs to be changed to by the ASOSU if all three signatures remain on the resolution.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Is that really a point of order?

Speaker Hatlen: I’ll ask, is the intent just the house or entire ASOSU?

Representative Rosoff: This being the first time going through I’m not sure what else that would entail or if its ok. Can we speak for the senate?

Speaker Hatlen: It originates here and then goes to senate and the president for signature. If it’s a house resolution it just goes to me.

Representative Rosoff: I would have it represent ASOSU as a whole.

Speaker Hatlen: we’ll strike out the thirds house and representatives from the be it further resolved sections any dissention in the body? Thank you for making it easy.

Representative Rosoff: I’ll go ahead and answer questions.

Representative Setzler: In the second be it further resolved as far as I’m aware and I attend the meetings, there’s at least one ASOSU person on their executive board as well as many members of this house as a part of already.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Is that a question?

Representative Setzler: Kind of. Why is it included?

Representative Rosoff: the intent of that resolution is that an official representative be chosen for the house to represent the interest of the house.

Representative Setzler: Can we amend it as such then?

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Next week.

Speaker Hatlen: amendments we can take care of next week or any rewordings can happen through this week.

Representative Setzler: I also wonder why the final whereas it mentions it is pertaining to litigation and as far as I’m aware nothing is going into litigation it’s all criminal proceedings. It’s really not relevant.

Representative Phou: It’s trying to encourage mediation if it’s going into litigation.

Representative Rosoff: If it’s not going into litigation we would like to see mediation before.

Representative Davis: Could you discuss your opinion why mediation is better?

Representative Rosoff: I would like to see for direct communication if possible rather than parties looking to a higher authority that many don’t represent either in a best interest.

Representative Stuart: Do you have any idea why those higher authorities or what it would look like wouldn’t represent our best interest?
Representative Rosoff: There have been many examples in history a ruling for either side is a negative ruling. There are plenty of rulings.

Representative Stuart: Can you give an example of a time when only mediation is used in civil rights issue?

Representative Rosoff: I would not recommend that only mediation would be used. Alongside mediation attorneys should always be consulted.

Representative Davis: Have you spoken to anyone in the administration?

Representative Rosoff: I’ve attempted to talk to both side if they’ve been willing to mediate and I’m not at liberty to discuss that.

Representative Phou: Can I speak to mediation in general? If anyone looks to civil rights to ADA and lawsuits against a body or university mediation I think would make more sense mediation focusses on corrective action for however being sued to take corrective actions in a lawsuit it involved a money settlement with the plaintiff and they would receive the money settlement. The people being effected doesn’t receive the money settlement.

Representative Rosoff: Can I move to have a second reading happen two weeks today?

Representative Setzler: Second

Representative Rosoff: I’m going to be out of town next week lobbying for student rights and I’d like to be here when second reading happens.

Speaker Hatlen: Discussion?

A voice vote to table two weeks from today was taken. The motion passed.

Representative Vanderwall: Thank you for coming.

Speaker Hatlen: You’re welcome back anytime!

HB-03.03 “Abstaining Vote”

Clerk Wolff read HB-03.03.

Representative Alvarez: I think it would be good to know it doesn’t have to be a detailed answer you can say personal or monetary. The whole point is to people aren’t to conform but to abstain per the standing rules. It says any reason is still acceptable it’s to let the body know why.

Speaker Hatlen: Do you know of other bodies that have this rule?

Representative Setzler: I saw a bill come up earlier this week and asked Van Drimmen across the united states some bodies have this rule and some don’t.

Speaker Hatlen: When I was a senator at Mount Hood Community College we had a conversation to pass something when someone abstained they didn’t have to say verbally why they abstained but in written record they could see why they abstained.

Representative Struthers: I believe our own students committee have that rule as well.

Representative Alvarez: In SIFC if we abstained we stated why.

Representative Davis: This applies to roll call vote?

Representative Alvarez: Any abstention. It doesn’t take long why you abstained but it doesn’t make sense for amendments. It would make more sense for roll call.
Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: rule 2 subsection 3 says they must abstain from those two votes. It doesn’t say if they can abstain from other things.

Representative Alvarez: If they don’t want to choose a position it would be interesting to know. It prevents so people become fully informed.

Representative Rosoff: Might such a resolution embarrasses those who don’t have enough information?

Representative Alvarez: You could say that would be preventative part so people inform themselves on the bills. If we’re all here to make position on issues. You can say it’s a personal matter any abstention is allowed.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: On that note when we bring this up for second reading would you bring up rep are required to state. Because I feel like requiring it but having the ability to say its person isn’t going to clarify a whole lot.

Representative Brantley: So if you were to open to that changing this to add another section to the statues that says it your requests or given the opportunity to state why you’ve abstained then what’s the point?

Speaker Hatlen: This is for the standing rules.

Representative Alvarez: It could be you don’t have to support it but the speaker you could perhaps say that member on why they abstain and the person could decline its just makes a more open and gets them to explain. They could decline but I’m not supportive of that because I’d like to get rid of abstentions that aren’t personal or monetary matters.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): Third whereas the rule 2 section 3 doesn’t say that abstentions are used in personal or monetary interest. That’s the only time you’re required to abstain. I’m curious the intent of the last clause in the whereas.

Representative Alvarez: The statutes, the reason that aren’t for the point of abstentions aren’t personal matters or monetary matters.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): The standing rules you have to abstain that’s the only case you can abstain.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Questions, questions, questions.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): Could you clarify the more context in the quote of the first whereas statement?

Representative Alvarez: In my eyes that intent of the standing rules when it says they’re required to in my mind the point of what they’re trying to say in the standing rules.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): I disagree with that assessment.

Representative Robb: What qualifies as a lot?

Speaker Hatlen: Oh my gosh. I mean that’s a good question.

Representative Alvarez: In my mind it was a lot.

Representative Stuart: Would you be willing to change the wording to make it less obscure and bring it back next time clear of grammatical mistakes and obscurities?

Representative Brantley: Point of Information. Can I ask a question? What part is obscure?

Representative Stuart: Requirements, a lot, allow.
Representative Struthers: I move to end first reading.
Representative Alvarez: I move to table this for two weeks.
Speaker Hatlen: if there’s no more question we’ll end first reading and yes I’ll entertain that motion. Second from everyone.
A voice vote was taken to table HB-03.03 for two weeks. The motion passed.
HR-03.13 “Anti-Smoking Ban Condemnation”
Clerk Wolff read HR-03.13
Representative Brantley: Why if all of the hereby resolves is about representatives is this pushed to everyone else?
Speaker Hatlen: That’s just formatting
Representative Alvarez: I just messed that up.
Ass Can you tell me where the U.S. Constitution or Oregon Constitution where smoking is alright.
Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn; Are you aware that you call it a choice in the same whereas?
Representative Struthers: How is it a right?
Representative Alvarez: I couldn’t get the correct article I bet this issue if there a right to ban the supreme court would reject that down.
Speaker Hatlen: That’s in New York right now
Representative Setzler: There are bans for smoking other things.
Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn; On the fourth whereas can you speak on the ban on smoking and speak on properly enforce.
Representative Alvarez: You can smoke a certain feet in front to of buildings. I don’t see any enforcement of people smoking in front of the buildings. The quad from my experience.
Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn; How would you like to see said enforced?
Representative Alvarez: I don’t know how you would do it. Rally the students around it.
Representative Vanderwall: if it’s not really being enforced its it wasting resources. It says it not being properly enforced and then that its wasting resources.
Representative Alvarez: if they put the ban in place if they’re putting resources to enforce the ban it would be department of public safety on smoking.
Representative Vanderwall: Do you know for the current building within 20 feet what resources are being used to enforce that.
Representative Stuart: Would you be willing to hold this off until Joe Taylor comes back in the fall I bet he would speak wonders to this.
Representative Alvarez: By then it would be too late.
Representative Stuart: He’s in Spain.
Speaker Hatlen: He doesn’t have a cell phone but we can Skype him.
Representative Alvarez: I was trying to get the exact number that opposed it but I don’t know reading articles by the Barometer and majority oppose. Is a lot of students responses.
Representative Davis: Can you make sure you invite the proper people to discuss this in second reading? It went around in circles because there wasn’t enough presence in both sides.

Representative Alvarez: I can invite the administration.

Speaker Hatlen: If this gets tabled I can do that.

Representative Brantley: Thank you, speaker.

Representative Setzler: I’m wondering in the third whereas. I know some of the buildings are thirty.

Representative Alvarez: I guesstimated it.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Have you been to the library? You’ll find it.

Speaker Hatlen: It’s on the front door.

Representative Struthers: Two things. Are you aware of the services student health are related to your last be it hereby resolved.

Representative Alvarez: They try to do that the whole point of that was the resources they’re put in will allocate away from that more than they already do.

Ass I move to invite two individuals who have been involved in this from day one.

Brant Second

Speaker Hatlen: That was my plan. So yes. Any dissention?

Representative Struthers: I would prefer it to be formal.

Representative Alvarez: I move to table this for two weeks.

Representative Brantley: second

A voice vote to table HR-03.13 for two weeks was taken. The motion passed.

XI. Other New Business

None

XII. Speaker’s Announcements

Speaker Hatlen: None because I want to leave.

XIII. House Comments

Speaker Hatlen: Oh I do have comments.

Speaker Pro Tempore Dunn: Out of order.

Speaker Hatlen: I’m going to knock you out. I’d like to extend an invite from what Laurie said. She’s in dire need of volunteers. They need folks to volunteer. Talk to Ravi afterwards he’ll be around too for the ways and means meeting. Thank you.

Representative Davis: I want to say that as far as ASA stuff I’d like to make sure we’re all united as OSU civil rights is something we care about and the only thing we should be divided on is how to get that not if it’s a problem. We’ve been divided a couple times this year and it wouldn’t look good to happen again.

Representative Struthers: I’d like to remind ways and means that we’re getting two request to get through tonight.
Representative Phou: I know some people have problem with it I’m going to go with information the AUAC is meeting tomorrow in the library to see how they run the meeting, I think they post it on the accessibility website.

Representative Struthers: Could that be sent on the listserv?

Speaker Hatlen: Can you send that to me and I’ll forward it to everyone?

Representative Alvarez: I want to reiterate we need help phone banking. Do your hourly activity, we have extra stuff.

Speaker Hatlen: I can give you an office hour.

Representative Vanderwall: I don’t know what phone banking is.

XIV. Gallery Comments

Ravit Patel: I was here to ask if you’re willing to do clip boarding that’s giving those pamphlets out basically reminding people that due May 15. Last day to mail in ballots. Drop it off at a drop box. There are other locations I can tell you if you want. Phone banking if you talk to me I can get you scheduled we’re doing it tomorrow and we are planning on Sunday and I’m sure most of you are going home. Tomorrow and Monday next week.

Emily Colvin: Also if you have specific question ASA meets on Wednesdays at 6 before the meeting its casual question and answer because I know a lot times if we let people ask all the questions you want in this time you have meetings until 930.

XV. Adjournment

Representative Brantley: I move to adjourn.

Representative Setzler: Second

Acclamation occurred and the meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.