

# Student Fee Committee

## Meeting Agenda

Thursday, January 9, 2025

SEC 354 | [Zoom](#)

### I. Call to Order - 6:09 pm

### II. Roll Call

- a. Sophia Nowers, *SFC Chair* - **present**
- b. Saegis Abbott, *Member-at-Large* - **present**
- c. Lillian Goodyear, *Vice Chair* - **present**
- d. Dylan Perfect, *Member-at-Large* - **present**
- e. Connor Chen, *Member-at-Large* - **present**
- f. Madison Wusstig, *Member-at-Large* - **present**
- g. Katelyn Banks, *ASOSU Liaison* - **Kari Hoy as proxy**
- h. Kayla Ramirez, *Basic Needs Center Liaison* - **present**
- i. Angelo Arredondo, *Family Resource Center Liaison* - **present**
- j. Noah Roberts, *Memorial Union Liaison* - **present**
- k. Oliver Devereux, *Performing Arts Liaison* - **present**
- l. Emma Flick, *Recreational Sports Liaison* - **present**
- m. Sarah Khan, *Student Experiences & Engagement Liaison* - **present (zoom)**
- n. Audrey Schlotter, *ASOSU President (ex-officio)* - **present**

### III. Land Acknowledgement

Let it be acknowledged that Oregon State University in Corvallis is located within the traditional homelands of the Marys River or Ampinefu Band of Kalapuya. Following the Willamette Valley Treaty of 1855, Kalapuya people were forcibly removed to reservations in Western Oregon. Today, living descendants of these people are part of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon and the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians. Indigenous people are valued, contributing members of the

Oregon State community and represent multiple sovereign tribes among students, faculty, staff and alumni.

#### IV. Approval of the Agenda

- a. **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear** motioned to add comments from **Sen. Eckman** and **Sen. Rowe** for a budgets committee update and comments regarding SB-84.16 to take place after the Southworth training; seconded by **Noah Roberts**
  - i. *The motion passes.*

#### V. Approval of the Minutes

- i. *The minutes were approved as written.*

#### VI. Business

- a. Expectations for the Fee-Setting Process
  - i. *View the presentation [here](#).*
  - ii. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** Today we will be talking about the Contingency Fund and the Student Facility Improvement Fee. We also will elect members for Mediations committees and a summary of the BRDs before Saturday. We shall start off with some expectations.
    1. **Dylan Perfect:** I know this is similar to last year, but I fear that one minute is a short amount of time for people to speak, especially if they are closely connected to the unit or community in a way that maybe one of us is not. I wonder if we may adjust based on how large the gallery may be. I might also suggest that if one of us directly addresses a comment made by a gallery member, we may give them more time to explain and such.
    2. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** There is the opportunity to provide written comment to myself or Lilly in writing or email. I do get your point.
    3. **President Audrey Schlotter:** I agree that a minute may be too short, but I would not go over a certain amount of time given last year we were short on time. I might say that 1:30 may be a good extension.

4. **Emma Flick:** I agree with both, I would say a limit of 2 minutes. I do think that we should be aware of our gallery size and make sure the gallery knows to sign up for gallery comment in a timely manner to anticipate a proper amount of time. Also encouraging to submit written comments, so people do not feel like they aren't able to have their voices heard.
5. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** For Saturday and next Thursday, what is allotted on the agenda is 5 minutes of public comments. If there are a lot of people, then that can be changed by the committee if the majority sees it fit.
6. **Dylan Perfect:** Is there a way for us to see those written public comments? As a member of the public who has engaged with groups in the past, a lot of times I will show up and speak in front of the group because I am doubtful that my written comment will have the same impact. Getting a copy would be helpful. When we are in committee discussion would we be able to cede time or call witnesses?
7. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** At this time the general gallery cannot be ceded time, though people who are presenting can be called to answer questions.
8. **Emma Flick:** When we are talking about expectations for gallery comments, if we can clarify who we may be referring to as presenters. At Rec Sports we will be bringing a lot of our professional team and admin who will be able to provide more information. Going into it and knowing who we are allowed to call would be helpful and should be clear ahead of time.
9. **Noah Roberts:** Could it just be people who are actively at the presentation table? They may not have to be presenting.
10. **President Audrey Schlotter:** What about pro-staff from the unit? Maybe them and SAB members. I think that would be good.

11. **Dylan Perfect:** I think that is reasonable but say, for example, a unit has a new intern program, it would be nice to be able to ask them questions regarding their experiences. They may not be pro-staff or part of the SAB, but I think their input may be useful. Maybe there is some way for us to call witnesses or cede time, unless there was an objection from the committee?

12. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** I am thinking we say members of SAB's, budget managers, and whoever they call to give additional information. So, it would be up to the discretion of the presenters.

a. **Chair Sophia Nowers** entertained a motion to give gallery members up to 2 minutes of public comment per gallery member per comment period, and to define presenters as members of SABs, budget managers, and those that they call up for further information.

i. **Emma Flick** motioned, seconded by **Dylan Perfect**.

ii. *The motion passed.*

b. Southworth Training

i. **Leslie Schacht Drey, Associate Dean of Students:** Tonight, we wanted to spend some time looking back at training and some of the underpinning principles such as Southworth and the concept of viewpoint neutrality. What do you guys know, or remember from past training, about this Supreme court case?

1. **Dylan Perfect:** The most foundational outcome is that if you are allocating public funds you have to do it in a viewpoint neutral way. If we did become more selective, we would be going awry from that neutrality.

2. **Connor Chen:** I believe it was that a student did not like that their funds were going towards, I believe, a political group that they did not agree with.

- ii. **Leslie Schacht Drey, Associate Dean of Students:** Yes, this was a case brought forward by law students, as they did not want their student fees to be going towards groups they did not agree with. Universities can require that all students pay a mandatory fee, and the activities that are funded have to be aligned with the mission of the university. Groups cannot be denied funding because of their viewpoint. Viewpoint neutrality focuses on process integrity in making sure that various viewpoints have access to the opportunity to be considered.
- iii. **Steve Hoelscher, Associate Vice Provost for Finance & Administration:** This notion of viewpoint neutrality is a bit of an abstraction. Ultimately it is ensuring that the criteria and approach that you are using to evaluate a unit, or some aspect of what you are considering, you would want to be consistent across all units or programs. Ensure that you are approaching with the same level of curiosity and questions across all units and upholding the standard of viewpoint neutrality. The end take is that if you do this well and that viewpoint neutrality is upheld, then the recommendations and decisions are defensible and upheld. The grand risk that all of you carry, and ultimately ASOSU carries, is if this is done in a haphazard manner it could erode and unwind.
- iv. **Leslie Schacht Drey, Associate Dean of Students:** Boiling it down, it does not mean that you cannot compare and contrast but thinking about how you are weighing your decisions independently and individually. Not thinking about it as a zero-sum game, rather that you are looking at them as individual requests.
- v. **Dylan Perfect:** So, the point here is that this will not be treated as a zero-sum game. I think there are reasons why that is advisable, but I am curious as to how you connect that to this case?
- vi. **Steve Hoelscher, Associate Vice Provost for Finance & Administration:** If ten units are asking for \$10 and you approve the first nine and then you realize that you only wanted to hand out \$90, then the zero-sum game moment is imposed on you

that you are not treating the tenth unit equally. It is not to say you cannot have a desired cap on your spending, but that is done upstream. The absolute zero-sum game is a problem as the last one gets the lesser amount irrespective of the quality and merits of their case or argument.

- vii. **Dylan Perfect:** I had been curious about this when I was Vice President, and I had a conversation with a General Counselor about this. If we are looking at units, generally speaking they are viewpoint agnostic. I think the response given concurred with the example you just gave, if we just cut the last unit, and that that would be an arbitrary and capricious decision. On that basis a student or someone could challenge the validity of that fee allocation. I think there is a little bit different rationale for why it would be advisable. I did not understand at the time why it was connected to this particular case.
- viii. **Steve Hoelscher, Associate Vice Provost for Finance & Administration:** This group wants to do this with high integrity even if Southworth did not exist. It is in the best interest of the SFC, ASOSU, and OSU, and underpinning that is that we would all as an institution risk exposure to this case. There is nothing in Southworth that will tell OSU how to do the work in the SFC and ASOSU, it is never that prescriptive and there is an interpretation of all Supreme Court cases.
- ix. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** There is a 4% cap on the fee this year, and that could be an example of how this would be applied more directly.
- x. **Steve Hoelscher, Associate Vice Provost for Finance & Administration:** For you all that is a thoughtful example of process integrity, and you set that upstream. The application of that has been consistent. Now, if you all halfway through Saturday decided to impose a 4%, and that was the first time anyone had heard of it, that would be devoid of process integrity.
- xi. **Saegis Abbott:** We are just evaluating everything on its own basis.

- xii. **Dylan Perfect:** I do think it is important that there is permissibility to have priorities here. Say if we wanted to prioritize the basic needs and the BNC. We are able to prioritize what one unit is particularly doing; it is more arbitrary.
- xiii. **Leslie Schacht Drey, Associate Dean of Students:** You all did that with the BRDs, talking about priorities. This is something that SFC has been thoughtful about, but this is helpful to come back to if you are considering how you will be evaluating each unit over the next several weeks.

c. Discussion on SB-84.16

- i. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** How does section 3 of the bill affect this process and the work we are doing here as well as in the Senate?
- ii. **Sen. Rowe:** It does not have a huge impact on what this process looks like. The biggest thing is that when the Senate deliberations come around, now the Senate can just amend the fee bills, as it has been in the past.
  - 1. **Dylan Perfect:** In 2019 I was in the Senate. Athletics and DCE the fee bills were voted down and sent to mediation. During mediation a compromise was reached, and the Senate voted it down a second time. When that happened the two groups came up with an agreement that they and the Senate would agree to, and those bills were voted upon directly. More recently in 2022, all of the fee bills were amended to be distributed across fall, winter, and spring. There is some previous precedent for this. The reason why the Senate passed this Section 3, is so that the Senate could have the ability to make such motions again if necessary to implement those objectives. There was a writ filed, and the JC decided to strike down the Senates ability to directly amend these fee bills. That is why the Senate has passed this statute to restore that, and to attempt to comply with the court's decision.
- iii. **Noah Roberts:** Can the Senate guarantee that the process for setting the fee is not going to change in the current fee cycle

and going into the next fiscal year? For the MU we are asking for a new Liaison, and if the process is going to change, we would need to know as soon as possible.

1. **Sen. Rowe:** There are no other plans to change the process. From your perspective and what you all do is unchanged by this section. The next two weeks of work are exactly the same.
- iv. **Connor Chen:** So, it seems that there are two options, sending to mediation or amending. What would be the dividing line between the two options you have now?
1. **Sen. Rowe:** I honestly could not give a good answer. One factor is time, and it also depends on what the Senate thinks. If there is uncertainty and they want more time to go through it, then mediation.
- v. **Emma Flick:** I am curious how the Senate plans to keep the same checks and balances as there were previously. I am concerned that this may not allow units and SABs voices to be heard during the process.
1. **Sen. Rowe:** I would not say there is a set plan but for one, the SABs and Liaisons will still have the same seat at the table and can speak about the changes being made. I am certain that your perspectives will still be heard. I think looking at ten years prior, this system did work and there was still a lot of weight for those perspectives. There are a lot of senators that really care about the work that the SAB's and the SFC do.
- vi. **President Audrey Schlotter:** We are talking about 35 million dollars which comes out of the students pockets every term. With only five senators in the room and essentially veto power of whatever they do, and without the information that is given by budget managers, how are you going to ensure that adequate information is given across the board? Now that we are in the implementation phase of this section, I do not want the work of this group to go away, and I would like to hear your plans to make sure that all senators have the information that they need.

1. **Sen. Rowe:** More senators are here, and they are aware that this is an introductory session. You guys will be there, at the senate meetings, available for questions. They will not be going into this blind, they will want input from you all. I am also excited because we will be taking more time with 3 senate meetings this year.
- vii. **Madison Wusstig:** I am also wondering about the long-term sustainability of this. I have not seen many senators show up for the unit tours or these meetings. Speaking of the long term, I think this whole process is so big and hard to digest that we have a whole branch. I feel like it is putting more weight on us to repeat what we are saying and the process, but at the same time ask for permission in a sense.
1. **Sen. Rowe:** I am not suggesting that you must do more work, but rather your expertise and availability will be the same as last year if that makes sense. I also do really appreciate you guys inviting me here, I do want this type of communication
  2. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** I will say from my reading of the bill; the changes are that Senate can introduce their own fee bills that are separate from the SFC. They can amend things on the floor and mediation is now an optional process. The Senate can develop a new bill or amend something on the floor, forgo a second reading and pass it that night without that second opinion. That is something that I am concerned about. I am appreciative of the Senators that are here.
- d. Budgets committee update
- i. **Sen. Eckman:** Something we looked at during the summer and fall was a base wage across all units, we have come to a consensus on what we want this to be. We have also been focusing on creating summary reports for all units. We have also been looking at the student ticket allocations for the ASOSU unit, which is something we are going to be talking about during Senate discussions. If anyone has any questions you can reach

out to myself or other members of the committee or come to our meetings which are on Fridays at 4:15.

1. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** Are those the reports in the same general format that were put in SB-84.14?
  2. **Sen. Eckman:** Yes, pretty much the same. The only thing is that the Senate will not be able to vote to obtain more information on a certain item, we just have to reach out to the unit
- ii. **Dylan Perfect:** What was the figure that the committee settled on? \$17.10. Do you have figures from FSS of what would be required for that?
1. **Sen. Eckman:** We do have a general estimate, but I would say it is not accurate as it assumes everyone is getting paid the base wage. The estimate would be \$4.57 cents for all units.
  2. **Dylan Perfect:** Would it be possible to get that updated figure from FSS and then distribute that to budget managers?
  3. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** Budget managers would have to request from FSS. That is not something ASOSU on any group within can request.
  4. **Dylan Perfect:** If we were to pass that then we would be consulting with budget managers so that there was no confusing down the road. I was speaking with Leah and saw that there was an error, and that is the reason why the base wage is different. If the target for the next year is \$17.10, we should make sure the money is sufficient to reach that.
  5. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** Wages are something we can ask units about, however, it is not something that we can mandate. Employment is within operations, not within ASOSU's purview. It is something we have to work together and communicate on.
- iii. **Emma Flick:** I am interested in the report about PRAX and the student tickets there. Is that something similar you were talking about doing with PRAX?

1. **Sen. Eckman:** We were just looking into PRAX ticket numbers. For this year it was budgeted as a pilot program, so that is why we were interested in it. One of the decision packages for Performing Arts has to do with the tickets so that is separate from the athletic tickets entirely.
  2. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** Performing Arts will be presenting on that as well.
- iv. **Noah Roberts:** For every unit that the budgets committee was proposing went through, do you know what the total percent increase would be for the incidental fee?
1. **Sen. Eckman:** We just had a general estimate, and we do not know how accurate it is, but it would be overall \$4.57 but we would have to reach out to all the units and have them reach out to FSS for that.
  2. **Noah Roberts:** What is the process if that pushes us over the 4% limit? What do we do at that point?
  3. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** That is a good question, no one really knows. It is something that I must request as Chair. Then it would be that the senate would have to make that call to make it 4%, and I do not know what happens if they forward that fee recommendation to Audrey that is over 4%, as she would be statutorily required to veto it. That is a good question that will definitely be talked more about soon.
- v. **President Audrey Schlotter:** Does that mean you are going to be using Section 3 from SB-84.16 to introduce this after it has gone through SFC?
1. **Sen. Eckman:** We do not have plans to do that, we were just providing information on what we did earlier. Like the presentation on the Student Ticket allocation.
  2. **President Audrey Schlotter:** I am more talking about the \$17.10 number. I know that budget managers have not had this number until now. Is this something you are going to be requiring using the new legislation, or are you looking for it next year?

3. **Sen. Eckman:** We have not thought about it as a whole committee yet. We hoped that this was sent out to budget managers earlier, but I guess it got lost somewhere.
4. **President Audrey Schlotter:** I had never received this number; I do not think any other SABs did either. I don't want to speak for the rest of the units, but we are done with our presentation as well. When you have that figured out it would be beneficial to share it with all of the units.
- vi. **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear:** Just to clarify, you will be asking units about it, but it is not something that the senate is requiring?
  1. **Sen. Eckman:** I think it is something that budgets would like to add, but not like a strike against units
  2. **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear:** Is that something you would want to see by next year? Is it not something you are going to require?
  3. **Sen. Eckman:** I guess it would be preferable for this year. I would see it coming to the Senate as separate legislation, so that all other budgets could be approved and then this approved separately.

e. Student Facility Improvement Fee

[ACTION] Acknowledgement of fee level

- i. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** We can briefly discuss the memo I sent out. Essentially 2-3 years ago, based on a consultation with OGC because this was passed through student referendum. We used to vote as if we could change these levels, we cannot do that because we are legally bound to pay them at this rate. We could have another referendum to change it.
  - a. **Noah Robert** moved that the SFC acknowledge the Facility Improvement Fee as charged as \$65 per student, per term, for Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026; and at \$48.50 per student in Summer 2025, seconded by **Emma Flick**.
  - b. **The motion passed with 11 ayes from: Saegis Abbott, Connor Chen, Madison Wusstig, Kayla Ramirez, Angelo**

*Arredondo, Noah Roberts, Oliver Devereux, Emma Flick, Sarah Khan, Lillian Goodyear, and Sophia Nowers; 1 abstention from: Dylan Perfect.*

f. Mediation Committees

[ACTION] Election of SFC members to serve on mediation committees if needed

- i. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** We will elect two people to be on the committee, and then 1 alternate. We can start off with ASOSU, you can self-nominate or nominate someone else.
- ii. **Dylan Perfect:** We are under an extreme time crunch this year and I would suggest having the same membership for each of the units so that we can reach a resolution before we default on the budget.
- iii. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** So, we would vote for 4 people, and they would serve for all units? How does that save time?
- iv. **Dylan Perfect:** We would have the same people in the same room instead of separate ones. If we had a longer timeline I would say go for it, such as last year, but I do not think we do this Fee Setting Cycle.
- v. **Noah Roberts:** I would tentatively agree but would add that liaisons should be a part of that. Having the same people is good as long as the unit being discussed has a seat at the table.
- vi. **Emma Flick:** I agree with Noah, understanding that the liaisons should be present for the mediations.
- vii. **Madison Wusstig:** I think it is important to split it up because not doing it might possibly affect the neutrality that we had just spoken about. Rather than 4 people focusing on all committees
- viii. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** So, what I understand is a 2 people for sure and 2 alternates for everything. Make sure we have liaisons for each of them but that we have the same 1 person to be added or alternates that we vote on?
- ix. **Saegis Abbott:** If a liaison is not able to make it would another be able to proxy?
- x. **Dylan Perfect:** The statute requires that the statute requires the SAB Chair to be a member of the mediation committee.

- xi. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** We vote on SFC representation, and liaisons are in a tricky role, so I would prefer not to sub out these roles.
- xii. **Oliver Devereux:** Yeah, I serve as both the Chair and liaison so that would not work for me.
- xiii. **Dylan Perfect** *motioned to proceed with nominations and approval of slate of mediation committee members and alternates for a uniform slate across units, seconded by Noah Roberts, objected by Emma Flick.*
- a. **Emma Flick:** I do agree with Madison that it may be hard to maintain viewpoint neutrality as I think it is important to give every single unit the full mental capacity available. If it is the same people, it will be more difficult.
  - b. **Dylan Perfect:** It would be ideal, but it is preferable to have a mediation committee rather than a defaulted budget. I do not think legally it is a viewpoint neutrality problem. I will proceed with my motion. The process would be a roll call vote if there has been an objection.
  - c. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** The motion from Dylan is to have the same 2 people contacted first, and two people to step in as alternatives. So, nominating four people for all mediation committees.
  - d. **Saegis Abbott:** Is there a requirement for it to be at-large members since the other members would be needing to be called? Now potentially any unit liaison could be called in addition.
  - e. **Dylan Perfect:** I think we would proceed with the alternates in that case.
  - f. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** Mediation is a scramble to give time for them to meet and everyone to attend.
  - g. **Connor Chen:** In the event we go with Dylans suggestion, would the next step be comparing how free our schedules are?
  - h. **Dylan Perfect:** We would still have nominations and vote on the members tonight, also we are out of order. I am continuing with my motion.

- i. **Madison Wusstig** objected
  - ii. **Madison Wusstig:** We will still have alternates; so, we would still be able to give mental capacity as well as talking about it when we would need to.
  - iii. **Dylan Perfect:** Point of Order, we are overdue to call a vote.
- i. **The motion failed with 4 ayes from: Saegis Abbott, Dylan Perfect, Angelo Arredondo, and Noah Roberts; 8 nays from: Connor Chen, Madison Wusstig, Kayla Ramirez, Oliver Devereux, Emma Flick, Sarah Khan, Lillian Goodyear, and Sophia Nowers.**
- xiv. **Noah Roberts:** By statute what is required?
- xv. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** The voting membership shall include the SFC Chair, the SAB Chair, 2 members from both the Senate and SFC all elected by their corresponding bodies. We could just have a pool of five alternates, and it could be whoever responds first? As opposed to creating this variable and hierarchy within the committee.
  - a. **President Audrey Schlotter:** Is this something you have to figure out now?
  - b. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** This is something that would be best to do now given the timeline.
- xvi. **Steve Hoelscher, Associate Vice Provost for Finance & Administration:** Historically the two variables are availability and willingness. Generally, they would elicit who is willing and presumably available, finding a pool has historically been the approach because there are so many variables.
- xvii. **Chair Sophia Nowers** entertained a motion for 6 members to be nominated as potential members for a mediation committee, seconded by **Noah Roberts**, objected by **Dylan Perfect**
  - a. **Dylan Perfect:** If we elect roughly half the committee I am not sure how that would work.
  - b. **Noah Roberts** continued with the motion. **The motion passed with 10 ayes from: Saegis Abbott, Connor Chen, Madison Wusstig, Kayla Ramirez, Noah Roberts, Oliver Devereux, Emma Flick, Sarah Khan, Lillian Goodyear, Sophia**

**Nowers; 1 abstention from: Angelo Arredondo; and 1 nay from: Dylan Perfect.**

- i. Angelo Arredondo nominated **Kayla Ramirez**, the nomination was accepted
- ii. **Dylan Perfect** self-nominated
- iii. **Madison Wusstig** self-nominated
- iv. **Connor Chen** self-nominated
- v. Saegis Abbott nominated **Noah Roberts**, the nomination was accepted
- vi. Lillian Goodyear nominated **Emma Flick**, the nomination was accepted.

1. **Chair Sophia Nowers** entertained a motion to nominate those 6 members, moved by **Oliver Devereux**, seconded by **Connor Chen**. The motion passed.
2. **President Audrey Schlotter**: As an ex-officio member can I object or make motions?
3. **Chair Sophia Nowers**: I am not sure? We would have to look at the democratic rules of order for that.

g. Contingency & Supplementary Fund

[FOR POSSIBLE ACTION] Change to per student charge

- i. **Chair Sophia Nowers**: It is currently set at 10 cents per term, the recommended balance is \$500,000, and it is currently at \$686,000. This fee is just in case a unit has a failure or huge, unexpected expense. For example, Rec-Sports had a chiller go out and that was when it was used last. I think its possible that we lower it.
- ii. **Noah Roberts**: Did last years SFC vote to lower it to what it was previously?
- iii. **Chair Sophia Nowers**: Yes, it was lowered by around 25 cents I believe.
- iv. **Saegis Abbott**: Is there any estimate of how much interest is gained on the balance each year?

- a. **Steve Hoelscher, Associate Vice Provost for Finance & Administration:** It is not in a building fee so these funds would not be interest bearing at all as it is not in a designated building fee. These dollars because there is no presumption, and as such those funds are not interest bearing. Regardless of this fee it will not be interest bearing.
- v. **Emma Flick:** I would argue we could down to 5 cents per student, maybe lower than that because we have plenty of excess funds currently. I would not like to do a zero fee as that seems difficult to come back from, but I also do not think a fee of one cent makes sense.
- vi. **Dylan Perfect:** We don't have a lot to cut here, so I would like to lower the fee by more than 5 cents. Do we have any data on how much has been pulled out in the last ten years?
  - a. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** We had FSS do an analysis of the last ten years, the last one was \$333,333 in FY19. I know there are a couple things coming down the pipeline, the FRC and the MU both have things they may want to get a jump on. I do not think it matters now, but I am in support of anything ten and lower as long as it is not zero, so that future committees can raise it in the future if needed.
  - b. **Dylan Perfect:** Whatever we have spent since FY15 and the contingency fee there and everything that was the demand. If that demand has been historically consistent, and if we charge the same, is that going to build up enough of a reserve to not have it deplete. If it is a 2-cent difference to have that security, that would matter. I do not think we will get that answer tonight, but in the future that would be helpful.
  - c. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** Because this is for contingencies, we cannot project what it's for. We can lower it now and if those groups do come, we can respond later.
- vii. **Madison Wusstig:** In the past 10 years, knowing we are in an excess of a lot of money.

a. **Madison Wusstig** motioned to lower the fee to 3 cents, seconded by **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear**, objected by **Angelo Arredondo**.

i. **Angelo Arredondo**: I do not think we should lower it. In these projects, some of these would be half the amount that is in the fund. It would be disastrous if 2 things happened at the same time. I think it would be worth it to keep it the same.

ii. **Madison Wusstig**: Though it is a small amount, it does add up for students, I will continue with my motion.

iii. *The motion **passes** with **11 ayes** from: Saegis Abbott, Dylan Perfect, Connor Chen, Madison Wusstig, Kayla Ramirez, Noah Roberts, Oliver Devereux, Emma Flick, Sarah Khan, Lillian Goodyear, Sophia Nowers; **1 nay** from: Angelo Arredondo*

h. Preview of Base Budgets and Decision Packages

i. **Angelo Arredondo** motioned to skip this section of the agenda; **Madison Wusstig** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

## VII. Chair Announcements

- a. Meeting starts at 9:30 in MU Horizons room. Breakfast and Lunch provided. On Saturday, because the MU will be closed you will have to enter through the SE corner door by Jefferson.
- b. ASOSU Elections are open! SFC at-large and Chair seats are open. Senate, President, and VP.
- c. **Sophia Nowers**: Message me if you have any questions. Also remember that you can move for a break.

## VIII. Member Comments

- a. **Angelo Arredondo**: Is there a reason we have not advertised our deliberations more? There has not been one announcement about it thus far.
  - i. **Chair Sophia Nowers**: It is in the Barometer and there will be a mass email being sent out tomorrow. Tell people you know!

- b. **Emma Flick:** If there is any way we could get pronouns on people's name tags?
- c. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** Yes, message me your pronouns so I can get those one.
- d. **Dylan Perfect:** There is no guarantee that that money will continue to be paid, so I caution against the view that after this it is totally out of our hands. I think there is a dialogue that needs to be had so that we can make sure we are allocating the money for what we think. As for the increase that the budgets committee proposed, I understand that we are hearing about this now, but I do know the position taken by the committee that was sent to the Chair in September. I believe that the committee was making a recommendation for several different options that we could pursue and implement. We need to be reminded that the committee did recommend options. Regarding SB-84.16, I think the work of this committee is important. As a member of this committee, I feel that it is important that any recommendation that we vote on is able to stand up to democratic scrutiny in a body representative of the student body at-large. The senate is not going to just duplicate our process, but that is checks and balances, and I just wanted to share that perspective.
- e. **President Audrey Schlotter:** I am excited for this, and I think we did a really good attempt at making sure everyone had the opportunity to speak. I can see this moving forward very well.

## IX. Public Comment

- a. **Steve Hoelscher, Associate Vice Provost for Finance & Administration:** Commendable work tonight, you got two items done. You had good conversation and respect for diverse perspectives so continue the work on Saturday.
- b. **Leslie Schacht Drey, Associate Dean of Students:** Think about how you are going to show up on Saturday, this is a significant decision, and how you are going to be present in the meeting and respect the process that you are part of.

## X. Gallery Comment

- a. **Keri Simonet, ASOSU Advisor:** ASOSU Elections info-sessions are on Wednesdays at 11 am until ballot closes.

**XI. Adjournment**

- a. *The meeting was adjourned at **8:02 pm.***