

**Western Washington University Associated Students  
Board of Directors Meeting**

Thursday, Thursday March 19th, 2015      OM 340

**AS Board Officers:** *Present:* Annika Wolters (President), Giselle Alcantar Soto (VP Activities), Chelsea Ghant (VP BusOps), Cristina Rodriguez (VP Diversity), Sarah Kohout (VP Governmental Affairs), and Zach Dugovich (VP Student Life)

**Guest(s):** Camie Herk (AS Productions Director), Clayton Schleg (Student at Large), Kyle Jiganti (Student at Large).

**MOTIONS**

- ASB-15-W-33** Approve the Substance Policy Initiative Language changes. *Passed*
- ASB-15-W-34** Approve the Cannabis initiative language. *Passed*
- ASB-15-W-35** Approve the Sustainability Action Fund Referendum Language with changing it not to exceed \$7 overall. *Passed*
- ASB-15-W-36** Approve the AS WWU Federal agenda for 2015. *Passed*
- ASB-15-W-37** Approve the AS VU Gallery Changes. *Passed*
- ASB-15-W-38** Approve Green Energy Fee Charge and Charter. *Passed*

*Annika Wolters, AS President, called the meeting to order at 8:45 a.m.*

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA**

Kohout moves to add the Substance Policy and the Cannabis Initiatives to the agenda as an action item with guests. Approved.

Dugovich said he would like to move the Sustainability Action Fund referendum from information item to action item as they need the language on the ballot and they may not have another meeting by the cut of deadline. Approved.

**III. PUBLIC FORUM** (*comments from students and the community*)

**IV. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests\***

**A. AS Motorpool Proposal**

Ghant met with Greg McBride, the Assistant Director of Viking Union Facilities and Eric Alexander and Fred Collins, the Outdoor Center Manager and they sat down and figured out the need for the

motorpool. She also met with Management Council and everyone seemed to be on board. She brought the proposal back to McBride after that and they solidified the type and number of vehicles. They were very thoughtful in their approach. They have a budget for vehicle replacement of \$60,000. They have the replacement reserve which is \$12,000. Ghant is proposing to purchase two additional vehicles for the AS. One Vehicle for the Outdoor Center (OC) and one off limits to the OC. The reason for that is the main user of the motorpool is the OC and one vehicle will be specifically for the rest of the AS. The demand for vehicles have grown significantly. The amount of traveling the AS travels has increased to say the least. She is proposing they purchase two new vehicles. She sighted the Vehicle Policy in her proposal which she intends to update and bring back to the Board after this is hopefully passed. The vehicles are meant to provide students with access to things they wouldn't have access too without them. They had even thought about maybe purchasing an electric car would but it's really expensive and they would have to get an electric charging station and for now that didn't seem like an option. She is open to feedback and concerns. She is proposing that this be a double information item so they can have good conversation. It was passed through Facilities and Services which is the body that passes these types of requests and she wants to respect that body. After it is approved McBride will be going through and doing the actual purchasing process. Kohout said wanted to thank Ghant for putting it together. She personally feels it is very necessary and they have had lots of problems in the past trying to get vehicles. Kohout asked what would happen to the other two vehicles. Ghant said the minivan will be for everyone else and the SUV will only be for the OC. The AS would have two minivans exclusive to the OC and the OC will have two SUV's. Wolters said how much money is being proposed? Ghant said not to exceed \$63,245 for the purchase of two AS Vehicles, one being specifically for the OC and one for the rest of the AS. Kohout said asked if they had thought about the storage component. Ghant said our motorpool has been more in the past so she doesn't think it should be a problem but she will bring that question back to McBride and provide an answer next meeting. Alcantar Soto said the request is basically empty that account? Ghant said no, that is a "not to exceed" amount but she doesn't think it will reach that with the numbers provided. There are two reserve accounts this will be coming from, one for Vehicle Replacement and the other is out of the general AS Reserves. They can approve a "not to exceed" amount and when McBride is actually purchasing the vehicles they will know the amount then. Alcantar Soto said in the proposal if they were to use to highest listed prices they would exceed that amount though. Ghant said she doesn't foresee it but then they can tap into the other reserves if absolutely necessary. They want to make sure they get good, newer vehicles that won't need a lot of maintenance. Wolters asked if there is any need to move this to another information item. Kohout said she doesn't think so because it's had a lot of work into it and gone through the two committees it should go through.

## V. ACTION ITEMS - Guests\*

### A. Substance Policy Initiative

Kyle Jiganti said he is here to talk about Substance Policy Initiative. They are hoping to get a concise policy on campus. They find it crucial to get this passed because a lot of dealers tend to substitute things into these drugs which can cause overdoses because people don't know what are in the drugs. People are going to use drugs regardless and they are afraid to call for help. Which something like the Good Samaritan Law implemented in ResLife it could help folks not be afraid to call for someone who needs help. Another thing he was concerned about was the "your body is a container" policy they have on campus. It is very vague and doesn't talk about how long you can go in between drinking can you return to the dorms. For example he got in trouble with it last year because he went downtown and had a drink and about 3 hours he came back to campus and was in a room with others who got caught for drinking.

He was honest to the RA saying he was off campus and had a drink earlier but was not drinking in the dorms. When he got in trouble, they said it would have been better to lie, and that regardless that there was no alcohol in his system he verbally stated that he had alcohol earlier that day. He believes they can come up with a better rule. With something like this in place, it is safer for the students. Wolters asked Jiganti to clarify what he means about your body as a container. Jiganti said from Reslife it states "your body is a container". If they go off campus and drink or do drugs than go back to campus, that constitute as bringing it to campus because "your body is the container". He believes there are other ways of getting around that through a Breathalyzer. Designer drugs are substances that are made to mimic other drugs and they are bad for people in other ways because they aren't tested. People don't know what they are looking at. It's not what they say they are selling because it is easy to tell marijuana but not as easy to tell something that is a white pill. People in the dorms may not know to be safe drug users and people are going to look for a profit on the drugs they sell so they change the drug because they are cheaper. He wants this policy to be in place because students in the dorm don't want to call for help if someone needs it because it risks both can get in trouble and be kicked out of the dorms. The punishment should also have some sort of protection. There are other options than kicking the student out of the dorm, such as take drug information class. Kicking students out of the dorm could potentially lead to students not attending WWU anymore. Wolters said she would like to emphasis that the "your body is a container" is vague. For example Marijuana, which is legal in WA, will stay in your system for 30 days. It is not fair to say students can't come onto campus for 30 days after they use this. Dugovich said he talked to Michael Sledge who handles most of these cases and they say this is something they already do, they don't get in trouble for calling if someone is overdosing. If it keeps on happening then they may kick someone out but not after one or two times. If it keeps happening then they send them to a treatment. Sledge had said he is worried about this because If it is passed it could prevent their ability to stop habitual drug users on campus. Jiganti said they could put something in the policy that doesn't prevent that. It's the difference between getting caught using it, and calling for a friend. A lot of people using aren't calling for help because they too may get in trouble. Dugovich said what happens if they keep calling for that person though? Kyle said it is a plausible situation but after two or three times of seriously overdosing that person has another person issue that needs to be worked out. There aren't many specific to the case where that would happen though, it's not going to occur more than a couple times a year where someone is seriously overdosing. Alcantar Soto said with this language it calls for the university and residence halls to have the same policy. As Dugovich said, they already do it in practice and she thinks they should have it as the actual policy if that is the case. She wondered if they should change the language to include anything more about "your body as a container". Jiganti said possibly, he wants to make sure they keep these two things separate. Good Samaritan Law is about someone else calling for someone who is unable to call. The second is to clarify "your body is a container" because currently it is a blanket statement. He personally feels students are being taken advantage of because the ADCAST class cost \$100 every time you do it. That hard for students who are struggling to pay tuition and feed themselves. Kohout said on the referendum it doesn't talk about your body as a container so why is it being brought up? Jiganti said it is in the substance policy. He wanted to make sure that it was clarified. Kohout said Alcantar Soto said if there is any changes to this document. Should they say anything difference? She suggested it saying "Shall the Associated Students of Western Washington University push for the AS Board of Directors to not only persuade Residence Life to work with the University Police to come up with a concise substance policy guide for the entire campus, as well as a better body as a container definition but also get Residence Life to enact a Good Samaritan Policy within the residence halls". Jiganti would agree with that and thinks that is worded well.

MOTION ASB-15-W- by Kohout

Approve the Substance Policy Initiative Language changes.

Second: Dugovich Vote 6-0-0 Action: Passed

## B. Cannabis Initiative

Kohout said she would like to limit these discussions to 10 minutes because it is finals week. Wolters agrees. Schleg said there was concern brought up about federal advocacy and whether this is taking precedence over other things because student debt is a bigger issue. Personally agree that tuition is a problem however he won't speak for all people. He doesn't see why they can't do both. It was passed last year with this language he doesn't see why it can't be passed this year. His understanding of the process, if they passed this, it would go to an initiative, then they would gather signature, last year they nearly got enough signatures to put it up for vote. If they receive the amount of signatures this year, then they would have to have a campus majority for it to pass. He thinks they should see what the student body feels about this. He knows people at WWU who are very passionate about this. Kohout said she really agrees. Some of the concerns last meeting were about whether this was binding and it says urges the AS Board, that doesn't mean it definitely will be on there. It would go through the Legislative Affairs Council (LAC) and be drafted there. Dugovich said although he doesn't agree with the initiative, he thinks it's a vote of the students.

MOTION ASB-15-W- by Kohout  
Approve the Cannabis initiative language.

Second: Rodriguez Vote 5-0-1 Action: Passed

## VI. PERSONNEL ITEMS *(subject to immediate action)*

## VII. ACTION ITEMS - Board\*

### A. Sustainable Action Fund Referendum Proposal

Dugovich said sustainable action fund proposal formally known as the Green Energy Fee. Over the past couple weeks himself, environmental clubs, people in the sustainability office, Alexander and McBride have been working to shape this fund for the next 3 years. The rates are currently \$.70 per credit. It will stay at \$.70 per credit per quarter but it will cap at not to exceed \$1.40 per credit and cut off at \$10 per quarter. There are actually some changes to this. He would like to change #2 to "enhancing student leadership through outreach education action through dedicated leadership positions that will be housed in the ESP". Another change he would like to make now is under #1 it says "to help fund the expansion of renewable power production and offset 100% of WWU's carbon output". He would like to remove 100% because they don't know if it is going to be possible financially. One last change is where it says "continuing to fund an operational employee position" he would like to change it to "continue funding the operational employees positions" because there are two employees now, not just one. He would love to take any questions and clarify anything. Ghant said wanted to clarify that it's going from .70 to 1.40? Dugovich said it would be at \$.70 per credit which is what it is at now but the Board of Directors could change it to \$1.40 if they feel it is necessary and not to exceed \$10 a quarter. Kohout asked can they legally raise the fee without student vote. Dugovich said yes, the Board of Directors and the Board of Trustees would have to approve it first though. Ghant asked why are they changing it not to exceed \$1.40? Why do they need to raise the fund? Dugovich said last week when they met the group want to raise it because they want to fund these different positions. He doesn't know if \$10 is the right amount. He is hesitant to put it at \$10. Ghant asked if there budget isn't large enough currently? Dugovich said there is plenty in the budget. Dugovich said it was a whole new restructure to the fund as well, so he changed it from 5 years to 3 years so that they can assess if it is working after 3 years. Kohout said she likes the changes, it makes it more accessible. It's something that they pay into and have access to now. Dugovich said he is open to changing the amount requested here as it was done by the committee and he personally doesn't want to raise the fee. Ghant asked if one of the possibilities is this fee could fund

positions around sustainability. Could the Native Gardens Position in the Outback be funded through something like this? Dugovich said potentially but it's not about what they are talking about right now. Alcantar Soto said there is no real justification for raising the fee. She doesn't think it is right to lobby for lower tuition then raise their own fees. Dugovich said in this proposal it would top out at \$10. Alcantar Soto said she suggest they reduce that \$10. Dugovich said he agrees, he would like to keep it the same not to exceed \$7 overall. Alcantar Soto said with the not to exceed \$1.40 per credit this only effect people who are under 14 credits. Dugovich said the budget currently, after taking out all the approved projects it around 400,000. Even if they don't have enough money it will be up for a vote in three years and can think about raising it then. Alcantar Soto said why did they feel there was a need though? Dugovich said they are all environmentally passionate people and they see it as a need. Wolters said she isn't going to vote on this because she doesn't want to raise student fees. Dugovich said it's not going to raise it anymore, it's to renew the GEF for 70 cents which is it set at currently and up to \$1.40per credit not to exceed \$7 overall.

MOTION: ASB-15-W- by Kohout

Approve the Sustainability Action Fund Referendum Language with changing it not to exceed \$7 overall.

Second: Dugovich Vote 4-2-0 Action: Passed

## **B. Federal Agenda**

Kohout said this is the same document as last week. Some of the things that were brought up were to get statistics, and she tried reaching out to folks and to get some however because it is finals week she hasn't heard anything from then and she wasn't able to find any statistics. She looked up the definition that was used last year in regards to the For-profit universities and it has very similar language. Asked Adam who is on LAC to stalk about the question Smiley brought up about student loads. He said it was condensing the student loans so two federal grant programs, would collapse into one. She expanded the acronyms as well.

MOTION ASB-15-W- by Kohout

Approve the AS WWU Federal agenda for 2015.

Second: Ghant Vote: 6-0-0 Acton: Passed.

## **C. VU Gallery SPAC Recommendations**

Ghant said they saw this last week and nothing has changed from it. They have Camie Herk the AS Productions Director if they have any questions. Wolters asked if they are still looking at tablets. Herk said no, they assume it will be won't passed because of the tight budget year. Alcantar Soto said they talked about how they should try it out for a quarter before purchasing anything. They should add it in the recommendation. After they try it, to make sure it will work, they can think about purchasing a tablet.

MOTION: ASB-15-W-Alcantar Soto

Approve the AS VU Gallery Changes.

Second: Ghant Vote: 6-0-0 Action: Passed

**VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board\***

**IX. CONSENT ITEMS** (*subject to immediate action*)

A. Green Energy Fee Charge and Charter

Dugovich said the only change he made to this was adding the Environmental & Sustainability Programs Director as a voting member. They weren't a voting member before because that position was a sponsor of the project so that's why they took it out.

MOTION ASB-15-W- by Kohout

Approve Green Energy Fee Charge and Charter

Second: Dugovich Vote: 6-0-0 Action: Passed

**X. BOARD REPORTS**

Due to finals week, no Board reports were given.

**XIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

*The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:57 a.m.*