

Finalized

Approve July 20, 2015

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL

Kerckhoff Hall 417

July 6, 2015

7:00 PM

PRESENT: Heather Rosen, Anais Leontine, Aaliya Khan, Lexi Mossler, Zack Dameron, Amy Shao, Ian Cocroft, Ruhi Patil, Marvin Chen, Ariel Rafalian, Cindy Wang, Patricia Zimmerman, Laureen Lazarovici

ABSENT: Zach Helder, Danny Siegel, Trent Kajikawa Heather Hourdequin, Deborah Geller

I. Call to Order

-Rosen calls the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

A. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet is passed around

II. Approval of the Agenda

-Shao strikes ARC.

-Chen strikes Student Wellness Programming Fund

-Patil moves to strike ASRF

-Leonine makes a motion to add June 2nd to the agenda.

9-0-0 the agenda has been approved.

B. Approval of the Minutes June 2nd June 9

-Rafalian moves to approve the minutes from June 2nd. Cocroft seconds.

-Rafalian moves to approve the minutes from June 9th. Shao seconds.

III. Public Comments

IV. Special Presentations

V. Appointments

VI. Office and Member Reports

A. President – Rosen

-Rosen states she's part of the food security task force and other members from USAC. We are allowed to allocate 75,000 and we secured 2500 for USAC for student led food grocery co-op. Dameron and her will do council wide initiative to food security and more details names and will be coming soon. I had a conversation with National Conference Leadership to work on federal advocacy and work on the federal level to advocate for things such as financial aid and sexual assault

legislation so a lot of that incorporated in future conversations. I have been working on the appointments so be on the look out for that.

B. Internal Vice President – Hourdequin

C. External Vice President - Helder

-Helder's proxy states they are going to campaign for the upcoming elections and affordability get some voter registration programs where you can instantly register to vote online and make students aware from that. We've been exploring the possibility of hosting a debate if they are going to choose California to hold the primary debated.

-Shao states last year they did the bruins vote concert or would you be needing them for this year

-Helder's proxy states that he's into it and will tell Helder.

-Shao states we need as soon as possible notice and look at budgeting and costs to see in terms of how it would fit in our program.

-Khan states that they are continuing the Student Activist Project Internship to look at how the events are playing out and the shooting that just happened to get as many new incoming students as well as transfers and student activism. Especially coming into a big college campus and the issues its important to have these great interns and help develop them to think critically and worldwide because one of our directors was an intern last year. If you all remember MSA has come and gave a representation and the Ramadan meals are happening right now because I'm waiting until I eat again. They're free and offered in SAC basement everyday and its really good food. I encourage all to go and community members and get involved for students that may not have meals especially with summer and are taking summer classes and food is a big worry. If you knew anyone everyday Monday-Thursday 7-9. The mental health resources to expand CAPS resources and mental health. I've been in contact with the greater Los Angeles organizations that work with cultural communities and religious while being culturally and religiously sensitive to the healing and so one of the groups that I got in touch with and bring them in for a presentation. The south Asian justice organization based in LA that brought south Asian solidarity with the black community and talk a lot about the trauma that south Asian communities face such as depression or anxiety and becomes a familial problem so I think that will be great because they are also working with the black community to talk about racial and religious stigma is what produces these mental health. A random thing that they talked to me about is on fourth of July on how we should be sensitive to war veterans and its very triggering. Its also really important to keep in mind other cultural communities such as south Asian war veterans from the 1970's and elderly folks in the partition wars in 1947 and the Armenian genocide have the same PTSD effects but not actually diagnosed with PTSD because of the huge mental health stigma in their communities.

-Chen thanks her for reaching out to other communities and he states Ria Thorne will fit well with AllofUs and wants them to see it do well and reach out to different

communities for every community to have a liaison in the USAC office or a student org or in the cultural community.

-Khan says her directors have applied to be liaisons

D. Academic Affairs Commissioner – Kajikawa

-Kajikawa's proxy states he is collaborating with interns and discussed financial and academic feasibility with UC student governments.

VII. Fund Allocations

A. Contingency Programming

-Wong states \$5,943.32 required. \$3,609 requested. \$1,106 recommended. 4,333.00 left in the budget for the restricted June-July budget.

-Rosen asks if this is allocated before August. What's the budget used for after?

-Wong states yes, the next budget is from August 1st for the entire school year

-Khan moves to approve \$1,106 from contingency.

VIII. Old Business

IX. New Business

A. USA Budget for 2015-2016

-Rosen states you have all been sent excel documents for association over heard such as the referendum money and the student fees

-Deborah Simmons the student account government manager and her office is right next door to SGA. This is your 2015-2016 budget based on the projected enrollments we will get from Amy. In it would be operational and SOOF. The interest income is practically nothing, based on ASUCLA estimates its less than \$18. She shows the general projected enrollment, and the interest is projected at \$0. This is a breakdown of the actual membership fees chronologic. There's a lot of money that goes out of there. Why I manage all those fees? I don't know.

-Champawat states the bruin towards the end of the term asks how they expended the funds and it became more apparent that much of them you're not directly overseeing. Its meant to convey the fees you're directly overseeing versus those you're not. The total is \$53.48 per quarter per student.

-Champawat states the Non-USA fees flow to the CPO for their program.

-Simmons states the overhead budget is \$727,501 and everything to run student governmenting such as telephone and election board and retreats and installation. It comes out of the overhead. The total net budgetable funds is \$44,822. SGOF has \$8964 and SOOF is \$35,857 for student groups. After you approve this budget it goes into affect August 1st and effective until May 31, 2015. It will be online at usac.ucla.edu and it's a great resource.

-Champawat states when you're calling something budgetable funds and what you're reviewing is your entire budget and essentially the \$4.5 million are the budgetable funds. Essentially this vote is going to enable Debby to populate the budgets and enable them come August 1st to extend those funds. Most of the moneys are not necessarily redirectable and its primarily based on the structure. It shows

the chronologic by fee and essentially the range of motion is primarily defined what the referendum approved by the voters set. If there's a community service commission fee and do x, y, z. You cant just take that money and redirect it. You cant readily redirect but there is the foundational fee on top of the membership fee which is the oldest fee that defines the underlying operation of USAC in general and that's the main source of paying all that overhead to run overhead fees and stipends and administrative fees. There's membership fees to be members of the association. As you see in the structure, the upper area defines budgetable income and talking about how the money comes in and the lower area is budgetable extents is in pretty much lock step with the income. The income defines where the suspense can go. Sometimes there's more clarity, such an entertainment fee. In practice as it defines usage it slid itself and designed into the referendum to cultural affairs commission and campus events commission. It occurs in an upper area to the budgetable income into the budgetable expense. One of the reasons we are condensing it down to areas of range with motion because most are defined by projected enrollment multiplied by fees to spend the money before it comes in. The flow of money allows us to do that to put your whole years and rolling in all year based on the budget university's enrollment office. Your range of motion down to SGOF and SOOF has been the repository of the remaining funds. That has been a declining amount of money and flagged to the council for years and almost all of your fees in particular that funds the council office more than the fees that are newer and your fees are not indexed to inflation. Your purchasing power is slightly eroded each year depending on you are affected by inflation. The reason there's inflation right now is because the gas prices have gone done so your mix of the things you purchase depends on how your office function. Your purchasing power has been slowly eroded by inflation and certain expense lines increase and take up more of the money and therefore less remains. I just wanted to lay out the whole structure and run to the accountants and make it as clear as possible. We're getting close to the point where there'll be an issue and no money. That's the main overview before getting into details. We might want to lead ourselves into detailed conversations.

-Rosen wanted to ask about inflation about how the CPI was measured in March, were we able to calculate it?

-Champawat states its still 0 and the purchasing power is holding in okay but it depends on what your market baskets of goods are. Your inflation is not actually 0, even if the national average is at 0.

-Rosen asks about the budgetable income if that would be easiest for everyone to follow. Rosen asks if anyone had questions about budgetable income

-Chen asks where does the funding for CalPirg go

-Champawat states the reason there is \$0 and made it as a placeholder and as the fee comes in, it flows in. These are not mandatory, but most of the fees are mandatory. CalPirg is something that is a pledge and as students sign in a pledge card its collected per student and a report is formed and check comes in to us and come report to the council and give some explanations and be engaged with the community. The reason its 0 because its none of your money.

-Chen asks if there are any other organizations that do this

-Champawat states no just CalPirg

-Mossler asks about the line of "surplus withdrawal" of \$392,231 and what does it stand for under the budgetable.

-Champawat states a lot of things you do with your money is allocations within little cups or buckets and cannot overspend. The error has to be under underspend to have systems. The margin of error is always on the side of under expenditure and as you multiply it by the cups and buckets there's always remaining funds. That is surplus. Your previous council, which will come back in Fall like November, and in that time we're going to let you know how many surplus funds are available and allocate with all our year. That was surplus that came from the prior year into this year. That's unexpended funds for 13-14 that float into 14-15. That's like 1% that flows through the accounts. Its still a modest amount and that's what that is.

-Mossler asks when will we find out about the overflow

-Champawat sates in fall quarter

-Mossler asks is there a reason why there's such a big gap for 13-14 or 14-15.

-Champawat states that amount of variation is in common. There's so much representation and student community with so much activity and can swing a couple \$100,000 a year. That's kind of what its natural flow is. Some of this money is restricted surplus and don't want to talk about so much detail we will find out restricted surplus and unrestricted surplus. You do not need to keep that in separate bank account. We need to do the income taxes that represent all of the activity and if you have other income we keep it safe and that would be restricted surplus and some includes restricted surplus. One of the biggest lines is the TGIF funds and it would be a pot of money that can transcend individual fiscal years. Unexpended money stays within the TGIF bucket and consider that restricted surplus. We will be talking about surplus more.

-Rosen states unrestricted surplus was about \$100,000

-Simmons states the actual breakdown is available at the expense column

-Rosen states in 2009 there was a high amount of unrestricted surplus. There was a controversy of what would have access to surplus, and if we have lower surplus it means we are more efficiently using our money but less student groups have that access. The money that's coming into the association is spent more effectively and efficiently.

-Champaway states the goal of this as stewards of this fund is to spend this money for this years students

-Khan asks what the student USAC programming endowment goes towards

-Champaway states it was established by the idea while council was being buffeted by the political difficult to manage and difficult to understand flow of money through surplus. What was happening was that surplus would be high and drop down. The student communities were applying towards funds and the primary source would come from surplus. Where the surplus was a low number, the student groups would not understand because they perceived it as a cut from their budget by the council. Its not an accurate understanding but that's just the flow of all the accounts. The endowment was conceived to smooth out the cycle to make money work for the council instead of the council work for money. It was conceived to cut the top off and put it in the endowment and as the endowment builds and you have the ability to donate to the endowment, and as that becomes substantial and while

its infancy. Its defined purpose is to come back to USA BOD programming and over time it would be a stable source of money that maybe alumni and each community can donate to and return its earning like an endowed chair. That's what it is there to do and within this budget its kind of neutral. Its money that a previous year placed there prior to even last year. At the very bottom you'll see \$9,938 and as a check to donate it. The year before put in \$100,000. Champawat states its value is passed around \$124,000 now.

-Simmons states \$1209 are the earnings from 1 quarter. That went through December 2014 and since December 2014 1 quarter has passed and the earnings were 1209. When we were discussing surplus whether you want to use your earnings or reinvest your earnings.

-Rosen states we can choose how much we want to add, correct?

-Champawat states yes, there's no bylaw by above certain amounts but its within your discretion

-Chen states that's a specific donation account and asks if that's different than other income?

-Champawat states yes because it has another purpose. The council established that endowment with the purpose of returning money to support student programming.

-Cocroft asks if \$1209 is realized gains

-Champawat states yes and they have stable return and normally are able to get good returns.

-Rosen asks if there's any other questions about budgetable income

-Rosen states okay they're going to start the conversation with budgetable expense. If you look at SOOF and SGOF you can see it severely depreciated. SGOF you had 17,000 and now 9,000. SOOF went from 69,000 and now around 30,000. 20% goes to SOOF, and 30% goes to SGOF. This is more or less because of what's happening with inflation because the money decreased and wanted to bring it to attention and be as conservative as possible because whatever is left over can go back to SOOF. Rosen states SOOF is underutilized and 40% was left unspent. A lot of student groups don't know what it is and student groups just apply to contingency. Rosen states we can have a conversation about moving SOOF to contingency since there are a lot of restrictions on contingency.

-Wong states SOOF allows stipends and t shirts and that would be an issue because a lot of community service orgs and other orgs need t-shirts and for contingency we would have to change the guidelines. We want to keep money for t-shirts.

-Rosen states that might be a conversation for later on just because SOOF is so underutilized

-Champawat states part of the reality that it's a small sum of money that you wont get a lot of stipends and not standing up that much and that's part of your discussion to make adjustments to contingency guidelines to accommodate t shirts and come to terms and identify additional funds to keep stipends up because this is a fund by the nature of the overall budget in pretty severe decline.

-Rosen states as we go through budgetable expenses that whatever money we're keeping will not be going back to SOOF or SGOF.

-Rosen wants to start a conversation about Budgetable Expense

-Cocroft states besides the funds and fees that are already allocated, how much flexibility do we have, say we wanted to put money somewhere else how does that work

-Champawat states you cant just redirect CSC funds to some place else. Dedicated fees cannot be redirected. For someone to say exactly where and what you guys are what you're doing and the degrees in which commitments are made and use funds in the budget would be a guessing game. Its common for student groups to get reimbursed. We're not trying to trap anyone into that and don't want to put people in that position. We don't know the commitments out there. We cant shift it away from the obligations and may have a range of motion and identify the method a little later. There's a limited number and there's a vice and want to leave it open to the group. Simmons is my cautionary agent and biting her tongue to make sure I don't commit to something. Simmons is the one who has to make it work and get us through the audits and the tax returns. Champawat states within that range and must work on mechanisms. Our job isn't to tell you what the values are, we're only telling you no because the voters or the rules. We are trying to give you maximum flexibility based on what your ancestors gave you on whatever circumstances.

-Wong wants to bring up flexibility and the most flexibility and if we were to do away with SOOF or even just decrease and that money can go to offices like FSC and GenReps and establish a fund since they have \$0 in their budget. I don't know if it's a good idea but I just would want to bring it up in the future.

-Rosen proposes that brings it back to SGOF and its usually divided by the 14 offices. Last year my office got 14,000 and this years its going to be \$9,000. If we divided \$9,000 by 14 it would be little. Especially those without referendum, you'll all have \$900. I recommend limiting SGOF to those that don't receive referendum. It would exclude CSC, CAC, SWC, EVP, CEC, and AAC and it will limit the office. SGOF would be for President, IVP, Facilities, FSC, Gen Reps, Transfer Rep, and FSC so they would get more money since they are receiving \$0 at this point. I want to put it on the table and see how different offices feel.

-Khan states she loves it and how does that application towards SGOF go

-Rosen states its provided already and you would look at the budget and thinking on how you would build that.

-Zimmerman states SGOF is used for office supplies, assistant line items, retreats and conferences. Its not meant for programming, its operational.

-Champawat states developing budgets and proposals based on presentations equal to all offices since it was a lot of work for distinctions that weren't that great such as \$2,000.

-Zimmerman states a lot of students weren't here during summer and a few didn't have the opportunity to turn in the requests and they would get 0. Zimmerman agreed to be redivided evenly.

-Khan asks that 13th and 14th with Genreps 5,600 is the 3 offices combined from SGOF.

So this time the SGOF would be fit between 13 offices?

-Cocroft asks if they do receive money from those who do get referendum can they buy operational costs? If they are having a retreat and aren't getting SGOF, can SWC use their referendum money for operational?

- Simmons said yes and a whole list should be submitted
- Simmons said it would be a programming fund, and those main commissions have a referendum for their commission to run.
- Champawat states they have to allocate a fund versus money to run a commission.
- Rosen asks if they receive referendum money?
- Champawat states yes they are part of entertainment fee and other fees.
- Dameron states I would personally be okay to give up the CSC because its largely funded and \$1,000 is minimal and we have left over.
- Champawat states the time frame is that we need to approve a budget before we go into August 1st and we cant enable any other budgets which means we cant delay the conversation forever. We cannot enter the year without an approved budget. I really prefer this week.
- Wong states tech and furniture opens beginning of winter whenever the surplus for the following year is approved.
- Chen states there are different conditions and requirements for what the money is allowed for SGOF, and do you know the difference between things we can buy with SGOF and Referendum. I know we cannot buy t shirts but can I get a general idea of what we can and cant buy
- Wong states she'll double check. SGOF and SOOF are all operational like supplies an things that you'll be using throughout the year and have throughout the year that wouldn't depreciate and wont be used for programs. That's the main difference, but referendums would be programming and everything else.
- Simmons states your referendums are on the USAC website and a big commission like SWC do all kinds of things
- Chen states he'll take a look at it.
- Rosen states if we keep SGOF for 14 offices everything would receive \$640 but if we do it just for the offices that don't receive referendum funds it would be \$1,120.50. Does anyone want to make recommendation that SGOF from 2015-2016 for just offices that don't receive referendum money. Khan seconds.
- Dameron moves that SGOF from 2015-2016 for just offices that don't receive referendum money. Khan seconds.
- 9-0-0 approved that SGOF is just for offices that don't receive referendum money which includes: President, Internal, Transfer Student, General Representative, Facilities, and FSC.
- Rosen wants to discuss budgetable expenses and administrated overhead on the next document.
- Siegel's have a couple of questions. Why does the administrative overhead significantly increase?
- Champawat states besides pay increases. That is your career staff and retirement costs and other expenses in the office and record keeping and the student staff and reflect minimum wage and part time staff. It reflects state of California minimum wage and there's a bridge to be crossed later about resolving the bylaw that governs your stipends and the stipends that are in the structures that are defined relative to your stipends. Your chiefs of staffs and those sorts are tied to minimum wage. There's a calculation of minimum assessment of hours spent times California minimum wage and its tied to California minimum wage. At the time it was done

they didn't discuss the Los Angeles minimum wage. That touches the last month of this year. Its going to be an issue in upcoming years and these bylaws haven't changed.

-Rosen states a later conversation about minimum wage and increasing minimum wage for future

-Champawat states their initial impression is that we have reason to believe we are in the city of Los Angeles and there's a way to look at being in the state, but it has to be looked at.

-Siegel states maintenance is increasing by \$5,500 and utilities increasing by \$2,064 and are those mandatory?

-Champawat states that associate students runs its own building and the primary costs of maintenance is waged and is custodians and electricians and carpenters and hose are represented wages and negotiated at the UCOP level and we are tied into that. If I can be more efficient with labor and there's much more labor efficiency available. What it is that we divide the numbers by the square feet of the complex and you have the small portion of the overall costs and an equal ratio on office allocations and the same with utilities. The numbers pretty good and aggressive efficiency plans and keep the energy costs down and have a number of plans to drive up our efficiency.

-Cocroft asks how do we determine if that's the amount that's needed for election board or is that discretionary

-Rosen states she's sending out the election board budget and how much they spend. If there are any items we want to change its time now. The total election board budget is \$36, 656. If you want a minute to review this I can offer a recess.

-Chen moves to have a 5 minute recess to review election board information.
9-0-0 there's a 5 minute recess at 8:12pm and will reconvene at 8:17pm.

-Leonine asks about the full page ads under advertising \$13,260.00

-Rosen states that's endorsements and we can change that but if we choose to change that CRC would have to include that an accommodate the change.

-Dameron asks if we change the budget do we then change election code?

-Rosen states yes.

-Cocroft states the stipend increases from \$331 to \$368 in January, why?

-Zimmerman states minimum wage increase

-Cocroft what is the stipend based on

-Zimmerman states financial guidelines, all stipends are tied to minimum wage. We took the same percentage and increase the other by the same percentage.

-Chen asks about the last category of repairs and maintenance if its supposed to be just \$0

-Simmons said its just 0

-Rosen states we can have a conversation about advertising

-Helder's proxy states how long has endorsement advertising been a part of election code because things like Facebook online might be more efficient than daily bruin

-Rosen states it's a way of advertising and in theory used to create a higher voter turnout even though its going down

-Dameron asks what are the expenses for advertising.

-Zimmerman last year they spent \$1100

-Champawat states its free and fair elections under the basis and its hard to get turn out. Its for those who aren't for some of USAC listservs

-Shao states because everything is so social media based and been the daily bruin website its usually election season is advertising itself already and everyone knows it hits spring quarter and crowded so its just the idea if the funding is as feasible to goal and purpose of what I t wants to create to increase voter turn out even though this year voter turn out went down

-Champawat states it's a two pronged goal, and one is voter turn out, but the other one is its turning out the voters you want. For integrity we want sufficient efforts that even the communities that are less connected to classic groups are aware of the election and issues. It's a fair question, but if there's an alternate it has to have some comparable function of broadness of transparency of those not part of classic model.

-Rosen states if you're relying on parties you are influencing a voter one way or another so the election board is supposed to be more neutral so the discussion is necessary printing the daily bruin the best option?

-Rafalian states daily bruin is viable and transparent but however maybe something we can do like the kind of ad and instead of having full page they can do ½ page ads to cut some funds. The ½ and full page are just flipping through that thing anyways.

-Chen has a quick question, if we have the amendments do we have to keep the money do we redistribute it

-Champawat states we have to keep track of what impact and the ultimate thing you have to do is to make sure you don't go to deficit spending. It has to be approved on very surface level and make sure you don't spend more than you have.

-Rosen states any money we allocate somewhere else could go to SOOF and SGOF and student groups and those 8 offices.

-Cocroft states they only spend \$10,000 on advertising and have \$6,000 left over, can election board spend \$6,000 elsewhere?

-Champawat states budget transfer is between costs lines. You are looking for insisting on the detail level and the detail is worth looking at to determine making prudent judgments and leaving them enough money to go through their work. Election boards do have to come back to the council at some point.

-Zimmerman states the extra \$5,000 was the special election.

-Rosen states to do 7 1/3 page ads would be 2,380 and 13 ½ 6,630 for a total of 9,010. It would decrease from \$18,830 to \$9,010 and the money would go back to SGOF and SOOF.

-Cocroft states the total money election board doesn't spend where does it go

-Simmons states surplus

-Dameron states the line item for flyering and we should consider removing that. With the reduction of advertising would reduce the 16,830 to 9,010 which is a total of \$7820 and the \$700 from removing graphics, brings us to \$8520 so I suggest we reduce the budget by \$8520.

-Zimmerman states in years pass they did issue flyers but whatever you all decide

-Leonine states given the fact that election board is during election season

-Rosen states we will vote on election chair when I push forward.

-Leonine asks have they submit a type of proposal on what they are using and an idea of what they're spending

- Rosen states that's what they spent last year and this is the precedent spent every year. The only conflict we are going to run into is that election code has to do a certain amount of ½ page ads and CRC will have to change election code. Right now we have on the table to reduce the election board budget by \$8520.
- Cocroft suggests taking that money and put it in discretionary in case they want to use it
- Dameron asks if its in discretionary can we transfer some from SOOF to SGOF.
- Rosen states the precedent for council discretionary would be council initiatives. Precedent is that student groups do not use council discretionary. We can do half to SGOF and half of discretionary or do one or the other.
- Champawat states there's \$10,000 in discretionary and if there's a need you can recognize that flexibility.
- Simmons states I was going to suggest contingency but election board isn't a student group so cannot apply to contingency.
- Wong states you're proposing taking some to discretionary. She states there was a request from eboard to use discretionary for incentives. Then in that case if they did want incentives and was approved and it would be flexible and they can take out money.
- Rosen states we are taking money that goes from SOOF and putting it in our own discretionary. If you take the \$8,520 we are giving it to our selves and not student groups. SOOF is underutilized and only 40% of SOOF used just throwing that out there. Rosen asks for discussion
- Rafalian asks what is discretionary used for.
- Rosen states \$5,000 used for AllofUs and part of it was used for EVP to travel to Sacramento, part of it was used for USAC live, and part of us used for AllofUs conference and used for council initiatives for everything or a specific office for emergency funds or an all council. Its up to the discretion of the council and goes to some sort of office initiative.
- Champawat states all of the money is locked up into channels and don't have a lot of places to go.
- Chen asks for a clarification of what's proposed
- Rosen states Dameron recommended taking out \$8,520 and do 7 1/3 and 13 ½ page ads and take out the graphics. The total reduced would be \$8,520. Further, it could be put into SOOF and SGOF or discretionary.
- Chen asks do we have to decide where that goes right now
- Rosen states yes we have to choose if that happens and where to put it whether SOOF and SGOF or council discretionary. We can do 2 separate votes. One for reducing the budget and the other is what to do with the money.
- Dameron moves to reduce the budget for election board from \$34,656 by \$8540.00 to \$26,136.00 for the 2015-2016 school year. Chen seconds.
- 9-0-0 the election board budget is now \$26,136.00
- Rosen states we must now vote where the \$8,520 goes whether its SOOF and SGOF and some of discretionary
- Khan asks to split it three ways
- Rafalian asks how much discretionary was used this past year
- Rosen states council has a buffer

-Khan states it would be best 80% towards SOOF and 20% towards SGOF and maybe not have as much towards SOOF and more towards SGOF and discretionary.

-Rosen states any left over funds 80% goes into SOOF and 20% SGOF we cant specifically put into SOOF and SGOF its just whatever is left over. We must choose how much to put in discretionary or the left over pool or put one way or the other.

-Zimmerman asks for any other discussions if there's any other changes we're making and where we're going to divide that funds so maybe we should come back to that.

-Rosen states it's a great idea and so far we have \$8,520. Now we will go to administrative.

-Siegel asks what the \$100 for jboard?

-Zimmerman states its all for supplies like nametags or supplies because made name plates for justices.

-Rosen states we discussed the infamous Kerckhoff telephones. As you can see there's \$13,030 used and FSC didn't use their phone but SWC and CSC used. We can have one consolidated phone line so that caller will call that one line and defer messages to respective offices and the offices that do use their phones can use their lines if they choose to do so.

-Cocroft asks how much would that save

-Champaway states the Kerckhoff telephones aren't just an antiquated instrument, a number of years ago there's an infrastructure and telecommunications IT. You all relate to IT and there needs to be a network of wireless systems and systems that support the computer infrastructure and all of that is in the telephone terminology on how it relates to your sense of the world. I think we were feeling that if we wanted to make a change we would be more conservative. I feel like \$1,000 would be a reasonable conservative target. If we got more from the task force the benefit would go down to future councils. That change would be put in lace and worth looking at and yield some to have a benefit of.

-Zimmerman there might be additional cost savings but additional expense to cut lines.

-Champawat states the idea to consolidate it's a change order at the very sort of least so we can feel confident to get \$1000.

-Rosen states its not just our office

-Champawat states that some groups have offices but aren't part of USAC so if you allocate someone an office there's a phone in that office and supported.

-Rosen states the 20+ student in Kerckhoff that have telephones are part of this charge

-Rosen asks who uses their phones or prefer to keep their lines

-Rosen states SWC, CAC, CAC, CEC, EVP, and Pres' office would still have the phone lines. Rosen asks who would feel okay to go through consolidated line

-Rosen states FSC, GenReps, Transfer, Facilities would be distributed back to the president's line and relay messages. AAC is questionable.

-Rosen states we can do a request for student groups who do or don't use them because I don't want to speak for them. We can reduce it be \$1,000 to \$12,030.

Dameron moves to reduce the Kerckhoff phone fees by \$1,000 to \$12,030. Rafalian seconds.

9-0-0 approved to reduce the Kerckhoff phone fees by \$1,000 to \$12,030.

-Cocroft asks about the new software update

-Zimmerman states we bought a 3 year firewall, but we also have to apply for the service so that's the depreciation cost we had to end. We used to have hardwire internet and we wanted to add wireless internet and to expand on how many computers you can have and we added the firewall for security measures.

-Rosen asks about administrative and overview expenses. Going back now we must decide what to do with the \$9,520.

-Chen states I would recommend a divide between the two funds because the most staggering figure was that only 40% of SOOF was used so that's the biggest thing we should all consider that.

-Shao asks if Rosen can list the options.

-Rosen states we have \$9,520. The first option is to put it all in discretionary. The second is to put it in SGOF/SOOF with 80% in SGOF and 20% SOOF. The third option is to put part of it in discretionary and SGOF/SOOF.

-Chen states to clarify as long as its divided between the SOOF/SGOF and discretionary. We have obligations to give it back to the student groups and we want to do discretionary as each of these things expand.

-Dameron states a good thing is to keep discretionary to an even number like a little more to discretionary a little less to operational funds of SOOF and SGOF. The total is 9,520 and put 6,000 to discretionary and take the remaining 3,520 to operational SGOF and SOOF which will be divided 80 and 20.

-Cocroft states he likes a majority to go to discretionary and since we gutted the election boards budget by $\frac{1}{4}$ we should be able to ensure that just in case anything happens with eboard and let it be supported.

-Siegel asks if it could go to contingency because SOOF if its being cut student groups aren't going to get that much money regardless if we increase it by \$1,000 and what Siegel suggests is to put most of it towards contingency because when you apply you get bigger sums of money and put it all towards contingency.

-Rosen states we can allow \$9,520 to contingency

-Dameron wants to amend it and we are cutting eboard's budget and want to be prepared and put 6000 to discretionary and put 3520 it into programming fund of contingency.

-Rosen states we have two options of \$6000 to discretionary and put \$3520 it into programming fund of contingency or \$9520 to contingency

-Dameron moves to redistribute the \$9,520 with \$6,000 to discretionary and \$3,520 to contingency. Shao seconds.

9-0-0 there will be \$6,000 to discretionary and \$3,520 to contingency for the 2015-2016 year.

-Rosen opens the discussion to any part of the budget.

-Leonine moves to approve the entire overhead budget for the 2015-2016 academic year. Rafalian seconds.

9-0-0 the overhead budget is approved.

-Rosen thanks all the administrators.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet is passed around.

XII. Adjournment

-Dameron moves to adjourn the meeting. Rafalian seconds.

Rosen adjourns the meeting at 9:02pm.

XII. Good and Welfare