University of Alberta Students' Union

BYLAW COMMITTEE

Tuesday, June 6, 2017
6:30 PM
SUB 0-55

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT	SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK (IF ABSENT)
Brandon Christensen (Chair)		Y	N/A
Sandy Brophy		Y	N/A
Navneet Gidda		0.5	N/A
Delane Howie		Y	N/A
Nicole Jones		Y	N/A
Robyn Paches		Y	N/A
Alannah Piasecki		Y	N/A

MINUTES (BC 2017-02)

2017-02/1 INTRODUCTION

2017-02/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 18:30 (6:30 PM) by CHRISTENSEN.

2017-02/1b Approval of Agenda

HOWIE/BROPHY MOVE to approve the agenda.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2017-02/1c Approval of Minutes

JONES/HOWIE MOVE to approve the minutes.

5/0/1 (Abstention by Paches.)
CARRIED

2017-02/1d Chair's Business

2017-02/1d Attendance

Attendance was taken. Proxies in attendance were noted above. Speaker Sumar was in attendance.

2017-02/2 <u>QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD</u>

2017-02/2a Executive election pre-campaigning - Where do we go from here?

CHRISTENSEN:
Let's defer the discussion about this to the next meeting.

CHRISTENSEN/JONES move item 2a to the next meeting.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2017-02/2b Universal materials discussion

CHRISTENSEN:
I want to have a brief discussion about this. As I have not run an executive election, I don't know what's happening regarding this issue.

BROPHY:
Vice-president Larsen and I rewrote this. However, the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) Donald didn't interpret it the way I thought he would. His interpretation wasn't wrong. But, it was read in a different way than its intent.

HOWIE:
If I can recall Donald's presentation last year, it was about what a universal material is, and what we can consider as a universal material.

BROPHY:

But, that's not what we had in mind. In our opinion, anything that a candidate was willing to provide to everybody equally was a universal material. I wouldn't mind going back to the drawing board on this. However, as I have other priorities, it may take some time.

HOWIE:
In your budget, are you able to spend money on anything?

PACHES:
In previous years, candidates would have a $550 budget and a separate $100 for universal materials. However, the C. R. O last year interpreted it as a $550 budget from which $100 could be used for universal materials.

BROPHY:
The second budget is not in Bylaw at all.

HOWIE:
Back to the original question, can you spend your $550 on anything you want?

PACHES:
Yes. But, I can't spend my money on incentives/prizes.

HOWIE:
So, if I don't like my tape, can I buy more tape with my budget?

BROPHY:
Yes.

CHRISTENSEN:
Why doesn't everyone have their own budget and buy their own resources.

BROPHY:
It has a chance to squash innovation. It can cut things out of your budget which may be interesting.

PIASECKI:
Some people would spend their money on essential resources as opposed to the actual innovative campaigning.

CHRISTENSEN:
I find the whole thing confusing.

HOWIE:
I do too. I'm more into how CRO interpreted it last year. Certain things will be provided. If you want to get other things, you must use your budget for that. There's no such thing as buying for everybody.

PIASECKI:
If essentials are taken care of, you should be responsible for your own campaign.

CHRISTENSEN:
I think that's the way we should go.

BROPHY:
I'll try to give a better explanation in the future. However, I worry that this may hinder innovation.

HOWIE:
You can be really innovative even with $100. There are some trade-offs for sure though.

CHRISTENSEN:
Let's discuss about this further during the next meeting.

BROPHY:
It's more an issue with Council campaigns as there's more wriggle room in executive elections.

2017-02/2c Bylaw 2400 - Candidates

CHRISTENSEN:
I think this might be an editorial change. Go to Section 8.14 and 8.15 in Bylaw 2400. There is no wording as to what happens when a seat is vacant.

BROPHY:
You can actually end up with a vacant seat even without intending to do so. We should word it such that whoever comes second will get the seat of the joke candidate.

HOWIE:
If the second place is "none of the above", the seat would remain vacant.

CHRISTENSEN:
Do you think that this is an editorial?

HOWIE:
I don't think so.

PACHES:
This changes the meaning.

BROPHY:
I wish it wasn't, but I think it's not. It's not going to be contentious.

PIASECKI:
Is there a rule about joke candidates not becoming joke candidates?

CHRISTENSEN:
Yes. You have a two after the nomination to change. The Bylaw says, "within 48 hours after being designated a joke candidate". Does this mean the nomination deadline?

HOWIE:
You are designated a candidate at the nomination deadline.

CHRISTENSEN:
Where's the wording for that? What if you hand in your nomination 2 days before the deadline?

HOWIE:
You're right. It's not there.

CHRISTENSEN:
I think we should also change this accordingly. Is 48 hours good?

HOWIE:
Yes.

2017-02/3 **<u>COMMITTEE BUSINESS</u>**

2017-02/3a **Students' Council Standing Orders**

CHRISTENSEN/PIASECKI move to recommend the amended Council standing orders to the Council Administration Committee. (See standing order document on Google Drive.)

6/0/0
CARRIED

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

CHRISTENSEN:
There used to be a heading before every single statement. I crossed those out because they were extremely redundant. If we're all in agreement we can forego those.

SUMAR:
Just make sure it goes all the way down even to the appendices.

CHRISTENSEN:
We should make a motion to omnibus those changes.

PACHES:
But, what would that motion say? If the committee agrees, that should be fine.

CHRISTENSEN:
OK. If we all agree, we can move on.

HOWIE:
The title need to be capitalized.

CHRISTENSEN:
Do you have comments about Section 2.5?

SUMAR:
We can make this into a single paragraph.

HOWIE:
Under Section 3, it should be "more than 96 hours" instead of "greater than …'.

SUMAR:
The numbering must be changed accordingly.

CHRISTENSEN:
If nothing is submitted in the order papers, the meeting is automatically cancelled. Currently, it's not cancelled until there's nothing in the late additions.

HOWIE:
Will it result in more cancelled meetings?

CHRISTENSEN:
I think it may. It'll give people more time to plan their schedule.

PACHES:
If there's no business in the order papers, whatever comes in the late additions can usually wait till the next meeting.

SUMAR:
If something critical comes up in the late additions, we can always call an emergency meeting.

PACHES:
I'm in favour of the change.

CHRISTENSEN:
It's a clean change. Anything in Section 4? I think Section 4.5 was one of Speaker Sumar's comments. We are changing the deadline to 2:00 pm. Currently, it's not stipulated.

PACHES:
I'm OK with the change.

SUMAR:
We have Section 4.6 under Special Orders as well. Do we want to have it at both places?

HOWIE:
It's odd to have it at both places.

SUMAR:
It would be good if you can remove the section “at the discretion of Students’ Council”.

CHRISTENSEN:
I’ll axe that.

PACHES:
From what I have seen only a few special orders were on timely matters.

GIDDA:
Why do we even have paper copies of the agenda package?

SUMAR:
If a student walks into 2-900, the paper copies are in their face.

BROPHY:
Yes, it’s good to have these for guests.

CHRISTENSEN:
I don’t have strong feelings about this.

PACHES:
It’s all right as long as we’re only making a few. Back in the day, we used to make paper copies for everyone.

SUMAR:
We usually ask councillors whether they need paper copies or not. Afterwards, we print a few additional copies to people who may turn up. These copies are available at 2-900. Once 5:00 pm hits, they’re taken to Council.

CHRISTENSEN:
Let’s move on to Section 6. What do you think about the oath reminder?

BROPHY:
Some people may like it while others won’t. It’s ceremonial. We come to the more important treaty acknowledgements afterwards. We can say

that the speaker will remind members of the oath councillors have taken.

CHRISTENSEN:
Why don't we refer Section 2.6 here, and have Section 2.6 refer Appendix 6?

SUMAR:
Should we add attendance to Speakers' Business in Section 6?

CHRISTENSEN:
Yes, for sure. It's appropriate for us to give Speaker Sumar some ability to make opinions. I hope we're all OK with that.

PACHES:
Under Section 7, the abstract should be "up to 100-words" not "a 100-word".

CHRISTENSEN:
We now come to the hotly debated topic of what happens if there are more than 2 presentations. It mostly occurs after Fall.

BROPHY:
It's not unreasonable to ask people to spread out the presentations.

PACHES:
Conceptually, I'm in favour of 2 presentations. Practically, I'm hesitant to put a limitation. Although we tried, scheduling was very difficult last year. I'd hate to see presentations on necessary updates be cancelled or delayed due to the limitation.

BROPHY:
If there are more than 2 presentations, we can have a rule that any presentation beyond the second is not eligible to have a vote on extension. Everybody's eager to accept a vote to extend even though there are more presentations. The presenter knows the length, and he/she should make the presentation accordingly.

HOWIE:
Who decides which one goes first? The presenter didn't decide to go after the second. It wasn't their call.

BROPHY:
I'd prefer if none can be extended if there are more than 2.

CHRISTENSEN:
We can prioritize presentations by importance. For example, some Students' Union (SU) ones can be realistically rescheduled. If its' somebody like the Provost doing a presentation, that could be maintained even if it was submitted late.

PACHES:
Right now, it's at the Speaker's discretion.

CHRISTENSEN:
If we are going to have this, we should put in a clause allowing a suitable person to establish how the order is going to be.

PACHES:
I trust our current speaker and future speakers to make the correct call.

BROPHY:
I agree.

CHRISTENSEN:
Student's Council can always have more than 2 presentations if they suspend the rules.

BROPHY:
The real problem arises from people not preparing the presentations properly. We are habitually allowing extensions. If there are more than 2, having the extra vote to suspend standing orders would enable Council to weigh in whether this is important or not.

PACHES:
In my opinion, we don't need to add anything like that. Council can

always suspend the Standing Orders and have more than 2 presentations.

HOWIE:
Talking about this makes me feel that we should remove the limit.

CHRISTENSEN:
The presentations should be limited to 20 minutes.

PACHES:
It's usually not a question of the presentations being overlength. It's the question period. It's not proper to limit questions especially at Council.

SUMAR:
The only occasion where you can limit questions is when that person is at Council's disposal, like an executive. You know you can ask questions from them during the question period.

PACHES:
Yes. When somebody like the provost is there, it may be the only opportunity councillors will have to question him/her.

CHRISTENSEN:
Let's leave it at 2 presentations, which are prioritized by the speaker for the order. Students' Council can overturn if they want to hear more.

SUMAR:
There's a later clause in the standing orders limiting Council to 10:00 pm. If that limitation is set already, you should be able to have as many presentations as you want.

HOWIE:
I'd agree to that more than limiting it to 2 presentations.

BROPHY:
If we schedule a bunch of presentations, we may have to cut off questions from the last one because we hit the limit of 10:00 pm.

PACHES:
You can get rid of the standing orders at that time too.

SUMAR:
I haven't been in a meeting where presentations have gone beyond 8:30 or 9:00 pm.

HOWIE:
If there some groups who don't have much time to present their things, I'd want to give them the opportunity.

PACHES:
In order for faculty associations (FAs) to get their membership fees approved, they must make a presentation to Council. This could have cascading effects if we have scheduling conflicts.

SUMAR:
Yes, sometimes presentations are necessary, while debate on a particular motion may be pushed till later. We have to allow these external parties to present to us.

CHRISTENSEN:
We'll keep this as is. Councillor Gidda agrees as well. She also prefers the 10:00 pm cut-off rather than limiting it to 2 presentations.

SUMAR:
Under Section 8, I haven't been in a meeting where someone has asked for a vote on a nomination.

CHRISTENSEN:
Yes, we don't vote on somebody when they are appointed to a committee.

BROPHY:
Also, we are nominating someone who has already been voted in. I can't imagine a vote taking place at all.

SUMAR:

The only situation I can think of is if somebody thought the nomination was a bit rushed. Even then, they can make a motion to table that.

CHRISTENSEN:
For section 9.4, I'm not sure what it used to look like.

SUMAR:
It was a summary of motions passed at the Executive Committee. It's the bare minimum that has to be included. For example, if you pass a bunch of motions at Bylaw, a summary of those motions should be included.

CHRISTENSEN:
So, are we good with deleting 9.4 because it gets repeated in 9.5?

SUMAR:
No, I wouldn't axe it.

CHRISTENSEN:
I rewrote 9.5 to bring align it more with practice. Right now, we include the motion along with the mover and seconder without any other description.

SUMAR:
The other important thing is the committee attendance. There's a written record submitted to Council.

CHRISTENSEN:
Are we good with this change? We had an era where every committee had to submit a report, which was almost always never done.

HOWIE:
We don't want a certain committee reporting on others. All committees are created equally.

CHRISTENSEN:
Great. Let's put a comment there saying that we discussed about it.

SUMAR:

I like Open Forum given that it provides a platform for students to ask questions from Council. However, it may undermine your positions as councillors. The councillors are the representatives of their faculties. They should be the conduits for their faculties. The only caveat would be when the student wasn't to hold the councillor responsible.

BROPHY:
I agree, but it's too late to change it now.

CHRISTENSEN:
I agree too. It was a decision made in haste, and at that time it was porly worded.

HOWIE:
I understand where you're both coming from. But, I like Open Forum because it gives the opportunity for students to ask questions and hold their councillors accountable. Apart from students, it's open to guests and media too.

BROPHY: When the Gateway asks questions, it's quite productive and interesting.

SUMAR:
Open Forum is slowly becoming a forum for debate as opposed to a platform to get information. That's not what it was meant for.

PACHES:
Before, you had to suspend standing orders if you wanted to extend open forum.

BROPHY:
To extend open forum beyond 30 minutes, I like the 2/3 because it has to be significant enough.

SUMAR:
You are basically going over the rules at that point, and it takes 2/3 to do that. So, it makes sense. This is already done, but not in this version of standing orders for some reason.

CHRISTENSEN:
That's why I'm personally going to make these changes. What do you think about limiting the number of oral questions to 4? There is no limit on written questions.

PACHES:
I like limiting it. However, picking 4 is kind of arbitrary. I don't have a number to suggest though. We can look a t a precedent.

SUMAR:
If we have it at 5, then one person asking questions and fully utilizing the opportunity will not result in open forum being extended. That makes some sense to me.

BROPHY:
I'd rather not let it get extended unless there's huge interest. I don't want one person taking over everything. Therefore, I like the numbers as they are now.

CHRISTENSEN:
Speaker Sumar is suggesting 5. I'd be amenable to anything less than 5. The precedent for 2 would be the number of speaking terms you'd get in a debate.

HOWIE:
I like to have 4.

BROPHY:
I like 3. 2 seems a little low.

PACHES:
3 seems nice.

HOWIE:
I'd be OK with 3 too. However, I'm not in favour of giving somebody a minute to ask questions.

SUMAR:
A minute may be important to give context to the question.

BROPHY:
30 seconds is a longer period of time than most people realize. It gives you a chance to give some context.

HOWIE:
If someone needs more time they can send it in.

BROPHY:
If your question is so complex that it needs a lot of context, it should be a written question anyway.

SUMAR:
But, you're reasonable and logical. If someone wants to come in and put Council and the executives on edge, they'll ask a complex question. To me, one minute makes sense.

BROPHY:
If someone uses all 3 of their questions to ask what ends up being just one question, I'm fine with that. If the question is complex, they have 2 more chances to get people to understand.

CHRISTENSEN:
I don't have strong feelings. Is 45 seconds a compromise?

BROPHY:
I think a minute is excessive.

HOWIE:
Is there anything else which is 45 seconds? I'd rather go with a minute rather than 45 seconds.

The committee conducted s straw poll for the number of minutes allocated for a question during open forum. Each member was allowed to vote for more than one choice. The results were: 30 seconds – 4 votes, 45 seconds – 3 votes, I minute – 3 votes.

CHRISTENSEN:
Is everyone good with Section 10? What do you want to do for the number of questions an individual is allowed to ask in Section 11? Should we keep it the same.

BROPHY:
While it's convincing that people who are elected should get more chances to ask questions, we may want to keep the numbers the same.

HOWIE:
If the system is working, you're asking questions from your constituents as a councillor. As such, there should not be so many questions for a student to ask directly. I'm fine with 3 and 3.

BROPHY:
In Section 12, the numbering seems weird, but the contents make perfect sense.

SUMAR:
In the previous version of standing orders, it mentioned that the speaker was able to sense inappropriate questions.

PIASECKI:
That's a good idea. Someone at some point will get very angry.

BROPHY:
It's a huge benefit.

SUMAR:
I'm looking for that wording here. I'm pretty sure that that change was made.

CHRISTENSEN:
Standing orders never get updated properly.

SUMAR:
I suggest putting a timestamp on all changes.

CHRISTENSEN:
Let's go back to section 10 and say that the speaker can sensor a question that is deemed personal in nature.

HOWIE:
It should be worded as "personal or inappropriate".

BROPHY:
It's a reasonably vague umbrella term that fits nicely with our intent here.

CHRISTENSEN:
Section 12 seems fine now.

PIASECKI:
I'll fix all the bad grammar.

CHRISTENSEN:
Should only students be guests? Or should we allow anyone to be a guest?

HOWIE:
Having non-students being guests enables our new committee to have elders present.

BROPHY:
Yes, that's true.

CHRISTENSEN:
Agreed. Let's get to Section 18. We need a conversation about this. Four hour meetings are long, and we should be pulling the plug at that time. It's an accessibility thing. Transit stops, and people have to get to work the next morning. We're doing a voluntary service.

HOWIE:
For me, it's mostly about the concentration at that point.

SUMAR:
Yes, you can't put forth your full mental capacity if you were at the meeting for 4 hours.

HOWIE:
Things are more likely to get passed through without due consideration.

PACHES:
I'm in full support.

SUMAR:
Do you want to put in a clause saying that items from the meeting which go past the 10:00 pm cut-off would automatically move on to the subsequent meeting? If not, do you want an additional meeting?

HOWIE:
I prefer moving things to the next meeting. We can always have an emergency meeting if required.

SUMAR:
When we get to the Winter semester, the meetings run very long, and the last 2 council meetings can potentially go till 10:00 pm. Then, you have no choice other than to have an additional meeting.

BROPHY:
You can have an additional meeting or vote to extend it past 10:00 pm.

JONES:
I agree.

GIDDA:
I agree with the 10:00 pm cap as well.

CHRISTENSEN: We'll make a comment saying that the committee unanimously agreed with the 10:00 pm cut-off.

SUMAR:
In Section 19, we need to make a small change in the first point by

deleting the “or”.

CHRISTENSEN:
No. If Council decides to suspend standing orders, we should keep the status-quo as it is now.

SUMAR:
You can’t build the rules in case somebody is going to break them.

CHRISTENSEN:
This is a rule that is going to be broken. Adjournment may not necessarily be at 10:00 pm. It could be earlier as well.

SUMAR:
Then, we should just leave it as “prior to adjournment” without including the 10:00 pm. The essence of the rule is that the meeting will end before 10:00 pm. To me that makes sense.

BROPHY:
But, if the meeting does go after 10:00 pm, you don’t have to worry about attendance after that according to the spirit of this rule.

SUMAR:
As speaker, I will always take attendance at 10:00 pm regardless of whether the meeting was extended or not.

BROPHY:
Somebody else may interpret it differently.

CHRISTENSEN:
There will be occasions where the meetings may go beyond 10:00 pm. In such an instance, the standing orders should imply that we shouldn’t worry about attendance after that point.

PACHES:
The only way for a meeting to go beyond 10:00 pm is by suspending standing orders. Then, the speaker can take attendance at his/her will because there are no rules!

HOWIE:
That's a good point.

BROPHY:
Still, keeping that clause will act as a guide to the speaker.

HOWIE:
I disagree with you, but I won't continue arguing about this.

CHRISTENSEN:
Shall we keep it then?
Coming to Section 19.3, shall we keep it like that?

BROPHY:
I like it because the faculty association can then appoint a proxy. If someone drops from Council at a weird time, that faculty may be without a councillor for a long period.

SUMAR:
There was an occasion where a councillor didn't come to any meeting. So, that faculty was particularly hard done by this. I regard councillors as representing their faculty, and not necessarily the whole undergraduate student population. For example, if a particular councillor isn't showing up and I'm a student in that faculty, I'd wasn't my voice to be heard even on an interim basis. For a vacancy petition, there should be a vacancy first.

BROPHY:
Yes, somebody must know that there is a vacancy for vacancy petitions to work. Notifying the faculty association ensures that somebody knows about the vacancy.

CHRISTENSEN:
I'm good with keeping it.

HOWIE:
Are councillors associated with their faculty association?

BROPHY:
Not in an official way.

HOWIE:
What if the faculty association in question is rebuilding? Would the power transfer over to the departmental associations?

BROPHY:
At least, the faculty association can pass on the knowledge that there is a vacancy. We aren't stipulating what should be done about it. If there is no organization to inform, so be it.

SUMAR:
Section 19.3 should say "3 consecutive meetings" instead of "3 meetings".

CHRISTENSEN:
Yes, I like that.

SUMAR:
In Section 21, I like the change about 24 hours notice. It enables the speaker to verify the proxy beforehand.

HOWIE:
What if it's 3:00 pm, I'm ill, and my friend is willing to go for me. Wouldn't he/she count as a proxy?

SUMAR:
It would be on a case by case basis.

HOWIE:
Should we add that to the standing orders?

PIASECKI:
You can say that extenuating circumstances may be accommodated.

HOWIE:

Are you OK with that?

SUMAR:
Yes.

BROPHY:
In Section 22, the official Council live stream is an official thing. Putting the capitalization shows how important it is.

PACHES:
We should say that only the stream administered by the speaker is considered official.

BROPHY:
Yes.

HOWIE:
Yes. Instead of just saying "live stream" word it like "the official Students' Council Live Stream".

PACHES:
Say that it is organized and set up by the speaker, and that there is only one.

CHRISTENSEN:
Shouldn't we just get rid of Section 23.1 about confidentiality? The Grant Allocation Committee doesn't even exist now. We should leave the Council Mentorship Program up to the Council Administration Committee.

2017-02/3b Bill #1 - Elections Forums Amendment - *Second Reading*

First Principles

1. Formal regulation of elections forums under Bylaw 2200 is limited to only the Myer Horowitz Forum. There is no regulation of forums under Bylaw 2300.
2. In light of DIE Board ruling 2016-01, additional and clarifying

regulations are required, in order for the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) most effectively perform their job.

3. Bylaw 2200 shall be amended to broaden the rules of forums to extend to all forums organized by the elections office, not just the Myer Horowitz Forum.
4. Bylaw 2300 shall be amended to include rules regarding the conduct of forums under that Bylaw, if applicable.
5. The new regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the following, in addition to those already listed in Bylaw:
    a. No candidate or side, or a volunteer representing their campaign, shall interfere, attempt to stop, limit, or otherwise dissuade a member from asking a question during an elections office organized forum.
    b. The CRO shall prioritize audience questions from members who have not already submitted a question orally or electronically.
    c. The CRO shall be permitted to set a time limit restricting the length of individual questions and answers during forums, at their discretion, so long as these details are provided to the candidates and sides in advance and verbalized at the start of the forum.
6. The legislative structure for Bylaw 2300 will follow the same framework as Bylaw 2200, except not mandating the CRO host a forum.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

CHRISTENSEN:
I'll read out the changes.

HOWIE:
It all looks great, and it's straightforward.

BROPHY:
It's good.

MOTION:

CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE to approve the second reading of Bill #1 - Elections Forums, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on the following first principles (See Google Drive for second reading changes).

6/0/0
CARRIED

2017-02/4 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2017-02/5 **ADJOURNMENT**

2017-02/5a **Next Meeting:** Tuesday, June 20, 2017 @ 6:30 PM in SUB 0-55.

2017-02/5b **PIASECKI/PACHES MOVE** to adjourn at 8:40 PM.

6/0/0
CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 20:40 (8:40 PM).

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
HOWIE/BROPHY MOVE to approve the agenda.	6/0/0 CARRIED
JONES/HOWIE MOVE to approve the minutes.	5/0/1 CARRIED
CHRISTENSEN/PIASECKI move to recommend the amended Council standing orders to the Council Administration Committee. (See standing order document on Google Drive.)	6/0/0 CARRIED
CHRISTENSEN/JONES move item 2a to the next meeting.	6/0/0 CARRIED
CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE to approve the second reading of Bill #1 - Elections Forums, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on the following first principles (See Google Drive for second reading changes).	6/0/0 CARRIED
PIASECKI/PACHES MOVE to adjourn at 8:40 PM.	6/0/0 CARRIED