**ATTENDANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Angus (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Kwan</td>
<td>Brandon Christensen</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Wang</td>
<td>Nik Viktorov</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrique Ndatirwa</td>
<td>Robyn Paches</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Larsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi Flaman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Brophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MINUTES (CAC 2016-7)**

**2016-7/1**  
**INTRODUCTION**

**2016-7/1a**  
**Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 7:02 pm.

**2016-7/1b**  
**Approval of Agenda**
CHRISTENSEN/FLAMAN moved to approve the agenda for August 16, 2016 as amended.
Vote 7/0/0
CARRIED

2016-7/1c Approval of Minutes

ANGUS amended the minutes to change the name “Victoria Dejong” to “Nick Dejong” under Attendance.

VIKTOROV/LARSEN moved to approve the minutes for August 02, 2016 as amended.
Vote 7/0/0
CARRIED

2016-7/1d Chair’s Business

ANGUS: There’s a PowerPoint slide about Council that Deb of Discover Governance has been preparing for the orientation. I need your opinion on it. She wanted your opinion on whether we should have this photo with Councillors or whether we should have the blurred photo of Council chambers. I think the blurred one looks neater.
LARSEN: The blurred one looks better.
FLAMAN: The word “ultimate authority” doesn’t look suitable.
ANGUS: I can ask her to change that as well.
FLAMAN: Between the 2 photos, I prefer the one with the councillors.
BROPHY: The one with the councillors looks somewhat tacky.
FLAMAN: Now that I think about it, that photo doesn’t even have all the councillors.
PACHES: I’m indifferent between the 2.
ANGUS: The blurred one looks neater. Also, if all councillors aren’t represented, it may not be appropriate to use it. That being said, we can get a photo of all of us if needed.
BROPHY: Maybe a photo of Council chambers or the building it’s located in might be suitable.
CHRISTENSEN: A lot of people don’t know where Council is held.
BROPHY: A picture of University Hall would be perfect.
ANGUS: The blurred photo actually depicts the Council chambers, but people won’t know that unless they have actually been to the chambers.
I’ll tell Deb about putting a photo of University Hall, and about changing the word “ultimate authority”.

FLAMAN: A phrase such as “highest governing body” may be more suitable.
PACHES: I prefer that too.
BROPHY: Yes, that makes more sense.
ANGUS: It sounds better. I’ll let Deb know. Just in case she has to go with only these 2 photos, which do you prefer?
BROPHY: The one without councillors.

ANGUS: We had 6 people from 2-900 order sweaters. There weren’t too many staff. But, it was nice to see at least some of them ordering. They should be here before September. I’ll take the cash from you guys, and I’ll let you know once we have them.

2016-7/2 OLD BUSINESS

2016-7/3 NEW BUSINESS

2016-7/4 DISCUSSION

2016-7/4a Voting Methods for Council

ANGUS: We have 3 main options: 1) maintaining it the way we are doing now (roll call), 2) electronic voting with assigned seats, 3) going back to what we had before.
CHRISTENSEN: Are those the only options?
ANGUS: I’d like to keep it down to those 3.
BROPHY: Roll call takes longer. Also, how people voted before affects later voters. I also believe we need to have accountability and a record of who voted for what. So, I think the best option is electronic voting.
CHRISTENSEN: I like the way it is. It doesn’t take as long as I thought it would.
LARSEN: In the span of our meeting time, the time it takes to complete a vote isn’t too big. I’m in favour of a roll call vote.
ANGUS: If we do end up going to roll call, I’ll move the Executive voting after the Councillor voting.
VIKTOROV: As an engineering student, I’m in favour of an electronic system.
PACHES: I don’t like roll call. It works against the purpose of abstaining. Everyone should realistically have a yes/no answer to every motion. You should abstain if there is a conflict of interest. With roll call, the “abstain” option isn’t used for its purpose. With what we had before, we didn’t see nearly the number of abstentions we’re seeing now. I’m all for accountability and transparency, but I don’t like the roll call system. If people don’t have a stance or if they don’t want to get caught in the contention, they’ll just say “abstain”.

ANGUS: We have seen a bit more engagement now. But, I do think it’s not used properly right now.

LARSEN: The last few votes had far fewer abstentions than before. The problem with abstentions comes from the fact that people are using the voting system incorrectly.

CHRISTENSEN: It’s your right to vote however you want.

LARSEN: We can ask the Speaker to push for reasoning when people abstain. CAC (Council Administration Committee) can also ask for those questions and post them with the meeting minutes. It’s obviously annoying. But, everybody has that right even though it’s not the best thing to do.

PACHES: You should be able to make those decisions. I don’t care about the time it takes. It shouldn’t be an issue. We should only be worried about accountability, proper procedure, and being transparent. With the electronic system, it’s still accountable but people wouldn’t have to pull their votes out in front of everybody. So, we’ll see a marked decrease in abstentions. The reason we saw less abstentions in the last Council meeting was because there were more contentious motions. We’ll see the most amounts of abstentions in the 70% of motions which are in the middle. If it’s on either end of the spectrum, people are going to be more confident saying yes/no.

ANGUS: I agree. Most of our motions would be in the 70% range. In our last meeting, we had a few of really contentious motions.

CHRISTENSEN: I’m in favour of moving on to electronic voting. However, it doesn’t fix the problem. Even I have abstained in the past because I wasn’t interested. Electronic voting will make it easier to abstain.

BROPHY: Psychologically, people are less likely to vote NO if they have to say it out loud.

CHRISTENSEN: We should not be worried about that.

PACHES: That’s something we should keep in mind in student politics.

LARSEN: Electronic voting disconnects us further than what roll call does. We’ll have to wait 3-4 days till the minutes came out in order to see how people voted. During the meeting, we may have
only a couple of seconds to look at the screen. The people who come to Council to watch us vote are coming to see a roll call vote. When the Gateway is there tweeting live, it makes it a more engaged process. We should continue with roll call. We don’t use electronic voting anywhere else.

VIKTOROV: Wouldn’t it be on the screen?
LARSEN: Yes, but it changes back very quickly.
PACHES: If it’s contentious, someone could ask it to be read off. It shouldn’t be a big deal. I don’t think people are coming there to look at roll call. The Gateway is tweeting about the actual results. It’s good that the votes are out 3-4 days later with the minutes because you can see the context within which people voted, and what they said.

BROPHY: We can make it last on the screen for a little longer. We aren’t really putting a show for the people in the gallery too.
LARSEN: It’s a process and procedure. In democratic institutions, you vote with your voice.
PACHES: If we’re talking about democratic institutions, we wouldn’t be doing roll call. A call for division is only used for specific motions when you want to see how people voted.
LARSEN: In student governance bodies, they use yes/no.
PACHES: We obviously made a decision to see everything with a call for division. I don’t think roll call is as effective as it should be. We should move towards the electronic system. At least it warrants a try.

CHRISTENSEN: I think that’s fair.
ANGUS: I have mostly heard negative comments about roll call. A majority of people who support it are incidentally in CAC. I believe it’s unfortunate that we have to take how people vote into consideration. But, we have to be realistic.
PACHES: I fully agree that we shouldn’t be thinking about this. The people students elect have to be confident in making the necessary decisions. However, we should keep in mind that we are still in student politics. Not everyone may have the gusto to come forward with a yes/no. So, we have to be realistic, and need to have a welcoming environment.
LARSEN: Do we properly prepare this people if we don’t have a gusto system?
PACHES: I believe we do. It’s not a stark jump.
ANGUS: As these results will be made public, it achieves the same goal as roll call without the whole persuasion factor.
LARSEN: Because it’s only me and Councillor Christensen who are more in favour of roll call, I’m amenable to moving forward with electronic voting with assigned seats. But, I would suggest that CAC
changes its standing orders so that this has to be a motion voted on in the future. The wording can be vague enough so that we can use the electronic version, but it should be a roll call method of some sort.

CHRISTENSEN: I agree with Councillor Larsen. I like it to be the way it is. But, if we are going to go ahead with this, I would like to have the call for division. I would like to have everyone stand up and redo the vote if someone questions about the results. But, at a minimum, it should be read out from the electronic system. Also, there can be glitches with the computer system.

ANGUS: If there’s the odd glitch, we can go to the roll call system.

PACHES: I’m fine with it being a backup.

NAGUS: For the more contentious motions, we can still call for divisions.

LARSEN: I don’t mind randomizing the order.

ANGUS: So, are you comfortable with moving forward with the electronic system?

CHRISTENSEN: Are we going to do it in the next Council meeting?

ANGUS: The Speaker wouldn’t be there for the next meeting, and I’ll be chairing it. Therefore, I don’t think it’s a good idea to jump into the electronic voting system. So, how should we proceed with the voting for this upcoming meeting?

LARSEN: Set a seating plan, and mention that we’ll be moving towards electronic voting afterwards. Specify that the standard will be roll call whether electronic or not.

PACHES: Why not take the vote to Council. I believe that would be most appropriate. I know that technically every Council member is a member of CAC. But, this is an important issue relating to Council.

ANGUS: Regardless of whether we go ahead with roll call or not, I believe it’s good to bring it before Council. Given how engaged Council is regarding this issue, we should bring it before Council.

CHRISTENSEN: For the next Council meeting, you can have Discover Governance print off a document containing the 128 voting numbers, and everyone could indicate where they are sitting. They can choose the seat for the rest of the year. With that, you at least have a record.

LARSEN: You can also ask the Speaker to note the seat while taking attendance. It can be cross checked later.

CHRISTENSEN: You can also include the name on everyone’s seat.

ANGUS: So, we’ll start the electronic system from September 6. On the same meeting, we’ll bring a motion to Council to finalize that voting method.

LARSEN: You can present the wording of the motion during the next CAC meeting.
ANGUS: Yes. I’ll keep the roll call voting for the next Council meeting for simplicity, and I will move the voting order so that the Executives vote last.

C. R. O. Rules and Challenges in the Office

CHRISTENSEN: There were issues with the Chief returning Officer (C. R. O.) office 3 years ago as well. At the time it was a non-student who was the C. R. O. He was very overwhelmed. It doesn’t say it has to be a student although it may suggest that a student be appointed. Anyway, because there were so many problems, they wanted to create a new role. The C. R. O. makes $8000-9000 per year. It’s not enough to be full-time or part-time. It’s a special job. They were considering creating a different job title, and making it a permanent position. If that was the case, they can’t just be the C. R. O. and get a $50,000 salary. They were considering merging it with the Speaker role, and maybe a few other roles in Discover Governance. That was more of an internal discussion. Currently, the Bylaw Committee decided that we should have 2 Deputy Returning Officers (D. R. O.s). Back in the day, there used to be a marketing person and a polling person. As such, the roles were divided. Now, there’s only 1 D. R. O. So, we decided to change it to have 2 D. R. O. s, and it may be approved by Council. Having that additional support would be a great step for now. We have also clarified the tasks so that the D. R. O. can do some of the tasks assigned to the C. R. O. under certain situations. CAC would be able to assign a D. R. O. as the pseudo C. R. O. if the C. R. O. becomes unavailable. I really like to suggest an internal review of the whole system.

LARSEN: Another change coming with the bylaw change is the definition of elections staff, duties, and office. Before, only the C. R. O. was able to accomplish certain tasks. With the bylaw change, we use the term elections staff. That way, the C. R. O. is able to manage the office, and give D. R. O.s certain tasks they weren’t able to before. The current C. R. O. Donald also mentioned about getting a second D. R. O. because of the overwhelming work load.

ANGUS: How do you see the tasking of the 2 D. R. O.s?

CHRISTENSEN: It will be assigned by the C. R. O. and CAC will be able to review. Historically, one was the assistant C. R. O. and the other was in charge of marketing and communications.

ANGUS: I would like to see the C. R. O., D. R. O., and a person dedicated for marketing. I was having a chat with the D. R. O. last year, and she said that while there was time to do certain things, she wasn’t able to because only the C. R. O. could do those tasks.
CHRISTENSEN: It’s good to have 2 in case 1 is incompetent. Otherwise, it would be restrictive. Back in the day, the C. R. O. also hired additional staff if required.

ANGUS: Can we have it in our bylaws that one D. R. O. was specifically tasked with marketing?

LARSEN: The tasks of the D. R. O.s were left to the discretion of the C. R. O. That’s because the election staff would know what would work best for them in that particular election. I also wanted to make sure that the C. R. O. office reported throughout the year instead of just once. That has been cleared through bylaw. From my understanding, they are paid installments every month, and larger installments during the elections period. So, they should be continuously in the office and doing something such as preparing for the elections. Otherwise, if they wait till the last minute, they’ll me extremely overwhelmed. They would have a mandate to answer to CAC.

PACHES: I agree with what you are doing to the elections office. Regarding the additional D. R. O., it will only come into effect after the next elections because it has to be put on to budget principles. The budget for the C. R. O.’s office this year was already voted by last Council, and therefore we will not be able to change it for the next election.

CHRISTENSEN: Back in the day, I heard that it was possible to add stuff like that, and that there were different options such as condensing the pay or splitting the pay.

PACHES: There are funds dedicated to that office. But, it defeats the purpose of having 2 D. R. O.s if you’re going to split that fund among 2 people.

CHRISTENSEN: Isn’t there any freedom for change within the C. R. O. office budget?

PACHES: The money has already been allocated. That’s binding by last year’s Council. We will be able to change it next year.

CHRISTENSEN: Sometimes the office can go over budget, and the reserve is used to pay for that. Would the reserve be able to cover the costs if we do it this year?

PACHES: That’s not the purpose of the reserve. It could not be used for that in my opinion. The reserve is used to cover unforeseen costs that go over budget, and not to supplement. We can’t just add things to the budget and ask they be covered by the reserve.

CHRISTENSEN: Is there any other option such as a project allocation?

ANGUS: Can we lower the C. R. O. and D. R. O. salary, and hire the other person?
PACHES: Not this year. Contracts have been signed. It’s very difficult to mess with pay. I don’t think bylaw is the tool to be used to mess with pay. The way to have that would be through employment contracts.

CHRISTENSEN: I agree that we shouldn’t be legislating employees through bylaw.

PACHES: The logical next step would be for CAC to prepare a set of recommendations on what you would like to see.

ANGUS: Who has final say on the reserve?

PACHES: Council.

ANGUS: Even though if this is not something the reserve should be used for, if Council agrees that this is a good idea to pursue, can Council go ahead and approve using the reserve for the second D. R. O.’s salary?

PACHES: Technically Council can approve.

ANGUS: What’s the D. R. O. salary and what’s the amount in the reserve?

PACHES: I can’t say on the top of my head.

ANGUS: I agree that something needs to be done here. But, what can we do in this situation for next year’s election?

PACHES: Your solution of changing it to the elections office is a good idea as an interim solution. From the feedback I got, the D. R. O could have done more, but was restricted because some of the tasks were exclusive to the C. R. O. After that, as a long term solution, we can look at the possibility of having another D. R. O. when we prepare the budget principles for next year. Everyone is welcome to come to Finance Committee and give feedback during the time we prepare the budget principles.

FLAMAN: I agree with Vice-president Paches. This last election was quite busy. The one before wasn’t. It’s not that they were overtasked. It’s just that their hands were tied.

ANGUS: I don’t want to cause this huge commotion and use this reserve fund if it’s not something intended for. There were lots of marketing shortcomings in the last election. They should review how they campaign for elections. I think CAC should have a more active role in helping out with the marketing.

LARSEN: With the wording coming to Council with this bylaw, there will have to be amendments. I would appreciate if Vice-president Paches can explain the reasoning. Another piece of legislation was CAC’s ability to request information from the elections office, and receive it within 72 hours. I recommend that CAC should use it in an appropriate way, and start a conversation with Donald. There would be a big change in the advertisement plan and how content is approved. Missed deadlines are also important. Bylaw should notify
the CAC chair, and the CAC chair should immediately raise those questions. If there’s no response within the 72 hours, the elections office isn’t doing its job.

ANGUS: If CAC can help the elections staff, it may ease the workload and offset not having a second D. R. O. Even though a second D. R. O may not happen this year, we can definitely make sure it happens next year after the budget.

CHRISTENSEN: Things get busy at that time, and CAC members may be volunteering on people’s campaigns. It will depend on how you prioritize your time.

LARSEN: DO you know why the Elections Review Committee was disbanded?

CHRISTENSEN: Cory Hodgson thought it was redundant. It wasn’t very effective in their last days too. This committee was originally tasked with making the elections bylaws clearer and more concise. They were basically the Bylaw Committee for elections related bylaws.

ANGUS: Just so I know, what is the process of using the reserve funds? I don’t think it’ll happen though.

PACHES: I’ll have to look it up.

Election Enrollment Errors 2014/2015 through 2016/2017

CHRISTENSEN: Councillor Prochnau notified us about the enrollment errors which happened during the last 3 years. The numbers don’t lie. I have attached the algorithm for the allocation of seats. We chatted in the Bylaw Committee about this. We have a unique opportunity with 2 Science councillors resigning. Engineering would get the additional seat, and Science would lose 1. We could reallocate the seats to fix the problem before the Fall by-election. There’s an Engineering councillor-in-waiting who was hard done by this error. I wanted your thoughts on how we should rectify this problem.

ANGUS: I believe we should leave it as is for this year, and make sure the mistake wouldn’t be repeated in the future.

PACHES: I agree with Councillor Angus. Even though we have a unique opportunity, we shouldn’t use that as a point to base our decisions.

CHRISTENSEN: I wouldn’t suggest this if we had full occupation, and we had to remove some councillors. But, in this case, we have a unique opportunity.

PACHES: We have to think about how it would be done no matter what. I would remind you of how the Government does it. When they find out people are being under-represented, they don’t
change seats midway through a term. They address it after the
cycle. I’m more comfortable that way.
ANGUS: I guess the number of seats was mentioned in the
nomination package. I think it’s unfortunate that this councillor was
hard done by this. Therefore, we should address this as an issue,
and make sure it doesn’t happen again.
CHRISTENSEN: The nomination is not binding. What’s binding
is Bylaw 100. It was not followed. Technically, the election was run in
contravention to that. If this was taken to the D. I. E. (Discipline,
Interpretation, and Enforcement) board, I don’t know how they’d
rule. Potentially, they could de-legitimize the whole election.
ANGUS: I don’t see a point in pursuing this further right now. The
point we need to take is to realize there’s an issue and to rectify the
issue. We have already done that. The rectification would be on a
longer term. It would be messy to fix it right now.
CHRISTENSEN: It wouldn’t be that messy in my opinion.
PACHES: The entire discussion we’re having right now is based on
the opportunity we have. If we take that off the table, the core of
this conversation is representation. It was a human error. You can’t
fix human errors with bylaws. None of us want any de-legitimization to the elections. Our goal as councillors is to
identify problems and solve them. It just doesn’t make sense to be
messing with it.
CHRISTENSEN: I would still personally move forward, and try to
address the problem in some way.
ANGUS: It’s a human error, we realized that there was an error, and
we will put forth measures so that the error won’t happen again. I
don’t think it’s beneficial to pursue it.
LARSEN: If we change it, it gives credence to the de-legitimization
of the election. If you change 1 seat, you change the allocation of the
vote. If we don’t make a change right now, we remain the
representative body even though it was in contravention to bylaw. I
would be more comfortable with that.
BROPHY: Now that I think about it, I don’t think anybody would be
crazy enough to de-legitimize the whole election. Anybody
reasonable enough to be on the D. I. E. board would be intelligent
enough to know that it’s an awful idea.
CHRISTENSEN: They don’t look at logic, and their rulings very
much follow the words in bylaw.
ANGUS: If this specific situation wasn’t the case, there would be no
way in which CAC would be comfortable in removing a councillor.
CHRISTENSEN: That would be against bylaw. I would never suggest
that. The opportunity we have here is to do the right thing, and fix
the problem. We did not fix it for this year, and what we are doing now is sweeping it under the rug so to speak.

LARSEN: If you reallocate the seats, you would be changing the votes. The votes were cast that way because the seats were allocated that way.

BROPHY: People voted with the expectation of a certain number of seats. I know it’s not fair to this individual.

CHRISTENSEN: It’s not fair to the whole faculty.

BROPHY: I don’t think it’s fair to the people who voted expecting a specific allocation.

ANGUS: We would be reducing representation to the Science students. In the perspective of Science students, they would have expected 7 councillors during the election.

CHRISTENSEN: It was an incorrect representation in the first place. As there’s nobody in those seats right now, they wouldn’t be losing representation.

PACHES: The Science students aren’t going to understand it. It won’t be clear cut as it is to us sitting around this table. They would see it as losing representation.

ANGUS: If we change it now, it’s going to create the same problem of perceived under-representation.

CHRISTENSEN: They were over-represented for some time now. They will not be under-represented. We are just correcting the issue. The students assumed the information given to them was correct.

PACHES: We identified the problem, and we will rectify it from the next cycle. Nothing is getting swept under the rug, and everything is in the minutes. We have come up with an approach that the majority agree to.

FLAMAN: This would be a quicker discussion if it was in February.

CHRISTENSEN: I don’t see why everybody else sees it different than I do. It seems clear cut to me. We have a problem, and we have an opportunity to fix it. However, we are choosing not to because of philosophical reasons that don’t really apply to the defined rules.

ANGUS: We both have found solutions. It’s just that they are different approaches with different timing. The end goal is the same. As a representative for Engineering, what do you say about this Nik?

VIKTOROV: By-elections aren’t a cycle. Because the mistake has already been acknowledged, switching it right now wouldn’t be the best approach. Changing it with the next cycle would be the best thing to do.

FLAMAN: If the Engineering enrollment remains relatively the same, they may lose this additional seat next year anyway.
PACHES: We’ll have the Fall enrollment numbers, and proper changes can be made to the next cycle.
ANGUS: So, we have identified that a mistake was made. We have put forth a solution to rectify it for the upcoming year. Although it’s not the ideal solution, especially with respect to the engineering councillor-in-waiting, I believe it’s the most appropriate solution.

**Fall Goals**

ANGUS: I would like to get an idea of what individuals want to see from Council, regarding engagement, or regarding what they want CAC to do for Council.
FLAMAN: My goal is regarding engagement to my constituents. Unlike other faculties that have a Faculty Association or an office to go to, there is no such place for Open Studies. Apparently there was an information sharing agreement where you could email constituents.
PACHES: I think it was regarding enrollment numbers.
LARSEN: Does the Students’ Union keep any mailing list for Open Studies.
PACHES: We only have one for undergraduate students. Not for specific faculties.
ANGUS: Have you started a Facebook page as the Open Studies councillor?
FLAMAN: I already have. I can definitely put stuff out there on social media. But, it’s really hard to go out and find the constituents. It’s nice to have the Council engagement budget again. I was thinking of getting business cards printed out.
CHRISTENSEN: I have pretty much accomplished all the goals I had.
LARSEN: Our Faculty Association needs a web by next semester. I will be doing some personal research and outreach as well. I’m a believer in physical posterings runs. I would like to have hangouts with the Arts councillors.
VIKTOROV: Councillor Wang would let you know when he gets back.
PACHES: I like the idea of working closely with the C. R. O.’s office. We got a spot for CAC on the week of welcome. In addition, we were contacted by the University about the Green and Gold day. They are doing a parade, and Council was asked to do a float. I thought it would be something appropriate for CAC. Let us know what support you need.
ANGUS: My big thing is hammering down engagement with Faculty Associations. I want to start the year having a strong relationship with them. I’m also going to encourage councillors to do a
classroom talk on the week before GovWeek. Furthermore, I want to see more Council hangouts.

2016-7/5       ADJOURNMENT

2016-7/5a       Next Meeting: August 30, 2016 at 7:00 pm.

The committee decided to have their meetings on on-council Tuesdays at 5:00 pm. from September 06, 2016.

2016-7/5b       Meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

**SUMMARY OF MOTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHRISTENSEN/FLAMAN</strong> moved to approve the agenda for August 16, 2016 as amended.</td>
<td>7/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIKTOROV/LARSEN</strong> moved to approve the minutes for August 02, 2016 as amended.</td>
<td>7/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>