

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Tuesday March 18, 2003 - 6:00 PM  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

**MINUTES (SC 2002-22)**

Faculty/Position	Name	6:00	9:00	Roll Call Vote #1 Exec Salaries
President	Mike Hudema	✓	✓	Against
VP Academic	Mat Brechtel	✓	✓	Abstain
VP External	Anand Sharma	✓	✓	Against
VP Finance	Steve Smith	✓	✓	Against
VP Student Life	Kail Ross	✓	✓	Against
BoG Rep.	Mike Reid	✓	✗	
Residence Halls Association	George Slomp	✓	✓	Against
U of A Athletics Board				
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Teodora Alampi	✓	✓	Against
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Paul Reikie	✓	✓	Against
Arts	Chris Bolivar	✓	✓	Against
Arts	Kyle Kawanami	✓	✓	Against
Arts	James Knull	✓	✓	Against
Arts	Matt Oberhoffner	✓	✓	For
Arts	Alexis Pepin	✓	✓	Against
Arts	Laura Roberts	✓	✓	Against

Arts	Vivek Sharma	✓	✓	Against
Arts	Paul Welke	✓	✓	Abstain
Business	Jamie Kidston	✗	✗	
Business	Meena Rajulu	✓	✓	Against
Business	Holly Tomte	✓	✓	Against
Education	Charles Beamish	✓	✓	Against
Education	Daljeet Chhina	✓	✓	Against
Education	Allison Ekdahl	✓	✓	Against
Education	Mandeep Gill	✓	✗	
Education	Janet Lo	✓	✓	Against
Engineering	Chris Jones	✓	✓	Against
Engineering	Margaret Laffin	✓	✓	Against
Engineering	Paige Smith	✓	✓	Against
Engineering	Michelle Vigeant	✓	✓	Against
Engineering	David Wepler	✓ (6:40)	✓	Against
Law	Paul Varga	✓	✓	Against
Medicine/Dentistry	Miranda Richardson	✓	✓	Against
Medicine/Dentistry	Jeffrey Cao	✗	✗	
Native Studies	Valerie Knaga	✓	✓	Against
Nursing				
Open Studies				
Open Studies				
Pharmacy	Kurt Greene	✓	✓	Against
Physical Education	Holly Higgins	✓	✓	Against
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth	✓	✓	Against
Faculté Saint-Jean	Lisa Clyburn	✓	✓	For

Science	Chamila Adhihetty (James Meeker)	✓	✓	Against
Science	Kimberly Dary	✓	✓	Against
Science	Katie Grant	✓	✓	Against
Science	Aisha Khatib	✓	✓	Against
Science	Tereza Elyas	✓	✓	Against
Science	Chris Samuel	✓	✓	Against
Science	Steven Schendel (Duncan Taylor)	✓	✓	Against
Science	Kimmy Williams	✓ (6:20)	✓	For
General Manager	Bill Smith	×	×	
Speaker	Gregory Harlow	✓	✓	
Recording Secretary	Helen McGraw	✓	✓	
				Defeated (3/37/2)

Observers: Alex Taylor, Carissa Reiniger, Alex “Haji-something-or-other”, Sara Katz, Roman Kotovych, Mustafa Hirji, Matt Robertson, James Crossman, Chelli Kelly, Chris Weaver, Josh Bazin, Nick Tam, Sarah Kelly, Shawna Pandya, and “The fans who make this happen.”

## Minutes (SC 2002-22)

2002-22/1                    CALL TO ORDER (6:05)

2002-22/4                    SPEAKER’S BUSINESS  
Brechtel and Smith have provided the required evidence of their student status; Hudema and Sharma are still in arrears.

2002-22/8                    APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

BEAMISH/EKDAHL MOVED TO APPROVE the minutes from the March 11 meeting.  
JONES/SMITH MOVED TO POSTPONE until the next meeting

Carried

2002-22/9

QUESTION PERIOD

**Reid:** What is the impetus behind the motion to remove several associate director positions?

**Smith:** 3 positions are up for the axe: 1) The ECOS director currently works a lot more than the mandated 20hrs/wk; the AD's salary will be 2) ADs keep leaving SDC because they think the job will be mostly counseling when it's in fact mostly admin. 3) By next fall we expect there to be an online registration system for student groups, thus mitigating the need for an AD. Temporary staff would be hired for clubs fair, etc.

**Samuel:** Why is the exec still planning to kill VIDS, even though Christine McCourt and Bill Smith support its continued existence?

**Hudema:** Making VIDS useful to students would require an unreasonable financial investment.

**Kawanami:** Why wasn't the incoming exec consulted on this?

**Smith:** Exec meetings are open and incoming exec were welcome to attend (only **Samuel** did)

**Bolivar:** Two union representatives spoke at the recent high school leadership conference. There is speculation that we owed them this opportunity after their support during the tuition rallies. Are there any other groups to whom we owe favors?

**Sharma:** We don't owe anyone any favors. We decided to include a presentation on leadership in the workplace because many students are unaware of their rights. The United Food and Commercial Workers were chosen because they have supported the SU in the past. This will probably not be continued next year as the response from students was mediocre. The sports leadership section also had a poor response. Kail did well for some inexplicable reason.

**Clyburn:** Can we expect a report evaluating both the whole and individual elements of the high school leadership conference?

**Sharma:** One will be prepared and presented both to EAB and to Council.

**Smith (Councilor):** Would **Weppler** be so kind as to share with Council the limerick her presented at the Engineering elections forum?

**Weppler:**

So I was drinkin' some beer down at Moe's  
And was feeling good right to my toes  
Then in walked Anand  
On his arm was a blonde  
And I laughed the beer out of my nose

**Jones:** The former wall of debt has had many things posted on it and it is already showing signs of wear, due to tape. Is there a policy in place governing what will go up on the wall to preserve it and avoid untimely repair costs?

**Smith:** Non-bulletin board postings need to be approved by the exec. I personally have observed neither wear nor tear.

**Lo:** Please elaborate on the rental agreement with the Womens' Center?

**Hudema:** This is a rental agreement between the SU and the Womens' Center Collective, similar to the rental agreements with the Gateway and CJSR.

**Reid:** Why did **Ross** not support this agreement?

**Ross:** I have a problem with a group whose sole purpose is to eliminate sexism by excluding 50% of the campus community. No men are allowed to have say or participation; the constitution will be drafted without their input. I can't support such a double standard.

**Reid:** Is it true that the Womens' Center operates to the exclusion of men?

**Hudema:** Their original proposal was for 2 rooms, one women-only (a safe room), the other a common room. Women-only room was removed at exec committee; only the common, inclusive room was approved. This is an autonomous organization and it's not up to us to control what they become.

**Williams:** Does the Womens' Center allow men to have input into the constitution?

**Hudmea:** Yes. There are two consulting groups: one all women, the other open.

**Hudema:** Is **Knaga** aware that the SU most humbly apologizes that Native Studies was left off the ballot and we will ensure that it's included next year?

**Knaga:** Yes I am, thanks.

**Kawanami:** EAB will be holding a meeting Friday at 4:00. Will **Sharma** be coming or does the rest of the committee need to go it alone?

**Sharma:** I'll be meeting with high school students then but I'll try to work it in.

**Jones:** AAB is the only SU board or committee whose minutes are up to date on the website; why is **Hudema** unable to ensure that councilors and other members of the SU can access this information in the timely manner guaranteed by the constitution?

**Hudema:** It is hard to control anyone on this exec. I hope they will all post their minutes promptly.

**Samuel:** How did the campus advantage meeting go?

**Smith:** Being a shareholder is valuable but I don't think that being on the board of directors is necessarily a good idea.

**Welke:** How much is a public intoxication charge going for these days?

**Kawanami:** In Halifax they're running at \$111.50, but only if you're in a tree.

**Sharma (Councilor):** **Samuel**, before you ask your next question, does everyone need to hear it?

**Samuel:** Yes

**Samuel:** Is it true that **Sharma** was disqualified from the ASA elections despite notifying **Oberhoffner** that he would be late for the candidates' meeting?

**Oberhoffner:** I was not the FADRO for this election; I assure you that everything is on the up and up.

2002-22/10

#### APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (MINUTES)

JONES/LAFFIN MOVED TO STRIKE 3a [VIDS]

**Jones:** Council doesn't have enough information to decide whether VIDS should be eliminated.

**Hudema:** The relevant boards have been consulted

**Samuel:** Bill Smith and Juliana Dupree think that VIDS is a useful system and should not be scrapped; it is not prudent to ignore their opinions.

**Ross:** VIDS will require at least \$15,000 to become useful.

**Smith:** This was an excellent decision on the part of the executive committee. I'd be happy to provide council with more information so that we can approve this at the next meeting.

WEPPLER MOVED the previous question

**Carried**

**Carried**

2002-22/12

**LEGISLATION**

2002-22/12a

**Bylaw 2200:  
Councilor Elections**

SMITH/SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the proposed changes to Bylaw 2200 (SECOND Reading).  
*Please bring supporting documentation from the February 4, 2003 meeting.*

**Smith:** This stems from the FARCE recommendations to centralize dates and control of councilor elections. Council has approved this in principle.

OBERHOFFNER/KNULL MOVED TO:

- 1) Insert item 2n reading: "FADRO' shall mean Faculty Association Deputy Returning Officer, and shall be a student in the faculty or school appointed by the relevant faculty or school association and approved by the CRO, to perform the duties of the CRO for faculty or school association executive, students' council and General Faculties Council Elections."
- 2) Amend sec 118 to read: "Nominations and elections for representative(s) of a faculty or school shall be conducted by the faculty or school association through a FADRO, within the constraints of this bylaw."

**Smith:** This motion is contrary to the principles approved in first reading. Faculty elections are a joke. Few faculties have demonstrated an ability to run legitimate elections; the CRO can delegate authority to those faculties as appropriate.

**Sharma:** These elections should not be run by FAs because their executives are involved in the process. In the Arts Students' Association, there is an idea that certain people should be acclaimed and that other candidates should be prevented from running. If FAs want to run their exec elections that way, that's their decision, but Students' Council elections need to be held to a higher standard.

**Kelly (Sarah):** If you do have those concerns, it might be worthwhile to create a new position. The CRO is underpaid and this would give her too much to do.

**Clyburn:** FARCE did consultations for a good two months during the summertime and not one FA came to talk to us. Now people who couldn't be bothered to show up during the summer are trying to usurp the process. Centralized elections will solve apathy problems and ensures every potential councilor on campus has the same opportunity.

**Taylor:** It is important that the CRO be able to delegate authority to a FADRO or there will simply be an unreasonable amount of work to do.

**Jones:** We currently have forced delegation to FAs and it is a shambles. Some have appointments; other elections are not up to the standards of 3<sup>rd</sup> world banana republics; others hold elections that Jimmy Carter would be proud of. Councilors are not representatives of their FAs but rather the students of their faculties. Elections need to be governed under common dates, nomination packages and criteria. The CRO could delegate if confident in the abilities of a FA but should not be obligated to. This is contrary to the very intent of this bylaw; if you want to do this, defeat the bylaw in its entirety and start over.

**Wepler:** Council is the most powerful body in the SU and it is essential that councilors be chosen in legitimate elections. Please defeat this amendment

**Oberhoffner:** Nowhere does this amendment require that Councilors represent the interests of FAs. This is the first year in the last three that all positions in the ASA executive are being contested; we have 16 people running for council and that's more than democratic. There has been a lot of talk in COFA about strengthening the role of FAs and their role in the university; centralizing councilor elections is contrary to this principle.

BOLIVAR/HUDEMA MOVED the previous question

**Carried**

**Defeated (10/32/2)**

OBERHOFFNER/KNULL MOVED TO ADD new sec 70: "Although a Faculty or School Association may choose to incorporate one of that faculty's representative(s) to Students' Council with other positions within the faculty or school association, and the students' union will fund only campaign costs that

deal exclusively with the election of a faculty or school association representative to Students' Council, ballots of such a combined position may, however, include all positions contested by candidates(s) within and/or external to the faculty or school association."

**Oberhoffner:** This would allow FAs to designate one of their faculty's council seats to a member of the FA exec.

**Samuel (POI):** Would this include FAs with only one council seat?

**Oberhoffner:** Yes. FAC currently has only one seat and it is traditionally held by their VP external whose only job is to liaise with Council.

**Smith:** This is the single most onerous amendment proposed in Council this year. It is unacceptable for FAs to put their own toadies onto council.

**Ekdahl:** FA exec members are better placed to discuss the goings on of their faculties.

**Welke:** The president of an association is elected to represent the students of their faculty; what better way to do this than through council?

**Kawanami:** Unlike many of the indignities committed to the FARCE recommendations, this one is a hill I'm willing to die on. This would continue an electoral apartheid whereby different councilors are elected according to different rules. Any halfway decent Councilor will know what's going on with their faculty; they don't have to be on a FA exec.

**Lo:** Faculty executives are free to contest council positions. Students should be able to elect the most qualified individual for the position.

**Williams:** Science had 21 people run in elections last year but UASUS regularly has acclaimed presidents who are obligated to sit on council, regardless of whether they really want to be there.

**Jones:** Council is meant to be directly representative of students, not of FAs. If representation from FAs is essential, COFA should be made into a senate. This amendment must die.

**Knoll:** A FA is more than just a club; it represents the students of that faculty and it is important that that body has a voice on Council. The interests of a FA should never diverge from those of councilors; a president who doesn't represent the views of students on council is probably not a very good president.

**Sharma(POI):** Aren't arts Councilors bound by policies

passed by the ASA exec?

**Knull:** Only the ASA president is bound by these policies.

**Kawanami (POI):** Haven't past FA Presidents on council abused their positions to obtain funds for the benefits of their FAs?

**Knull:** That was for the benefit of students in their faculties.

REIKIE/WELKE MOVED the previous question

**Carried**

**Defeated (10/29/1)**

**Oberhoffner:** I encourage you to defeat this bylaw since my voice apparently doesn't have much influence at Council.

**Lo:** What exactly will start "15 days after executive elections"?

**Taylor:** I encourage someone to define FADRO and to give the CRO power to delegate to that individual, rather than to a FA; allowing delegation to FAs allows an unreasonable conflict of interest.

**Smith:** The election itself will not occur less than 15 days after the exec elections. I trust that the CRO would only delegate authority to a FA with appropriate infrastructure in place.

OBERHOFFNER/WELKE MOVED TO ADD new section 2n reading: "FADRO' shall mean Faculty Association Deputy Returning Officer and shall be a student in that faculty or school, appointed by the relevant faculty or school association and approved by the CRO"

**Smith:** I trust that this will be defeated as were the other amendments in **Oberhoffner's** one-man battle against the FARCE recommendations. This defines a term that is never used again in the bylaw and is thus pointless.

**Wepler:** This sets a dangerous precedent for micromanagement by the CRO.

JONES MOVED TO STRIKE the word "association" from the term FADRO

**Friendly**

**Defeated (17/19/5)**

**Carried (28/9/2) Opposed: Welke, Oberhoffner**

2002-22/12b  
Bylaw 7550:  
Student  
Development  
Center

ROSS/SMITH MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Student Life Board, adopt the proposed changes to Bylaw 7550 relating to the Student Development Centre (SECOND Reading).

**Ross:** This bylaw governs our newest student service; it is intentionally vague and necessarily so.

**Carried (25/0/0)**

2002-22/12c  
Bylaw 7200:  
Orientation

ROSS/BRECHTEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the proposed changes to Bylaw 7200 (SECOND Reading).

**Ross:** Many superfluous articles that didn't need to be included were a part of the old bylaw. It has since been made more concise. All the relevant staff support this.

**Carried (27/1/3)**

2002-22/12d  
Communications  
Advisory  
Committee

SMITH/SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, repeal Bylaw 5200 (FIRST Reading).

**Smith:** Former executives in their infinite wisdom decided that the best way to cut through red tape and connect with students was to create a committee. This committee deals with issues of executive, rather than legislative character and the bylaw itself is archaic and should therefore be repealed.

**Hudema:** Communicating with students is a worthy cause for the existence of a committee.

**Smith:** We have too many bylaws, most of which are ignored by everyone except the members of Hack Club 7. Removing bylaws is an inherently valuable exercise.

**Sharma:** Other committees, particularly EAB, have had to compensate for the non-existence of CAC this year. While it's popular and indeed fun to get rid of as much as you can, it is important to consider why these committees were created in the first place.

**Wepler:** The committee found what didn't work to communicate with students: CAC. Let's get rid of this.

**Kawanami:** If you vote this down, I expect to see constructive legislation at the next council meeting explaining who will be chairing CAC.

**Hirji:** As the SAL on this committee for its entire existence

and having attended each of its meetings, I can attest to its uselessness. This job is the purview of an executive committee, not a legislative one.

**Varga:** Does the board meet regularly, or only when there is an issue to be discussed?

**Smith:** It had regular meetings.

**Carried (27/8/5)**

2002-22/12e

OBERHOFFNER/ALAMPI MOVED THAT Students' Council approve the proposed changes to Bylaw 3200.

*Please see document SC 02-22.01.*

OBERHOFFNER/WEPLER MOVED TO DIVIDE the question into 9c and 10 (Executive Salaries) and 9v (Councilor Honoraria)

**Carried**

### 9c and 10: Executive Salaries

**Oberhoffner:** Many students are embarrassed that our execs make less than an average restaurant cook makes. We pay our execs \$19,600/year. Compare to other schools: U of L: \$20,000; RDC: >\$20,000; MRC: \$30,000; U of M: \$30,000; U of C: \$24,000; GMCC: \$24,000. This change would bring salaries more in line with those in the rest of the province.

**Hudema:** I'm not ashamed that we are low-paid; I think it's something to be proud of. This is plenty for someone to live on. A salary review is scheduled for next year; there is no reason to arbitrarily do this when there is a process in place. Our financial position will be much better farther in the future than it will be next year. While I appreciate the gesture, I would hate to see programming cut to cover this.

**Sharma:** This should be considered by the Salary Review committee. Exec shouldn't be lucrative; people shouldn't get into this job for the money. If we're out there fighting for increased living allowances for students, we need to provide all of our staff, not just execs more. We should emphasize quality, rather than our current mentality of paying cheap and tolerating high turnover. Salaries should be increased but not now or this way. Salaries should not be a barrier for people to run.

**Welke:** Low pay does decrease accessibility. I didn't run because I can't afford the pay cut: right now I make a little more than the execs and I get to play with guns and fly around in helicopters.

WELKE/BEAMISH MOVED TO strike an ad hoc exec salary review committee and to review this question to them.

**Wepler:** Our salary review committee exists for a reason. Lets defeat this and continue with our business.

**Kawanami:** Bad things happen when we try to make things up on the fly. No compelling reasons have been presented for the creation of this committee.

**Samuel:** This shouldn't be done on the fly, as much as I'd like to "bling bling"

**Oberhoffner:** This salary review committee hasn't met in the four years I've been at this school and no one seems to know what is comprised of.

**Smith:** Last year, council passed a bylaw establishing a 4 year cycle. A salary review committee will be struck every 4 years. This is not meant to be a committee that meets regularly.

**Wepler:** It is dangerous to deal with salaries in this haphazard manner as emotions are often attached to them. The salary review committee exists for a reason.

**Taylor:** It is unfair to consider exec salaries in isolation without considering the remuneration to other SU employees.

**Defeated**

**Laffin:** This is very similar to when we considered the remuneration of the speaker and recording secretary. Did people whine when we did that?

**Smith:** It is inappropriate to be doing this piecemeal when a process for review already exists.

**Oberhoffner:** Barriers are important to consider. If I'm going to take a year off school, I need to be able to afford to live.

**Kawanami:** Given our current exec's actions toward salaries given to university administration, it is particularly important to follow due process before increasing their salaries.

**Pepin:** It is important to pay our exec fairly but also to pay all SU employees fairly. The salaries are known in advance. People don't take these jobs for the money. These jobs are rewarding in terms of flexibility, contacts and personal growth. Other schools' execs have different internal structures and different VPS have different roles and responsibilities.

**Taylor:** It is unfair to consider exec salaries in isolation.

REIKIE/VARGA MOVED the previous question

**Carried**

**Defeated (Roll Call) (3/37/2)**

**9v Councilor Honoraria**

**Oberhoffner:** The \$500 figure is in line with other councils around the province. Please support this in principle. While the amount itself is amendable, it is important that council be recognized for its hard work.

**Varga:** There's enough resume padding going on here; we don't need to pad our wallets as well.

**Williams:** Councilors should be here to represent students, not for the money.

**Reikie:** This has the potential to pervert councilors' intentions for running.

**Bolivar:** For the amount of effort we put in, \$500 is a slap in the face. \$500 won't make a difference in terms of greater accessibility. I don't think that giving councilors a monetary honorarium is appropriate. Other concessions (coffee, food, etc.) would be a better sign of appreciation.

**Weppler:** The optics of this are terrible. Students do this for much better reasons than money and there are some things that money can't buy.

**Sharma (Councilor):** This will make it easier for the average student to be here.

**Sharma:** We have a responsibility to appreciate councilors; there are low cost ways to do this. You call it fiscally prudent; I call it inconsiderate of other peoples' needs.

**Brechtel:** Right now we are debating in principle the idea of rewarding councilors. A committee can consider the particulars of how to reward councilors. It is essential that this be in bylaw to ensure transparency and protect it from negligent execs.

**Taylor:** This will encourage people to come to council, receive their honorarium and not contribute.

**Welke:** Someone who runs for council for a \$500 honorarium would likely lose an election since they're unlikely to go to the effort to run a real election campaign.

BEAMISH/SLOMP MOVED the previous question

**Defeated**

**Pepin:** Consider the precedent that this would set. There are many other individuals who make important contributions to the SU; are we to give honoraria to all of them?

**Kelly (Chelli):** This isn't enough for people to show up only for the money.

**Jones:** The optics are the worst part of this. If this is a real concern, it should be put to referendum. Who better to decide than those we're representing?

**Samuel:** This will cost about \$22,000/year; this money will have to come out of some other program. If councilors are to be rewarded in a non-monetary way, it doesn't belong in bylaw 3200. Codifying this in bylaw needlessly ties the hands of executives.

**Smith:** There is something wrong with the exec deciding whether Councilors should be awarded. Any compensation needs to be non-arbitrary and publicly available. I support this motion but it needs a lot of work. You get what you pay for and this would buy us some legitimacy. I'm running for council but I expect to lose my seat, I don't think this will pass, and I'd plan to donate my honorarium to the food bank anyway.

**Kawanami:** The existence of 2<sup>nd</sup> reading is no excuse for passing shoddy legislation. We're treating "\$500" as if it means "we're going to give councilors stuff"

ROSS/SLOMP MOVED the previous question  
**Defeated**

**Knull:** Councilors are the only non-SALs that are not remunerated. Once Councilors are included in bylaw 3200, they'd be subject to the quadrennial salary review process; the slippery slope argument is fallacious. People don't vote for people they think are corrupt. Students will care more about what we do if we're getting paid. This change would remove barriers to participation.

**Higgins:** You can't pay for quality or accountability.

**Hudema:** Where will this \$22,000 come from? The money simply isn't there.

SMITH(COUNCILOR)/SLOMP MOVED the previous question  
**Carried**

**Defeated (13/21/1) Opposed: Wepler, Kawanami, Jones, Pepin, Lo, Williams**

2002-22/13a

WEPLER/JONES MOVED THAT the Engineering Non-Academic Fee Proposal approved by Students' Council be amended to bring it into alignment with the University's fee collection capabilities by:

- (1) Striking "Visiting and Special students are exempted from payment under the Bylaw." from the proposal.
- (2) Striking "During Intersession, only those Engineering students who are taking on-campus classes where Intersession is a regularly-scheduled part of their degree program are subject to the fee." from the proposal.
- (3) Striking "Students who are enrolled in CIV E 251 ("Survey School") during Intersession do not pay the fee if they would not otherwise do so." from the proposal and striking the accompanying explanatory test relating to CIV E 251.
- (4) Replacing the text "opt-out mechanism" with "refund mechanism".
- (5) Replacing the text "Engineering Students' Social Activities Fund" and the text "ESSAF" with the text "Engineering Student Activities Fund" and "ESAF", respectively.

**Wepler:** These changes are necessary to bring the fee in line with the abysmal capabilities of PeopleSoft. The principles of the original proposal are kept intact.

**Sharma:** Are you comfortable with the number of students opposed to this?

**Wepler:** Yes. We had numerous requirements, including a minimum voter turnout, that were approved by council.

**Carried (23/6/2)**

2002-22/17

**ADJOURNMENT (9:50)**

SMITH/OBERHOFFNER MOVED to Adjourn

**Carried**