



**STUDENT ASSOCIATION**  
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MILWAUKEE

---

***SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING***

March 6, 2019, Called to Order at 8:42 am  
Union EG80  
2200 E Kenwood Blvd.  
Milwaukee, WI 53211

---

***I. Call to Order***

***II. Roll Call***

- 1) *Emma Horjus - Present*
- 2) *Santiago Moreno-Islas - Unexcused*
- 3) *Mohiminul Islam - Unexcused*
- 4) *Conal McNamara - Unexcused*
- 5) *Will Paltz - Present*
- 6) *Dick Marcus - Present*
- 7) *Nicole Oswald - Present*
- 8) *Binky He - Present*
- 9) *Luke Bartsch - Present*

***III. Reports***

Emma: No significant reports outside of the legislation to be discussed later today.

***IV. Open Forum***

No members from the public wishing to speak.

***V. Approval of Agenda***

Motion by Nicole to approve the Agenda. Second by Binky. Motion to approve agenda passes unanimously.

***VI. Special Orders***

No Special Orders

***VII. Old Business***

No Old Business

***VIII. New Business***

***a. Union Seg Fee Legislation***

The committee begins reviewing Will's proposed "Panther Union Reinvestment (PUR) Project Resolution" legislation line by line.

Nicole questions the purpose of lines 32-35 regarding Restaurant Operation revenues.

Dick comments that the wording of lines 32-35 is not clear. He suggests changing lines 34-35 to read "Moreover, this deficit is subsidized by residential student meal plans." Will accepts.

Will expresses the intention of lines 45-50. He states that to compensate for the \$75 fee being reinstated, the Athletics Capital fee (previously voted on by the committee to later cover the debt payment of a Norris capital project in FY22) be eliminated.

Emma states her concern in not having something to subsidize the Norris capital project debt payments if this fee be removed. Will replies that he does not believe it is our duty to find something to cover the Norris project given that health center capital projects are generally not allowed to be covered by segregated fees.

Nicole comments that the FY20 Senate Finance Committee voted to allow the use of this segregated fee towards a Norris capital project, and that she still supports the way she voted at that time.

Emma comments that lines 51-54, stating that the Union's own fee be lowered by \$5.00 in FY21, FY22, and FY23, cannot likely be binding to the Senate Finance Committees overseeing those respective fiscal periods.

Sarah Edmondson (of SAPS) asks Will if he is more frustrated with the Union Capital Fee itself or the process and lack of transparency in how it was instated. Will expresses a need to cut fees, and states that both components frustrate him. Sarah comments that at the time of the original Union Capital Fee being instated, fees of other entities were already lowered to compensate.

Both Nicole and Emma question why a cut needs to be made elsewhere at all. Will responds that a cut must be made for this fee to be reinstated. In response to Will's statement, Emma comments that this Legislation's proposed fee cuts should be addressed as a committee conversation, and not an ultimatum.

Will moves on to line 57, mentioning that he was not sure if the fee be reinstated in FY20 or FY21 with a gap year. Emma comments that the budgets for FY20 have already been decided and include this capital fee. Nicole adds that the budgets for FY20 are going to be paid out relatively soon. Will concludes that he is content with it starting in FY20.

Emma, referencing lines 65-69, states her support for a fee cap tied to the bonding and not a monetary cap. Sarah expresses concern in having too many stipulations on the project, and suggests gathering other documented commitments by the entities involved instead. Emma suggest cap be set to when bonding debt is paid in full, and not limited to a time frame.

Referencing lines 70-71, Emma, having been in meetings with relevant administration, questions if the stipulation that only 92% of the project be funded through segregated fees is too low, given that gifts and grants are difficult to obtain without a tangible fundable idea. Dick suggest that the legislation support a goal of 8% of funding coming from outside of student segregated fees. Nicole introduces the idea of having a range of percentages that this project will aim for. Will asks the committee if a 94% stipulation is more appropriate. Binky states that she likes the idea of a range of ideas. The committee ultimately concludes that a range of percentages is difficult to enforce, and settles on 94%.

Will expresses the intention of administration to have 33% student representation on any committee dedicated to the Union Capital project, as stated in lines 76-77.

The committee runs through the legislation again, and Will restates all of the proposed changes made by the committee to this document. Changes to the proposed legislation include:

- Removing lines 51-54 and recommending the Union fee stay flat unless citing a UW System allowable reason such as pay plan and fringe benefit needs.
- Removing lines 18-19 stating that the Union segregated fee and capital projects be reduced to mitigate financial burden on students.
- Removing lines 65-67 that instates a monetary cap on segregated fees accrued for the project
- Removing lines 78-79 on capping the increases on the Union budget until the capital fee ends.
- Removal of lines pertaining to the Athletics/Norris Capital fee being eliminated:

- Line 20, the “whereas” statement introducing how health services are allowed to fund capital projects.
  - Lines 45-50 requesting the removal of this fee.
  - Lines 59-62 stating the removal of the Athletics/Norris fee as a stipulation to the PUR project
- Several wording changes to more accurately/clearly depict the purpose of the legislation.

Emma asks if this document, having not been previously sent out to the committee 24 hours in advance, can be voted on by the committee, given they played a large role in drafting it. The committee discusses stating that the committee drafted the legislation, and not that it was voted through the SFC in the legislative history.

Dick suggests holding a vote for good measure, to enunciate the support of the committee for the revised document.

Dick moves to approve the document as edited. Second by Will. The motion passes unanimously.

Will comments that once he has incorporated the edits suggested by the Senate Finance Committee, he will send it to the committee via email.

#### ***IX. Questions and Concerns***

No questions or concerns.

#### ***X. Adjournment***

Motion to adjourn by Nicole. Second by Dick. Motion passes unanimously.

***Meeting adjourned at 9:48 am***

