Call to Order

The meeting of the Thirty Third Regular Legislative Session was called to order by Speaker Westbrook. A moment of silence followed by the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Senator Duhon.

Roll Call

There were 45 senators present.

Public Input

Eric Harper

Eric Harper came to formerly resign from his position as Senator. He thanked the floor for the past year and for helping him pass SGFB No.1 and for support it. He also thanked Landon Watts for acting as a mentor during his time with SG. Senator Watts moved to accept Eric Harper’s resignation, seconded by Senator Zeringue. There was an objection. It was in the opinion of the chair that the Ayes had it. Speaker Westbrook thanked him for his service.

Carrie Hebert

Carrie Hebert took a minute to applaud the Secretaries for their work on the minutes. She presented a report on the SEC Exchange. Those who went on the SEC Exchange came together and talked about ideas that were liked:

- Soft closing of bars
- “Blue light” app (An app that would enhance the safety of students)
- Transfer Student Association
- Tiger Remembrance Day (A day once a month that honors the passing away of a student, faculty, or staff member of LSU)
- A position to help student organizations with funding request
- Changing the structure of the Graduate School to better represent those students
- Food Pantry/Meal Swipe Initiative (Having the option of donating 5-10 meals to students in meals in the form of a gift card)
- Academic Major Affair

Judicial Branch:

- Robes
- Election board (J branch hears all complaints and election board just deals with logistics)
- Using judicial aides as proxy voters if needed for quorum
- Justices appointed by president rather than elected
- Justices have at least 2 year terms (where they overlap every two years so that the president isn’t stacking the court)
- Election changes – businesses can only donate primary project to tickets/candidates.

College Councils:
- Keep Council Chats
- Every CC has to review and update their bylaws each Fall semester
- Mandate that they meet with their advisor during the first 2 weeks of the Fall semester
- Article V, Section 3, Subsection G – semester (changing from annual) plans must be turned in and approved by the Vice President and the Financial Coordinator at job. If all the seats are empty by the 2nd week of each semester
- CCPC Meetings – at least twice a month
- For cc’s filing vacancies – I think we should have senators take on that job. If all seats are empty that responsibility can fall to the Speaker or CC.

The SEC Exchange will be moving into the summer, from 2014 on.

**Reading, Correction, and Adoption of Minutes**

Senator Catalanoto moved to adopt the minutes as dispersed by email seconded, by Senator Thompson. Senator Rees moved to suspend the rules and insert **SGCR No. 23 & 24** into **Unfinished Business**, seconded by Senator Cavell. Speaker Pro Temp Campbell moved to suspend the rules and move **SGCR No. 22** into **Immediate Consideration**, seconded by Senator Bevin.

**Immediate Consideration**

**SGCR No. 22** by Senator Schwartzenburg a Concurrent Resolution to appoint Patrick Corry as a Senator for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. Senator Schwartzenburg yielded his time to Mr. Corry.

Favorable Passage was urged.

92% in Favor SGCR No. 22 Enrolled

Speaker Pro Temp Campbell moved to suspend the Rules and immediately consider **SGCR No. 21**, seconded by Senator Beadle.

**SGCR No. 21** by Senator Beadle a Concurrent Resolution to appoint Christopher Kunz as a Senator for the Graduate School. Senator Beadle yielded his time to Christopher Kunz. Mr. Kunz introduced himself, saying he would be a good representative for the Graduate School.

Senator Zeringue asked why Mr. Kunz is attending LSU. He responded that he is the process of receiving his Master’s Degree and LSU offered him the best package.

Senator Meringue asked if he was in SG as an Undergraduate. Mr. Kunz responded that he was not in SG, but he was in a fraternity, as well as student organizations.

Favorable Passage was urged.
96% in Favor SGCR No. 21 Enrolled

Speaker Pro Temp Campbell moved to suspend the rules and move back into Induction of New Senators, seconded by Senator Catalanoto.

**Induction of New Senators**

Christopher Kunz and Patrick Corry were inducted; the Code was read.

**New Business**

*SGB No. 5* by Senator Baumgartner a Bill to amend the College Council Constitution was hereby referred to the Committee on Rules by Speaker Westbrook.

*SGB No. 6* by Speaker Westbrook a Bill to amend the Student Government Rules of Order was hereby referred to the Committee on Rules by Speaker Westbrook.

*SGB No. 7* by Senator Beadle and Grashoff a Bill to amend the Student Government Budget was hereby referred to the Committee on Rules by Speaker Westbrook.

Speaker Pro Temp motioned to suspend the Rules and move SGB No. 7 into Unfinished Business, seconded by Senator Thompson.

**Committee Reports**

**Academic Affairs**

Senator Frias stated to the floor that she would be resigning due to the lack of time she will have to spend on SG affairs. She thanked the Committee on Academic Affairs, various Senators and Speakers, and to SG as a whole. Senator Boudreaux moved to accept Senator Frias resignation, seconded by Senator Taylor. There was an objection. It was in the opinion of the chair that the Ayes had it. Speaker Westbrook thanked her for her service.

**Budget and Appropriations**

The committee met on Monday at 7:30 p.m. Budget and Appropriations deals with all financial matters of the Senate. *SGC No. 3* was heard, and the committee also worked on the budget that night.

**Campus Affairs and Sustainability**

The committee met quickly to finalize initiatives. Feel free to email Senator Taylor with initiatives.

**Rules**

Rules met Monday night and Wednesday night. Public Defender and the Student Recommended Fees were appointed. SGB no. 7 was also heard.

**Student Auxiliaries and Services**

SAS met Monday at 5:54. There was no legislation to review. Next week SAS and other senators will discuss dining hall initiatives, such as extending the hours for the Take 5 and Outtakes, move vegan
options, make more meal plan options, having an unlimited meal plan option. Software compatibility is still being worked on, as well as finalizing plans for microwaves. Paperless ticketing is going through in the fall, with LSU Athletics doing a trial run for the next football season.

**Student Life, Diversity, and Community Outreach**

SLDCO met this week at 5:30. SGR No. 5 was heard, and there was some debate and several questions. It is the 6th Legislative Week; Senators have till the 9th week to obtain all required SO Points. The Kaplan Testing Center will count as an SO Point and any college council even that your council plans count as long as you speak to Senators Cavell and Latusek beforehand so that they can approve it.

**Caucus Reports**

**Black Caucus**

The Black Caucus talked about forming a Diversity Caucus, and what the vision of the caucus is. There will be discussion of whether the Black Caucus will be changing or not.

**Greek Life Caucus**

No meeting, no report.

**Executive Officer Reports**

**Thomas Rodgers, Director of Academic Affairs**

UCAC Task Force met on Tuesday. There was a discussion about the issues faced. There will also be an overseer of the UCAC Task Force who will be working on a quick reference guide and scheduling reference system on each of the senior colleges for each of the councilors to have. There will also be group counseling available. There is a lack of space within UCAC for PhD students to help with busy work and counseling.

**Leslie Leavoy, Director of External Affairs**

Director Leavoy met the 12th District Councilman and had a really good conversation with him. The councilman will work on gaining funding from City Council to add lights on Nicholson by Brightside. There will be a Tigerland manager meeting to address safety concerns, and there will be a Tigerland Task Force to work with law enforcement.

**Aimee Simons, Commissioner of Elections**

Commissioner Simons thanked everyone who has been reaching out to candidates. The Election Board meets every week to go over the Code and current events. The Board also went over an outreach plan to enhance SG voter turnout.

Standing Senators do not have to go to the Board meetings.
Judicial Officer Reports

Chief Justice Faulk

Last week J Branch met briefly before the court hearing. The hearing was at 7 p.m. in the Red River Room, Docket 13-01Boudreaux v. Woodard. The results of the of the hearing was that Woodard was found not in violation of Article V, Section 2, Paragraph C with a vote of 0-8-1. He was found in violation of Article 6, Section 1, Paragraph A & B with a vote of 5-3-1. He was found not in violation of Article 6, Section 3, Paragraph J with a vote of 0-8-1. He was found not in violation of Article 6, Section 3, Paragraph K with a vote of 0-8-1. He was found not in violation of Article 6, Section 4, Paragraph A with a vote of 0-7-2. The court decided to deny the relief requested of the disqualification of John Woodard. The relief provided was Public Censure via the court case and a public statement made by the respondent stating that “he was in no way affiliated with ‘#WoodardWednesday’ and does not support their efforts or actions and will not participate in any affiliated event.” The relief was passed with a vote of 7-0-2. Chief Justice Faulk met with the respondent to formulate and approve the statement on Sunday and assure that the proper notifications were made. John Woodward’s statement was posted to Twitter, Facebook, and the SG website on under the Judicial Branch, under the Boudreaux v. Woodard case. The statement says “The #WoodardWednesday movement got misconstrued as having my endorsement or as a way for myself to garner votes before the appropriate time. I in no way planned or consented for these outings to occur, nor did I in any way hope that they would solicit any of your support for my upcoming campaign.”

There are three vacancies on Student Parking and Appeals Board.

Senator Rees asked how the justices come to their final decision, was all the evidence that were presented heard, and what other options were considered for the final verdict. Chief Justice Faulk responded that all the violations were discussed individually and broke down what Articles were violated and what were not. All evidence was available doing deliberation. The justices considered taking away Mr. Woodard’s active/passing campaign days.

Speaker Pro Temp Campbell moved to suspend the Rules and move back into Executive Officer Reports, seconded by Senator Thompson. Seeing no objections, Speaker Westbrook so ordered.

Executive Officer Reports (cont.)

Taylor Cox, President

Firstly, President Cox reminded that there was to be no election paraphernalia in the Executive, Judicial, or Legislative Branch Offices. President Cox asked that the floor please respect the current leaders in the administration and those running for presidential positions. The past week there was a Student Experience Subcommittee. All the meetings are open to the public, and he encourages all those running to please attend the meetings. He’s very frustrated about the lack of student attending the meeting.
Senator Baumgartner asked if an email can be sent to senate about the meetings. President Cox responded that an email will be sent out to the student body.

Speaker Pro Temp Campbell moved to suspend the Rules and immediately consider **SGB No. 7**, seconded by Senator Catalanoto.

**SGB No. 7** by Senator Beadle and Grashoff a Bill to amend the Student Government.

Two-hundred and twenty-two dollars and twenty-two cents ($222.22) was pulled from contingency; all other budget accounts are fixed. There were no questions or debate.

Favorable passage was urged.

95% in Favor SGB No. 7 Enrolled

**SGCR No. 23** by Speaker Pro Temp Campbell

Chief Justice Faulk is allowed one appointment to the Student Recommended Fees Committee, and she is in favor of Brianna Crabtree. Ms. Crabtree introduced herself; on Monday she went to be passed through Rules.

Senator Beadle asked if there were any other facets of student government Ms. Crabtree is interested in getting involved in. She responded that she’s interested in the Black/Diversity Caucus.

Favorable Passage was urged.

98% in Favor SGCR No. 23 Enrolled

**SGCR No. 24** by Speaker Pro Temp Campbell

Chief Justice Faulk is allowed an appointment to Public Defender Student Recommended Fees Committee, and she is in favor of Kurt Ristroph. Mr. Ristroph introduced himself and summarized his application process to the floor.

**Debate**

Senator Rees gave his support to Mr. Ristroph.

There were no questions, or further debate.

Favorable Passage was urged.

92% in Favor SGCR No. 24 Enrolled

**SGR No. 5** by Speaker Westbrook and Senators Boudreaux, Tillay, and Vargas a Resolution to recommend the implementation of a Medical Amnesty Policy as Louisiana State University.
Speaker Westbrook stated that the bill is very important and a lot of time was put into this bill. The bill was made into a Resolution so input can be gained. The authors have looked at a number of universities with similar policies. The policy of the bill pertains to when a person is inebriated or has overdosed on drugs, if someone calls for medical assistance, those persons affected will not be held responsible for the Student Code of Conduct as long as they comply to certain situations and stipulations laid out before them by Student Accountability or the Department of Residential Life. However, they will still be liable for local, state, and federal laws.

Senator Schwartzzenburg moved to extend the time for opening comments by 15 minutes, seconded by Senator Zeringue.

Speaker Westbrook moved to suspend the rules and to review SGR No. 5 by sections, seconded by Senator Pinac.

Section: Philosophy

Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schwartzenburg</td>
<td>Logistics of implementing the Resolution into LSU policy.</td>
<td>The policy will have to go thorough President Jenkins, the Student Code of Conduct Review Committee, and it might not be signed off till summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herwig</td>
<td>Is the policy designed towards the person in need of assistance or the person calling for assistance?</td>
<td>The overall idea is to implement a sense of responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham</td>
<td>What is the difference between the policies LSU has now and the Resolution being presented? Is the Resolution based on a first time offence?</td>
<td>Now a student’s record will indicate that he/she was charged. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buvens</td>
<td>Would the Resolution go into effect in the fall? Will the policy encourage those to go against current university policy? Is this policy exclusive to alcohol or drug misuse?</td>
<td>Yes. Marketing will go into effect after the Resolution is passed and possible cooperation with LSU Ambassadors. Further research will need to be conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavell</td>
<td>Has there been a lot of cases heard in which the board has or has not granted amnesty? To clarify, a person who receives amnesty may or may not be held responsible and may or may not have to take classes with the student health center.</td>
<td>A situation does not exist. If amnesty is granted, they will not be held responsible, but they will possibly complete difference courses of actions that are put out before them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the policy cover only campus incidents?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, the policy will still apply to off campus events, if LSU were to be notified of the event, as long as the stipulations are met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no questions or debate on the Philosophy section of SGR No. 5. Favorable passage was urged. There was a voiced vote. It was in the opinion of the chair that the Ayes had it. The Philosophy section was adopted.

Section: Policy

Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schwartzenburg</td>
<td>If currently you’re in violation of anything we had previously talked about, it goes on your transcript officially? Who has access to your files?</td>
<td>It depends on the charge and the sanctioning associated with it. The university has various levels of probation statues, such as warning probation, disciplinary probation, deferred suspension, suspension, and expulsion. A simple warning probation will not have a track on the transcript, but any of the other four would. The probation will have to be requested to be lifted after the probationary period. Educational records are maintained for seven years. Educational files are protected by federal law. The file is accessed when applying to graduate school, or to a job with an educational background check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herwig</td>
<td>If the violation is removed after the probation is over, will it still be on your educational records?</td>
<td>The violation will still be on educational records, expunging records is not allowed. The notation of the transcript is different. The transcript and the educational records are different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalanoto</td>
<td>Does medical amnesty still apply if an RA finds a student and that student asks for medical attention?</td>
<td>No, medical amnesty must be sought after.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debate

Senator Baumgartner

Senator Baumgartner pointed out in the policy that medical amnesty does not apply to repeat offenders. An idea he proposed was that instead of being able to receive medical amnesty one time at a person’s time at LSU, that there should be a way in which that it should apply to a two year period. He was not encouraging for students to become inebriated or to act irresponsibly but that in case of an incident happening two or more years later, that the student will be able to receive Medical Amnesty. He does not believe in unlimited amnesty, but that medical amnesty should be a last resort lifeline that every LSU student should have. In his opinions, having only one change at medical amnesty is “a little bit harsh”.

Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watts</td>
<td>Do you believe that the LSU PD or BR PD is out to make money on students?</td>
<td>In his personal opinion, sometimes LSU/BR PD go around looking for campus looking to fulfill their quotas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herwig</td>
<td>Why do you believe that going through that process that the student will learn and take the classes and do what they need to do, and learn about SAA, that the student should not learn his/her lesson once and not do it again? Are you opposed to making an amendment for one medical amnesty per two year period?</td>
<td>After the incident, the student should learn his lesson, but people make mistakes and run into crazy incidents, and that the students should have a second chance. He is not opposed to proposing the amendment, but he is debating to bring forth a point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeringue</td>
<td>In the universities listed in the Resolution, what are their policies regarding the issue?</td>
<td>(Yielded to Speaker Westbrook) The policies are very vague and basically state that a student might receive medical amnesty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copley</td>
<td>Should there be a second set of conditions for the second amnesty?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Do you think that the Resolution should be left vague so it can lead towards letting a student receive a second medical amnesty?</td>
<td>I am all for this Resolution, and I do believe leaving the Resolution vague would allow a student the greater chance to receive a second medical amnesty, but that without explicitly stating it in print, it could work to your advantage or disadvantage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalanoto</td>
<td>Do you believe it’s important for</td>
<td>(Yielded to Speaker Westbrook)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a student to receive second amnesty if they experience being roofied or date raped?  

If a situation like that happens and a student needs to go to the hospital or a friend calls or someone finds you, or some report is made to SAA, SAA will investigate the situation and if a student is in that situation, that student will not be punished. Victims are not charged.

Favorable Passage urged on the Policy section.

Section: Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rees</td>
<td>If a person calls for a friend who is in need of medical assistance, will that person be in trouble for possession illegal substances in his/her room?</td>
<td>Medical amnesty would still apply and that person would not be held liable for possession of illicit substance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debate

Senator Taylor

Senator Taylor pointed that often in situations involving alcohol, there will be more than one person in the room, and that it does not necessarily have to be the person in possession of the alcohol who has to call for assistance. She does not believe that the owner of the room and alcohol should be covered for having alcohol beforehand because they are knowingly breaking the rules before they have occurred. Secondly, if alcohol is not in visible sight, the RA cannot search the room for it or accuse someone for having it. An RA cannot search for beer in the fridge, or under a blanket, even if it’s obvious. Senator Taylor feels that since LSU has a lenient policy on possession in res halls, she does not think that that should be covered in this policy.

Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Llorca</td>
<td>Do you know that having only conditional amnesty would not be amnesty at all?</td>
<td>I’m not asking for amnesty to be conditional but to make it clear to students that the policies set by ResLife are withholding even before the amnesty has taken place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>For clarification, doesn’t being</td>
<td>An RA cannot judge a person’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vargas</th>
<th>Drunk mean that you have had to have been in possession/consumption of alcohol.</th>
<th>Intoxication unless he has possession of the alcohol. The owner of the room is responsible for the alcohol that is present within the room.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that this goes against creating policy to have students call for help because they don’t fear consequences?</td>
<td>No, I do not; the only thing she has a concern about is the lack of policy and lack of accountability that some individuals will have because the will use this to their advantage in the sense of solely owning anything alcohol related memorabilia, paraphernalia in the door. Her concern is, e.g., what if the roommate isn’t there, but it’s his/her alcohol, but the other roommate is there, and if the alcohol is seen, according to what you’re saying we would technically not even be allowed to report that alcohol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillay</td>
<td>If LSU PD is called for an emergency situation, do they have a right to search the room? In certain situations, could they search the room? If LSU PD did search the room and found alcohol, would that report go to ResLife? If a person is in possession of something on their person and the owner of the room is unaware, would the owner still be held responsible?</td>
<td>They do not have the right to search the room unless it’s proven important in the situation. In drastic situations, such as suicide, if there was a knife in the room, it would have to be removed. Anytime LSU PD is in the building, the RAs are notified and the on-call RA must be present, unless the officer tells him/her to step out of the room, which happens in very rare and sensitive cases. The owner of the room will not be held responsible if it is on the other’s person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Favorable Passage was urged for the section Student. It was in the opinion of the Chair that the Ayes had it. The Student section was hereby adopted.
Section: Student Responder

Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rees</td>
<td>Does the same situation apply to two roommates who keep having the same</td>
<td>That’s hypothetical, so it goes by a case by case basis. If one of the roommates is a medical responder, his recurring amnesty will not apply to his roommate. If you are able to ask for someone to call for you, by all means, have them call for you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incident, e.g., one or the other is passed out, and the other one calls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For clarification, can you ask for someone to call for you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibeson</td>
<td>In the example of the two friends, what if one of them was in need of</td>
<td>Under this policy the distribution is covered, however, if you are supplying alcohol to a minor, and if you are reported by LSU PD, you will still be held responsible for that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medical attention, and the other person who was calling provided that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>person with alcohol, does the amnesty cover that situation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBlieux</td>
<td>Can a student seek attention upon himself?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No debate. Favorable Passage was urged. It was in the opinion of the chair that the Ayes had it. Section Student Responder was hereby adopted.

Section: Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gibeson</td>
<td>Would it be in their (organization) best interest to report as individuals multiple times as opposed to as an organization? E.g., a fraternity has wild parties and one person called for assistance one week, and then another person calls on the next week, etc.</td>
<td>There is a difference between a registered organization event and an official organization event. A registered organization goes through the process of registration through Campus Life. To answer the question, no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rees</td>
<td>Is there any specific reason it is written “until all liable members are no longer enrolled at LSU” instead of until all members are no longer part of the organization.</td>
<td>If you are no longer a member of the organization, you can still spend a lot of time with that organization, go to their events, and most likely be affiliated in some way with that organization and cause harm again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copley</td>
<td>Will the advisors count as “liable members no longer enrolled at</td>
<td>No. If for ex, student government were to get into</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debate

Senator Grashoff

In favor of the Resolution, especially as a member of a fraternity and the issues that can come about with official organization events.

Favorable Passage was urged. The floor then moved on to a voiced vote. It was in the option of the Chair that the Ayes had it. The section Organization was hereby adopted.

Debate (bill as a whole)

Senate Latham

In favor of the bill as she is living in a residential hall right now and has seen instances where students have not reported incidents because they were afraid of the repercussions. She sees the bill as an opportunity to have students do the right thing and call for help.

Senator Cavell

Yielded his time to Director of External Affairs, Jeaux Zurkas. Director Zurkas thinks the bill has a great policy; it allows students to make the right choices without fear of getting in trouble.

Senator Baumgartner

Gave his support for the bill. He does not believe that the bill is entirely perfect; however, he also believes that no bill is. He thinks that the resolution is a great first step and it will do great things for the student body.

Favorable Passage was urged.

93% in Favor SGR No.5 Enrolled

SGFB No. 3 by Senator DeBlieux a Financial Bill to allocate a maximum of twelve thousand five hundred dollars ($12,500.00) from the Initiatives Account to the LSU Office of Parking, Traffic, and Transportation to fund a fourth night bus servicing students living on Ben Hur Road and Brightside Drive.

Senator DeBlieux went to the transportation forum and thought about the issues of not having a night bus that went to Ben Hur Rd a lot. The only issue with not having another bus was financing. The contracting fee is $90.60 per hour. The night bus will be three nights a week, 5 hours, form 10 pm – 3
With adds up to about $12,500.00. Senator DeBlieux showed the floor the proposed route. It will be the fastest route of any of the buses, and it will ease up tension on the other routes, shortening the other bus routes. It will serve a lot of students, approximately 2,200, and with the expansion of the Woodlands and the Cottages, the number will grow.

**Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herwig</td>
<td>Does the president who you met with plan on further funding this plan?</td>
<td>Yes. Transportation is making a few changes that will not be implemented until fall of next year, so if this plan goes really well, and it receives positive evaluations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baumgartner</td>
<td>How many students live in the Campus Crossings area, and in the future will the route extend its days, outside of the proposed Thursday-Saturday? Will there be someone monitoring how many students use the route?</td>
<td>He does not have that number; it will also service those apartments, but this bill was targeted towards Ben Hur Rd, because those residents who don’t receive any services will get higher. As far as things go now, that topic will be brought up at a later point. The route is subject to change depending on the amount of riders; he does not think that there will be an issue of lack of riders on the bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Cavell</td>
<td>Currently students pay a $35 transit fee per semester, would another option be to just raise the current fee? What about raising the fee for transporting people at night for sports and recreational instead of adding another bus line? Would it be better to fund bus during the day to take them to class or for recreational bars at night?</td>
<td>It was brought up within Transportation, but it would not go into effect until fall. He thinks that education comes first, but at the same time these issues are being looked into.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Debate**

Senator Grashoff

Think that this is an excellent initiative. He went on to give information on the Initiatives account. It’s the first time all year that money has been pulled from the account; there is currently almost $50,000 dollars in it. The account is a onetime expenditure on new programs. The money put
into the account does not roll over into surplus. The money in the account is money that has accumulated over semesters for the past few years.

Senator Cavell

    Showed his support for the bill. The bill is very good for students, because there is a large number of the LSU population who lives on the route. There are always checkpoints in that area.

Senator Baumgartner

    As a member of the Cottages there have been a number of times where he was in Tigerland and needed a ride home. He believes the bus system is efficient and fast and can help a lot of students return home safely.

Senator Marrian

    Senator Marrian was in favor of the bill and that it would improve the safety on the road.

Senator Boudreaux

    In support of the bill because there is a checkpoint on every major holiday by LSU PD and that in his personal opinion he feels it a form of entrapment.

Senator Latham

    In support of bill; Senator Latham knows a lot of 1st year students who live in the area and that the bill is a good way to use the Initiatives Fund.

Senator Llorca

    Senator Llorca was not in favor of the bill because he’d rather have the money used for academics. Some other uses to use the fund could be to increase the library hours.

Senator Buvens

    Senator Buvens yielded her time to Director Zerkus. Director Zerkus is in opposition of this bill because the floor should think of the principles and priorities. One main problem he has is that the bus does not even reach campus; a student taking a night class will have to walk off campus to get off the bus. He feels that the bill supports safe driving, but that he also has a problem with spending a large amount of money on a bus route that does not reach campus.

Favorable Passage was urged.

    91% in Favor SGFB No.4
LO No. 11

Senator Corry was appointed to Budget and Appropriations.

Favorable Passage was urged.

100% in Favor LO No. 11 Enrolled

Advisor Reports

N/A

Legislative Officer Reports

Speaker Westbrook

    Thanked the floor for a good debate and for any senators to feel free to talk to her about medical amnesty.

Petitions, Memorial, and Other Committees

Senator Watts

    Has renewed an organization at LSU called Landmark LSU. The purpose of the organization is to renew/restore/renovate/remodel historical landmarks on LSU’s campus. The Huey Long Field House is the first project. The organization is working with the Foundation for Historical Louisiana, who is in full support of the project. Landmark LSU is on Facebook and Twitter (@LandmarkLSU).

Senator Zeringue

    Wished Senator Pinac a Happy 20th Birthday.

Senator Herwig

    Brought up the issue of the bell tower not ringing at midnight on Valentine’s Day.

Senator Bevin

    Informed the floor of the Student Experience Committee meeting on March 14th from 2:30-4:30 somewhere in New Orleans. The meeting will be broadcasted live, with the link provided in a broadcast email. Questions and comments can be emailed.

Senator Murphy

    On March 5th in the International Room there will be an informational meeting for a charity dance marathon.
Adjournment

Senator Schwartzenburg seconded by Senator Williams. The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.