AMS Operations Committee
July 16th, 2019, Room 3511

Members: Cole Evans (Chair - VP Administration), Katherine Westerlund (Councillor), Jeanie Malone (Councillor), Nicholas Harterre (Councillor), Kelvin Au (Councillor), Aidan Wilson (Vice-Chair and Student at Large), Roger Wang (Student at Large)

Attendance: Cole, Katherine, Jeanie, Nicholas (phone), Kelvin, Aidan (phone)
Guests: N/A
Regrets: Roger

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at: 5:00 pm

Adoption of the Agenda
Moved: Kelvin
Seconded: Katherine

Passes Unanimously.

Approval of Committee Minutes
Chair Updates

Cole: "Brief overview of what ops comm is for our new members"

[Cole]: regarding the UBC confessions people, we have concluded it isn't an AMS executive (some people don't get this kind of information, and the people who do have confirmed they didn't do anything). Not sure where this may have originated from. It's possible this was just another group of people (club execs maybe?), but haven't figured out who it may have been.

[Jeanie]: There are a couple other groups to consider (permanent staff, club execs, ombuds, SASC staff...). Have you talked to them as well.

[Cole]: Yes, have discussed with HR, reminding staff. Would be surprised if they did not already exercise discretion in these matters.

Policy I-4: Alcohol Consumption Policy Working Session

[Cole]: Is the scope of this appropriate?

[Kelvin]: Serving it right?

[Katherine]: That's the law

[Aidan]: What about the scope of private VS public places in the NEST? Offices, etc?

[Cole]: AMS offices is less of a concern to me than club offices. Pre-ing in clubroom before going to the PIT....

[Jeanie]: We have in the OpsManual that clubs cannot consume alcohol/drugs in their offices.
“SECTION 4: 11.k) No flammable, explosive, perishable, alcoholic, or illicit materials shall be stored in any office or locker spaces.”

“SECTION 7: 13.iv) The following will result in six (6) strikes and the resulting repair or labour charges, along with any fines incurred by the AMS:

1. Serving alcohol without a Special Event Permit”

[Cole]: Should we be more specific about consumption in clubs manual?

[Jeanie]: I think we are covered with the above?

[Cole]: May not be explicit enough; bookable VS private space.

[Katherine]: What is the law? Seems like no open alcohol or public intoxication is allowed. Intoxication is not well defined.

[Aidan]: Quick search of case law - seems to be prerequisite on being a disturbance.

[Jeanie]: If we want a rule specifically about club offices, should be in OpsHandbook rather than a broader policy. Not sure what the goal of the broader policy is.

[Cole]: The law... exists. We may not need this.

[Jeanie]: It appears that promoting alternatives to alcohol is the only AMS focused part of this policy.

[Katherine]: EUS alcohol policy is more around risk management... having food, non-alcoholic options available. Those running events not consuming alcohol.

[Aidan]: What would the relevance of this be to AMS?
[Cole]: Could use if there was a non-event/non-booked event that was wild to shut it down?

[Jeanie]: I-7 emergency nuisance could also be applied?

[Jeanie]: Actionables: Cole to talk to Advocomm if we need to have a stance on safe alcohol promotion. Cole to talk to AMS Events and PIT/Gallery and Conferences about whether it is useful to have any sort of risk management.

Policy I-7: Building Suspensions and Expulsions Working Session

-Nick, Katherine leave at 6pm-

[Jeanie]: I have added comments/suggestions on the working document from our in camera deliberations from last year.

[Kelvin]: What about constituency events?

[Jeanie]: Unauthorized acts is not well defined.

[Cole]: Appeals are a big challenge in this policy.

[Aidan]: Important to make sure there is a pathway for an alternate person to be given the appeal.

[Cole]: If every case goes to OpsComm and they are the highest body for appeal, why do we have an appeals process?

[Jeanie]: Not intended to be an appeal in the sense of a formal appeal, more of a parole/probation piece. Not intended to make the assessment on the same evidence, but on new evidence.
[Jeanie]: We need to align this with SVPREP. Can you collect that for us?

[Cole]: Trespassing?

[Jeanie]: Lack clarity in the role of our public/private building. Lack clarity in the boundaries of the NEST. Could have maps as an appendix.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30pm.