



AMS Operations Committee

Tuesday, November 12th, 2019 - Room 3511 at 5:00pm

Members: Cole Evans (Chair - VP Administration), Katherine Westerlund (Councillor), Alex Gonzalez (Senator), Jeanie Malone (BoG Representative), Max Holmes (BoG Representative), Aidan Wilson (Vice-Chair and Student at Large), Lily Liu (Student at Large)

Guests: None

Regrets: Katherine, Lily

Call to Order

Called to order at 5:00pm.

Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by: Jeanie Seconded by: Max

Motion passes unanimously.

Approval of Committee Minutes

Be it resolved that the Operations Committee approve the minutes of the October 29th, 2019 meeting

Moved by: Jeanie Seconded: Alex

Abstention: Max.

Motion passes unanimously.



Chair Updates - 5 min

[Cole]: Someone threw furniture! Police were called.

UTSAV Update - 5 min

[Cole]: I met with the president and talked through the situation. TLDR: miscommunication. They acknowledged the place was damaged and took responsibility. They are willing to pay for the damages. They got a strike and were put in bad standing with bookings suspended. Bad standing now expired (2 weeks up).

[Max]: How was this misunderstood?

[Cole]: Garbage bags - custodial staff allegedly said the bags would be taken care of. They claimed they would not have left overnight if they had known. Floor damage (liquid damage) from leaking bags. Sticky floors - needed to be scrubbed down

[Max]: Cost of damages?

[Cole]: \$850-1000. Mostly cleaning. Need to check with C&C to see if there are any floorboards that need to be replaced.

[Aidan]: Do they know that?

[Cole]: Still confirming cost.

[Max]: Did this cause issues for future bookings? Did we have to cancel bookings because of sticky etc? If so - additional repercussions are needed.

Conclusion:

- if it is ~\$1000, Cole will unsuspend bookings, authorize C&C to remove cost of damage
- if it is more than \$1000, this will come back to OpsComm and we will need to figure out a payment plan and bookings will still be suspended until further discussion



IFC Report Debrief - 5 min

[Cole]: WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT THE MONEY THIS TIME. The account is presently frozen \$10k.
Next steps: meet with IFC and see what we need to do moving forward with MOU.

[Aidan]: They don't have an office space... what do they need?

[Cole]: Bookings. Wouldn't like to see individual chapters being booked out on behalf of IFC though.

[Max]: Why do we need an agreement then if it's just free bookings? We shouldn't allow them to book in the NEST, we don't get any benefit. Lot of universities have taken this stance. Current VP students banned first years from being able to rush. Not sure we want rush to be here.

[Cole]: Benefit is: leverage. Can limit privileges like bookings.

[Jeanie]: How much would booking NEST cost as an external group? Would be good to present that to IFC when talking about agreement, may be useful to see.

[Cole]: Best way to do advocacy to this community is probably not to fight

[Alex]: Can we turn down people from external bookings?

[Jeanie]: No academic freedom at the AMS

[Aidan]: What are we even trying to change with IFC?

[Max]: Advocacy committee should do that not us. Transparency online, zero public accountability



[Jeanie/Aidan]: When will we talk about the money?

[Cole]: EVENTUALLY

Nest Camping - Infinite Time

[Jeanie]: 24hr NEST - what would that cost us?

[Cole]: Concerned about designation of property type I think? Logistics...

[Cole]: What would that look like?

[Jeanie]: Over night duty manager. And don't lock the doors.

[Cole]: Like IKB? Seems possible...

Policy I-7 Working Session - 45 min

[Cole]: Maybe I7 won't take too long¹. I think a gap exists if our services can administer bans without it coming through this policy. Limitations currently says we cannot prevent people from accessing services. Have added some clarity in requests for suspension, warning stages, ombudsperson's role.

From Shirley's presentation last week - I have added that a person can request to come in person to the meeting for review. Committee can reject though. Not sure if this solves the problem.

[Alex]: Anonymity is ruined. What if we know them? Can we give the person a list and ask them if they know any of us?

[Aidan]: Personally, I like this compromise. Most of the updates makes sense.

¹ blatant lie



[Cole]: If the complainant is the SASC manager, the VP Admin isn't complainant and doesn't need to recuse themselves. But I would know the identity of the individual.

[Max]: Management of conflict of interest should be on us not on the person appealing/respondent.

[Cole]: Why don't we know the names... *in camera* anyways.

[Max]: We should have this conflict of interest discussion earlier on.

[Jeanie]: Historical problem... we should fix this.

[Max]: We should remove the anti protesting piece in the nuisance activities. Too much power!

[Jeanie]: Agreed, if there are big disturbances or violence that's covered under other pieces. Respectful environment policy.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:05pm.