



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Floor Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

Date:

Location: HUB 250

---

## CALL TO ORDER

5:01 pm

---

## APPROVAL OF SENATE AGENDA

**Husna Chepkemboi** moves to approve the agenda

**Teddie Schmitt** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

---

## LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

**Erick Jacobsen** reads the following statement: The ASUW Student Senate acknowledges the Indigenous peoples of this land, and the land which touches the shared waters of all tribes and bands within the Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations, and the Duwamish peoples, whose land our university currently occupies. It is our role and responsibility as guests to understand how our impact entangles the caretakers.

---

LEADERSHIP REPORTS | [Erick Jacobsen](#), [Joseph Riggio](#), [Julia Tanner](#)

---

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Erick Jacobsen:** Moving on to the announcements and public comment. If there are any announcements from any senators or if any member of the public would like to speak, now is your opportunity. You can line up at the mic or raise your hand.

**Kaitlyn O'Connor:** Hi guys, here's some legislative session updates from OGR. The following bills have been relieved with further consideration of Senate rules, meaning they have moved out of the Rules Committee Senate Bill 5886 concerning forged digital likenesses and the expansion of personal property rights. Senate Bill 1506, the SAVE Act and Anti ICE legislation. Senate Bill 5963,

which guarantees automatic eligibility for the Washington College grant to the Passport for Careers program participants. And then Joint Senate Memorial 8014, which concerns the independent US Senate investigation into UW alum, has passed out of the House State Government and Tribal Relations Committee and is currently in House rules and Brandon, our Director of Legislative Affairs, testified in the committee and is requested. We are requesting for a rules pull basically to go on the process. House Bill 2411 is currently in Senate rules and we are also requesting a rules pull and then Senate Bill 5855 concerning banning face masks for law enforcement is currently up for debate on the House floor. So if you want any more information on these pieces of legislation, come talk to me, e-mail me at [asuwohrc@uw.edu](mailto:asuwohrc@uw.edu) or you can e-mail Brandon directly at [asuwohrc@uw.edu](mailto:asuwohrc@uw.edu).

**Ava Wahl:** Hello everyone I'm Ava and I'm with WashPIRG's Hunger and Homelessness Campaign here at UW with the WashPIRG Chapter. Just a quick announcement. Tomorrow, Wednesday, March 4th, from 11:00 AM to 4:00 PM, we'll be holding a clothing donation drive on Denny Field on North Campus. We're primarily looking for women's clothes, especially winter garments like coats, jackets, sweaters, hats, and scarves. Unused hygiene products like soap, shampoo, and conditioner are also really appreciated. So if any of you have a moment, do some spring cleaning, take a look in your closet for any old clothes you'd like to give. Any donations are helpful. All proceeds in all clothing donated through this event will go to Jubilee Women's Center, a local transition program that supports women experiencing poverty on their journey to finding healing, stability and community. If you're interested in housing and economic justice in the Seattle area, please consider stopping by Denny Field tomorrow afternoon to donate, just consider that. Hope to see you soon you guys and we hope to get some good clothes and make sure they get to some good owners that are going to need them in the cold during the winter, although it's a little bit warm now, but you know.

**Sora Tolley:** Hi I'm Sora Tolley I'm a student advocate for UW Impact, which is a legislative advocacy arm of the UW Alumni Association. We have a QR code that's going to pop up here and if you scan it, then we'll just give you some updates and information about the legislative session, about higher education information that's important to all of us. And yeah, it's just basically like very flexible based on how much time and effort that you want to put in, but it's just something that I wanted to spread awareness for.

**Maggie Schoenfeldt:** I'm also one of the student advocates and I am a signature senator here. And as for like specific programs you can get involved with, you can sign up for action alerts which are basically like pre templated letters to your or emails to your local legislators in the State House and state Senate and it's like literally 2 minutes. I promise it does not spam you when it sends you a reminder to send these out or you can become a student advocate for next year and we have a separate lobbying day in addition to Huskies on the Hill that you can participate in as part of that program. And there's information of that on that QR code too. So yeah, thank you.

**Charrise Vales:** Hi everyone, I'm Charrise, Char for short and I'm here as a fellow senator and also on behalf of the Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity. I'm here just to softly promote the collaboration event that we're holding with ASUW EAC. I don't know if anyone here has filed for

candidacy and like are on a ticket or anything, but just beyond the candidates and also our RSO leaders like a part of Black Student Union or First Nations or our multicultural RSO's, we want to be able to bridge more connections and also networks and across student leadership here on campus. So our forum is on Monday, April 6 from 4:00 to 6:00 PM and it's going to be at the Ethnic Cultural Center out West on the Unity Suite on the 1st floor. If you need any more information, feel free to flag me down or also check out and keep your eyes posted for the Instagrams on ASUW EAC and as well as UW OMAD\_SAB. Thank you.

**Naomi Law:** Hello everyone. There we go. So what are you thinking of the QR code? Yay, it's so exciting. I'm here promoting the Living Communities Forum. It's a great opportunity to get to the candidates who are running for ASUW Board of Directors and what you want to hear from the board directly. This QR code is like a three in one. It's your fast track to get into the event. We'll have two lines, RSVP and people who didn't. People who did will get priority. It'll be your ticket to enter our raffle. We'll have a giveaway and it will be an opportunity for you to say what kind of pizza you prefer to have because it is catered and so this is a good time to kind of put your two cents in for pizza. So please come. Thank you.

**Adam Ford:** Hello everyone, I'm Adam Ford with hall caucus and I do have one last QR code for y'all. Is that on the? Oh awesome. It's just in the pre-meeting e-mail. So yeah, if you want to check that out and give your thoughts on housing amenities, I would greatly appreciate it. Thank you.

**Ella Shepard:** I'm a representative from the Office of Student Health Relations and we're going to be hearing a little bit today about updates on the health fee survey that we were pestered with for so long. Such a great project. Thank you so much, Joseph. I just wanted to call everyone's attention to how important health services are on campus and how this is to bridge equity and access. So yay, that's all. Thank you.

**Husna Chepkemboi:** Hello everyone my name is Husna I'm here on behalf of Terry Hall Council. We're hosting A Beverages plus Bob Ross event where there'll be paintings where you can paint your canvases, maybe give it up to a friend and there'll be Italian soda, so there's drinks. Just come, have fun and enjoy. It will be in Terry Hall's second floor lounge from 6:30 PM to 8:30 PM. If you're on west Campus, it's easier for you. Thank you.

**Gabrielle:** Hi everyone. My name is Gabrielle and I'm here on behalf of LiveWell, which is one of those three health branches on campus. We are here to kind of advocate again for that health fee. We know that you guys have been working super hard on that legislation and all the things involved with it, all of that survey data, which again looks amazing. Joseph is working so hard on it and it's been great. So thank you all so much. But really we're, I'm here to just advocate for how important this health fee is, especially for our unit here at LiveWell as the main like health promotion and education branch, we do so much education for students, like 15,000 students per year, which is the largest by far for any like student organization and like health group on campus. So it's really super important and vital for students to get public promotion and advocacy for that. So really just continue all the hard work that you guys have been doing and we really appreciate it on our end and I know that you guys are super passionate on your end too. So thank you.

**Karen Mullholland:** Hello everyone. My name is Karen Mulholland. I'm also here to speak on behalf of the health fee. I will say that I'm an employee of Livewell and the Health Center and one thing that I've heard a lot in in my time working in these units is how valuable our services all are to students and how students do wish that they were like you know, more robust health services and more opportunities for people who are uninsured. Specifically when it comes to the Health Center we know that with our current state of the world, you know, health services and accesses are going to be changing a lot so anything that you all can do as student government to kind of foster that and just at least keep that in mind is really appreciated. So thank you all so much.

**Erick Jacobsen:** Are there any other announcements?

**Joseph Riggio:** I know it was said earlier, and Erick, I don't fault you because I don't know if you would know this, but there's gonna be a special meeting for the Judicial Committee on Friday because we didn't get to the proposal for that constitutional amendment Erick was talking about. So I don't want to, still go to board meetings if you want to. They happen Thursdays from 5:30 to 7:00 or they go longer, but I don't really think it'll be discussed at that board meeting. So it might be the next board meeting. Thank you

**Erick Jacobsen:** Are there any other announcements?

---

## FORUMS

---

## NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

---

## NEW BUSINESS

**Erick Jacobsen:** We'll move on to the summary of new business. Our first item of new business is R-32-5, a resolution to direct ASUW and GPSS executives to create the Student Health Fee Memorandum of Understanding. This is sponsored by the Student Health Fee Planning Committee, led by Joseph and the bill summary is quite long. I'll read it out anyway. Since autumn of 2024, the ASUW held conversations with UW Husky Health, Live Well, and the Counseling Center to discuss funding pathways to sustain, improve and increase health services for students. Simultaneously, R-31-4 a resolution to support increased funding and staffing for the UW Counseling Center passed unanimously by the ASUW Board and Senate. The Student Health Fee Planning Committee was created to assess student interest in a student governed health fee like UPASS, Services and Activities Fee and the Student Technology Fee. This fee is designed to separate health units currently under SAF and allow for sustainable funding pathway for these units. Health units proposed to the planning committee a \$125.00 per quarter per student fee. This bill references a survey conducted by ASUW, GPSS and the health units that opened in November and closed in February. 6045 students, 2401 graduate, 37 non matriculated and 33,607 undergraduate students

completed the survey. Out of 6045 responses to question one about establishing the Student Health Fee Committee in the 2027 to 2028 academic school year, 39.86% of students responded yes. 23.61% responded maybe and 36.54% responded no. However, the survey data demonstrates that the majority of undergraduate students prefer a fee lower than \$125.00 per quarter per student. This bill, pursuant to UW policy SGP 205 voluntary fees of students, directs ASUW and GPSS to negotiate fee logistics, amount and conditions attached to its passing with the Student Life Division. This was placed in the On Campus Affairs Committee. Our next item of a new business is an Organic Act OA-32-04. An Organic Act to provide RCSA a representative on the ASUW Senate Steering Committee. And the bill summary for this is as the Senate Committee on steering holds immense power in crafting the agenda for the Senate floor, and as such holds a great deal of influence over what the Student Senate advocates for, this organic act would create a voting seat on the Senate Steering Committee in perpetuity for the RCSA Director of Government Affairs or a Hall senator serving as their proxy, starting an ASUW of Session 33 or ASUW of Senate Session 33, I believe. And this being an organic act did not go through or will not be going through a standing committee because it went through steering. And so it is now directly an old business under item C. So now we're going to move on to committee meetings. On campus affairs you have R-32-5, General Affairs, you still have SB-32-3. Restructuring Committee still has SB-32-2 discussions and Off Campus Affairs and AAA can continue their resolution revolutions.

---

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS

### **On Campus Affairs**

- Read and discussed R-32-05 A Resolution to direct ASUW and GPSS Executives to Create the Student Health Fee Memorandum of Understanding
  - Heard from sponsor Joseph Riggio
  - Grammatical amendments made
  - R-32-05 tabled until next week due to lack of time

### **Off Campus Affairs**

discussed some issues at UW that we are interested in writing legislation about including the new UW AI software and the supplier of the free menstrual products throughout UW as well as brainstorming bonding ideas for next quarter.

### **General Affairs**

- Committee Meeting Begins at 5:28pm
- Sarah took attendance for Teams, Pierce took in-person attendance
- Begin bill discussion at 5:31
- Isabelle Green- discuss bill based off of email correspondence as well, wants us to get information, but would put us out another week
- Ava Wahl- Meeting next week? Pierce responds yes

- Recommendation by Pierce, we are not making any permanent changes on bill, just making/providing amendments and suggestions (take with a grain of salt) + we can pass bill unfavorably/ neutrally as well
- Isabelle Green- clarifies comments on wanting emails
- Resuming at line 200 (Section 3)
- Opens the floor
- Comment by Ava Wahl- was looking for clauses that there was no proof/evidence attached/citation, begins at line 255
- Response by Jenna Miller- feels that it is impossible to prove that something hasn't happened. Feels like there is evidence then they should be able to prove it, if not, it's a blanket statement
- Pierce reminds committee of a comment made by Joseph on how some of the claims do not have evidence that can be released
- Ava Wahl- line 268, what is the definition of "publicly disclosed effort"?
- Isabelle Green- screenshot from SharePoint, attach to appendices, wants to add
- Ava Wahl- Point of Information- where would the financial records be? Not on Senate SharePoint
- Pierce- not sure, can ask Joseph to provide
- Sarah sent a Teams message to Joseph to ask
- Ava Wahl- line 292, similar concern with clause and wanting a citation/reference
- Isabelle Green- the Senate SharePoint only has 2 forums, no financial records located there
- Pierce- he will ask Joseph about 255 and 292
- Ava Wahl- Comment, the current difficulty in trying to even find the current information is something that we should consider
- Joseph response, not publicly available, Senate has the power to accumulate list and request it
- Line 321- Personnel Director, Maddy Pittis, any record of an employee of the month?
- Mason von Ledford- values passing this through committee and let floor see, Ava Wahl agrees
- Pierce explains that we can pass neutrally since there are claims that some feel may need more answer
- Santiago Quesada, we have the best eyes on this
- Isabelle Green- issue with substantiating claims is that they are anonymous for fears of retaliation
- Jenna Miller- wants to move this out
- Jenna Miller moves to vote bill out neutrally, Mason von Ledford seconds
- Results: 13-2-3, passes neutrally out of committee
- Committee Meeting concludes at 6:09pm

## Academic and Administrative Affairs

### Discussion:

- Brennan says it is an ambitious project that would take time, money, and a lot of resources.
- Diana says it's devastating to go on break late
- Kira shares her thoughts on how we would not get a summer quarter
- Kyra talks about the 18-credit limit

### Action Items:

- We decided not to peruse the date change bill
- Further research the transfer student legislation

## Committee On ASUW Restructuring

### DISCUSSION

Split into small groups

- Article XIV: committees of the ASUW - Teddie Schmitt, Collin Sawyers, Aiden Reeder, Jayden Kim, Russel Ross
- Article VIII: Executive Branch- Jesse Luu, Skylar Best, Kathleen Esnaurrizar, Brian Kim
- Article XVI: Gavin Horton, Kayla Gorspe, Addison Wooster, Radcliffe Cushman
- Article XI: Electoral Branch- Adam Ford, Malia Marin, Detlef Gerbing

Deadlines for these changes is coming up, there should be some work done between senate meetings

### ACTION ITEMS

- Do some work outside of the meetings to be prepped for the next meeting which will be full group discussion

---

## OLD BUSINESS

**Erick Jacobsen:** Alrighty we are now back. and we do have another item of new business that I forgot to mention because it was approved by steering after we approved the agenda for today. So just for reference, we have our steering meetings from 4:00 to 5:30 before on Mondays, but the Open Public Meetings Act says that we have to post a public agenda at least 24 hours before the meeting. Obviously Senate meetings start at 5:00 PM. So at 5:00 PM every Monday in the middle of

steering, we have to post the public agenda link. So we did that and then afterwards because we did have more time in meeting steering discussed and approved [LD-32-5 Establish ASUW's Federal Legislative Agenda.docx](#) I forgot to put it in the summary of new business. That's completely my bad, but that is our first item of old business. We decided to treat it very similarly to the statewide legislative agenda in that it goes directly into old business and doesn't go into committee. I'll read out the bill summary and then I'll invite the sponsor up. This bill establishes federal legislative agenda items for the ASUW Office of Government Relations to advocate to the federal government. These include amending SNAP eligibility to increase access for students experiencing food insecurity, updating funding policies to sustain the SNAP program overtime, updating Medicaid work requirements to better promote access for the 3.5 million students who rely on Medicaid for health care coverage for doing research grants and ending targeted anti equity investigations against colleges and universities, affirming and codifying protections for undocumented students rights to live and work and learn safely on college and university campuses and protecting international students from the threat of visa revocation. These items are a priority for advocacy, legally is the term we have to use for advocacy at the federal level, because each of these items directly affects significant portion of both the student body at the University of Washington and all students across the United States. If the sponsor would like to come up and also because I'm a co-sponsor, I yield the chair to Joseph.

**Erick Jacobsen** yields speakership to **Joseph Riggio**

**Joseph Riggio:** Jump scare. Thank you. All right. So if you'd like to. So I guess for this we'll read the bill summary first because we didn't get a chance to read it in new business. So if you would like to read the bill summary first

**Erick Jacobsen:** I just did that.

**Joseph Riggio:** Oh, you did. I'm sorry, I was focusing on something else. So I think it'd still be good just to read out the whereas clauses, that clauses and we'll go section by section, so. Towa if you would like to read section one for us, please. Also introduce yourself.

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** Oh, yeah, I forget that not all of you know me. I'm Towa. I'm an OGR intern, and I was a senator last year. Yay.

**Towa Nakano-Harris** reads LD-32-05 section 1

**Joseph Riggio:** This is going to work a little bit differently. Since we're going to go section by section, we'll do a tentative vote. If you move to approve this a section, we'll do a raised hand vote just to move on to the next section. We're not voting on the bill until we've gone through every single section and then we'll take the actual vote to need to approve the legislative directive. So with that, Towa, would you like to provide any additional context?

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** I'm happy to answer questions, but I'm hoping that the bill contains enough info



**Abigail Appleyard:** I was just wondering if you could explain what the payment error rate was, I tried to look it up.

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** Yeah, totally. There's a citation there that if you want to read more in depth, you can. But basically what it's getting at is that after I think it's 2028, the degree to which the federal government will cover like the actual benefits of SNAP, not the administrative costs, will depend on the error rate, which is an error in the SNAP system occurs when benefits disbursed to a recipient are either more than they're actually eligible for or less. So the rate at which errors happen will determine what percentage of the benefits the federal government covers. The worst case scenario for states, I think it's something like only 85% covered by the federal government, which isn't a lot, but it is still a big cut

**Joseph Riggio:** Questions, comments, motions.

**Maggie Schoenfeldt:** So this is just a general question I only briefly skimmed the legislative directive so it's if it's mentioned later, my bad. I'm sorry. But I was curious, like in what way would you guys be at, I know you have the Office of Government Relations, but in what way would you be advocating for this? Would you be going to regional offices, that sort of thing?

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** So this legislative directive is in anticipation of the Association of Big 10 Students Conference in DC. So a couple members of our Board of Directors and Brandon, the Director of Legislative Affairs, are traveling to DC and Brandon just asked me to write this up as a official statement of student sentiment. I believe he has a couple meetings and that's where this will not be enacted, but this that's what this is for.

**Joseph Riggio:** Questions, comments, motions?

**Isabelle Green:** So I'm aware that this is a general statement of priorities. In reference to amending student eligibility for SNAP is there a specific policy that this is referencing or is this proposing something that we would like to see at the state or federal level?

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** So while I didn't get too specific in the legislative directive itself, so for context, and it's also in the citation if you want to look deeper. Basically, students are not eligible for SNAP at all unless they meet one of a couple, a few exemptions, and that disqualifies the majority of students from receiving any SNAP benefits at all. So there's a bunch of different requirements. This basically is saying that that's unfair, that students have to meet one of those exemptions that other populations don't.

**Joseph Riggio:** Questions, comments, motions

**Kira McKey:** In reference to the same that clause on line 22. I was wondering if that the higher proportion piece was vague on purpose and if you, an ideal, I mean ideal would be 100%, but can that get more specific or would that harm the bill do you think?

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** I suppose it could. I mean, like you're saying, my ideal would be 100% of students that experience food insecurity. There are in the whereas clauses, I have a specific

proportion of students who experience food insecurity who are currently, I guess I would be open to a amendment to say like any student that experiences food insecurity.

**Erick Jacobsen:** Just adding to that the Office of Government Relations as like part of, if you think of this as like a sort of government as part of our executive branch, they can't like advocate for anything that doesn't specifically go through the Senate. So in some cases like this, it's vague. Now it can still be defined. And defined in maybe a flexible way if we prefer, but to answer is it vague on purpose? Yes, it can be less vague, but the point is more or less flexibility. So if it can be like less vague but still as flexible, that would also be great.

**Joseph Riggio:** Questions, comments, motions

**Abigail Appleyard** moves to approve

**Avery Kirscht** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

**Joseph Riggio:** Moving on to section 2, So would you like to read aloud Section 2?

**Towa Nakano-Harris** reads LD-32-05 Section 2

**Joseph Riggio:** Any additional context you'd like to provide?

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** I'll just wait for questions.

**Joseph Riggio:** OK, awesome. I'll open up the questions, comments, motions

**Isabelle Green:** This is just more of a general question to what exactly does the cost sharing do in terms of its impact on both the patient's medical care and on their actual finances, like I'm not familiar with the policy in question, so just a bit of context please.

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** Yeah, for sure. So basically, the cost sharing here is making patients responsible for a sliding scale proportion of the cost of their care. There are certain types of care that aren't subject to cost sharing, but most services covered by Medicare would be. And the bill, the big, beautiful bill also says that if a patient is subject to cost sharing because of their income, a provider, if the patient doesn't pay, can refuse them care. So I hope that's the context you're looking for. If I can clarify more, I'd be happy to.

**Jesse Luu:** So this is in reference to So what you were essentially proposing here is that the amount of time that students like spend in classes would be counted towards the 80 hour work requirement?

**Towa-Nakano-Harris:** yes.

**Jesse Luu:** OK it is also true that in HR one in this specific section of it that halftime students being a halftime student is also one of the requirements. Is that correct? Like you could either be a halftime student, or you could fulfill the 80 hour volunteer requirement or fulfill the 80 hour work requirements?

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** So are you you're referencing like the Medicare requirements? I believe even if you're half time well. I believe even if you're a half time student, you still have to like this work requirement is for all Medicaid recipients. If I could be wrong about that, but that was my impression.

**Jesse Luu** I was under the impression that it was an or statement rather than an and statement.

**Erick Jacobsen:** that can be something that checking the source, we can like get a clearer picture on and if there needs to be another source, um, there can be a motion for an amendment

**Jesse Luu:** OK, I see. But besides that, that I guess we can just double check.

**Joseph Riggio:** Questions comments motions?

Teddie Schmitt moves to approve section 2

**Naomi Law** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

**Joseph Riggio:** We're now moving on to Section 3.

**Towa Nakano Harris:** Yeah, before I read, I do want to clarify. I just looked it up really quick and I don't really trust AI, but you know, the AI summary says that. It's for the work requirements are for all able bodied adults, so that includes all students. If you want to look deeper you can, but I'm that's what I remember from my research.

**Towa Nakano-Harris** reads LD-32-05 Section 3

**Joseph Riggio:** Any additional context that you'd like to provide including any answers to previous questions? I'm going to take that as a no and move on. So any questions, comments or motions?

**Kyra Lui:** what would these specific and extreme circumstances be? Because that seems a little vague to me and I feel like maybe it could be taken in some other way.

**Towa Nakano Harris:** For sure. I definitely understand that. I would say that I don't think I'm qualified to determine those. I didn't want to include specific standards by which we would determine an investigation or not. That's my rationale.

**Erick Jacobsen:** this is the document for our student lobbyist to parse out and interpret. This is not something that like legislators would look like look at and go, oh, students would support if I did this. So it's something that like the interpretation and execution is up to Brandon. And so he'll likely interpret that according to like student interests, like that's in his job description and stuff. So it's something that like we're not like giving the government a blank check basically.

**Joseph Riggio:** However I will say that even though we tentatively approved sections, I'll call for motions again for all of the sections. So if you want to draft amendments as we're going for sections

that we've already covered, you'll have a chance to propose those amendments or make those motions to amend as y'all see fit.

**Brennan Sandora:** That was also my question but I guess I would motion to approve this section.

**Joseph Riggio:** I'm sorry, you what?

**Brennan Sandora** moves to approve

**Adam Ford** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

**Towa Nakano-Harris** reads LD-32-05 Section 4 Subsection A

**Joseph Riggio:** Any additional context?

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** Yes, I will say I would welcome an amendment to add “without a judicial warrant” to the second that clause at the very end.

**Joseph Riggio:** Any questions, comments, or motions?

**Adam Ford** moves to amend second that clause to read “without a judicial warrant”

**Collin Saywers** seconds

**Isaac Pasco** objects

**Adam Ford** yields

**Isaac Pasco:** Judicial warrant, judicial schmarrant.

**Joseph Riggio:** We are now in a period of debate

**Dylan Bianchi:** While I appreciate Isaac's insightful contribution, I do think we should note here that like, as much as I personally despise ICE, as much I would personally like to see ICE functionally abolished, it's not as realistic a policy aim as restructuring what they are and are not allowed to do and restricting them to a warrant is like it's probably not going to happen in the current federal administration, but it's just a kind of a reasonable line we're probably going to have to swallow.

**Joseph Riggio:** And just for future reference, this goes for everybody. Please try and direct, as per Robert's rules, that you'd either direct your comments in the chair or the motion that's being made. Please try and not direct targeted comments to an individual.

**Isabelle Green:** Seconding Dylan Bianchi's comment on the viability of the legislative agenda, I think it's important to recognize that while we in the Senate may hold a specific set of views, a federal legislative agenda is going to need to come into an actual practical contact with people who frankly are working from a very different set of paradigms. So I think it's important to stay realistic with what we're proposing in order to get a broader base with what we want and believe in through

like, I mean, so I think, yeah, restricting it to a judicial warrant seems more reasonable because if we go on the record arguing to abolish ICE, it'll be easier to dismiss the rest of our proposals.

**Collin Saywers** moves the previous

**Radcliffe Cushman** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Amendment approved by raised hand vote

**Joseph Riggio:** Any questions, comments, motions about Section 4, subsection A?

**Jayden Kim:** purely grammatical but could we add an and after the amendment that was just made?

**Isaac Pasco:** I don't think I'm allowed to do this

**Isaac Pasco** moves to strike "without a judicial warrant"

**Isaac Pasco:** Because of the fact that I think preemptively capitulating new fascists is cringe and bad. Thank you.

**Joseph Riggio:** OK, so and yes, you are allowed to do that.

**Spencer Grubbs** seconds

**Collin Saywers** objects

**Isaac Pasco:** If they have a problem with what we say then they can sort that out themselves. I don't want to say, oh yeah, no, we, this UW student body are perfectly fine with ICE deporting people. That's all. Thank you.

**Collin Saywers:** It seemed to me like the previous amendment passed by a pretty wide margin, so it seems pointless to revoke that now.

**Joseph Riggio:** We are now in a period of debate.

**Erick Jacobsen:** I would like to clarify that it is not the stance of the Senate through this bill or any other that we're perfectly fine with anyone being kidnapped or deported. And multiple past pieces of Senate legislation has established that we have condemned ICE and we have passed bills supporting undocumented students. This is specifically what we're trying to do on a federal level to get legislation passed and echoing Dylan as much as I'd love for ICE to be abolished, we have to start somewhere.

**Joseph Riggio:** I know this is a heated topic I'm just going to say it again. Please, when we speak, if you raise your hand at the same time, please direct the conversation to either I as the chair or to the motion that's being made and not to direct to any individual senator.

**Avery Kirscht:** moves the previous question

**Adam Ford** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Amendment fails

**Joseph Riggio:** So we are now back to questions, comments and motions on Section 4A.

**Teddie Schmitt** moves to approve

**Elizabeth McAleer** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

**Towa Nakano-Harris** reads LD-32-05 section 4 subsection B

**Joseph Riggio:** Any additional context that the sponsor co-sponsor would like to offer? All right, opening up the floor to questions, comments and motions for subsection B.

**Ava Wahl** moves to approve

**Radcliffe Cushman** seconds

**Isaac Pasco** objects

**Ava Wahl** yields

**Isaac Pasco:** You guys seem really chill with letting people be forced out of the country and I'm not very happy about it. Thank you.

**Joseph Riggio:** We are now in a period of debate. Questions, comments or motions.

**Kira McKey:** The way that I read this bill is in no way implying any chillness with ICE's actions, if anything, no, I fully support this bill as written.

**Spencer Grubbs:** This is more just a question that I was gonna ask. So this the that clauses refer only to like the State Department and things and that's an executive of like under the executive branch so just like wondering if there was like what kind of advocacy was like or is it or is it more was like planned here or was it just more like statement of like this is the kind of thing that we support.

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** Joseph can I respond to that?

**Joseph Riggio:** You may respond but then I'm going to note that so moving forward because we're having discussion about the motion that's in question, which is to approve the subsection, we want to keep the conversation about approving it. But since it's relevant to people's decision to approve, I'm going to allow a response.

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** Thanks. So once again this legislative directive is just in anticipation of a specific trip. We have this in here because our representatives in DC, well, the UW people we're sending to DC can't talk about this issue unless we include it. So that's all, yeah.

**Jayden Kim:** I want to echo the previous sentiment that nothing in this resolution or subsection specifically indicates a quote chillness. And yeah, I was. I'm going to reiterate that this is a position statement that we are forwarding to our OGR and our, or that of what we believe we should be supporting as the ASUW. Thank you.

**Ava Wahl:** I was basically going to say something similar. Yeah, I don't see anything in this particular section that states that we're OK with what's going on. I also wanted to mention the fact that, you know, this is just going to be, you know, temporary approval. So if we want to continue discussing the bill, its language after we temporarily approve each section it's still on the table.

**Naomi Law:** I would like our representatives in OGR to be able to speak about this as soon as possible.

**Naomi Law** moves previous

**Maggie Schoenfeldt** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Section 4B approved

**Joseph Riggio:** Now we are in discussion for the entire legislative directive. If there were any amendments or motions or questions or comments for the bill generally, now is the time to do it before a motion to approve.

**Jesse Luu** moves to amend lines 43-44 to read "Whereas part time students at the University of Washington take on up to five credit hours per week."

**Collin Saywers** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

**Radcliffe Cushman:** I was just kind of wondering how successful do you expect this lobbying to be? Because I know the federal government already has made these pretty conservative changes already. So like, how many, if any do you like expect any of these things to actually like happen in part or full,

**Towa Nakano-Harris** yields to **Kaitlyn O'Connor**

**Kaitlyn O'Connor:** the likelihood is probably very low with our current federal government. However, we want to put it out there as ASUW, as the student government and the student opinion, and with a lot of the work that gets done with lobbying and with student advocacy, it lays the groundwork for future legislation and makes our stance very known for a lot of future plans and future legislation. So while there is not much likelihood that the federal government is receptive to

it, it does send a statement, especially with the political power of The Associated Students of Big 10 schools and then for the future too.

**Spencer Grubbs:** Not to beat a dead horse on line 108 with regard to the amendment. I'm not at the end of this I'm not recommending we make a motion to amend it. I'm just commenting on it specifically. The language that's already there in 107 and 108 like would include without an official warrant like under like not limited to. So I think it isn't necessary to be there but also consider all things considered I also don't think it's necessary to like make a whole motion to remove it, but that's my mind I think.

**Joseph Riggio:** Just for technicality because of Microsoft Word, oh, we're gonna refresh it. That was a technical issue that it was struck. It was not struck.

**Ava Wahl:** I'm not sure if this is relevant and I might be misunderstanding other comments that people have made, but I found what I believe to be a draft or perhaps the final version of the, you know, the big, beautiful bill. And it does say the, it explains like Medicaid requirements, the best of my ability as I'm looking at this, it says something along the lines of the individual is enrolled in an educational program at least half time. From the information that I'm looking at, which seems to suggest that any student who is enrolled at least half time would qualify.

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** So I was partially wrong about this Thanks for bringing it up. So basically as according to this website that Erick found, basically the requirement is for all people, able bodied persons to work, volunteer, whatever 80 hours per week. If you're employed half or if you're enrolled half time, the time you're in class can count towards that 80 hours on this. It doesn't replace it. So you still have to meet that 80 hours. It's just your class credits are counted towards it. With that in mind, not a huge deal because I don't think it changes the meaning or the objectives of this. I would welcome an amendment to reinclude the credit hours taken on by full-time students since those are counted towards the 80 hours but wouldn't fully fulfill it if you're taking 18 credits a week, I don't think, yeah to be safe because it's a greater amount.

**Abigail Appleyard:** I was just gonna make a note about Jesse's amendment earlier that I don't think that source applies anymore. Source seven, it doesn't say anything about half time students that I could find on it, so I would just grammatically recommend to keep that one up.

**Radcliffe Cushman:** I believe it was mentioned that this is going to be, part of this legislative advocacy can happen during the Big 10 conference. So is the intention to work together with other schools to present like a unified front of student opinion to the federal government? And if so, is there a way to put that in the bill as a legislative directive to our intention is to work with other universities?

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** I would direct that question to Brandon. You can contact him on Teams or at the OGR e-mail, which is [asuwoqr@uw.edu](mailto:asuwoqr@uw.edu). Sorry, I don't know.

**Erick Jacobsen:** Adding a little further to that I don't know the specific answer to that question, but I know in the past how ASUW has done like federal advocacy work is that even if we go as a



group with other schools who are from different states, we like meet with the people from our state and then like it's a combined like rally. So I think that it may be very likely that that is how that is done. But again, if you want to contact Brandon, he might have more insight to that.

**Joseph Riggio:** Also, I'm going to prioritize senators who have not spoken much yet. I'm calling for questions, comments, motions.

**Maggie Schoenfeldt:** I'm still curious about the Medicaid cost sharing requirement and that sort of thing, because from my interpretation, this whereas clause talking about part time students also affects like amending the Medicaid work requirements as well since we found out that it's educational hours does count towards it. So I was wondering if it would be like to extend what educational hours count towards the cost sharing requirement would be more important considering this recent amendment or if this still stands.

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** Yeah, I think we could amend that that clause to be more specific. I think the only in class hours that wouldn't count towards the 80 hours a week, if I'm correct, are in class hours taken by students who are taking less than five credit hours or less. So I think so. Yeah.

**Madeline Steppe:** I'm going back to likes 43 and 44 about the part time student requirements. This is kind of like a point of information and I don't necessarily know who to direct this to, but I was looking up the actual like part-time student requirement and just states that it's less than 12 credits for undergraduates. Should that language be changed to reflect that it is less than 12 credits? Because it says up to five credit hours per week and that is very confusing to me.

**Towa Nakano Harris:** Like I said I would welcome an amendment that is along the lines of just stating the amount of credit hours that all students take, both part time and full time, probably separately for clarity, and then all students would be included within this.

**Avery Kirscht** moves to amend line 97 to change Americans to individuals.

**Elizabeth McAleer** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

**Jayden Kim:** going back to line 43 and 44 the whereas clause that states the part time student description looking at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell's advising websites, they say that half time students must be taking at least six credits at least. And then looking at the UW Seattle's financial aid website, it says you must be enrolled in at least half time credits to receive loans and then it goes on to say halftime for undergraduate and graduate professional students is at least 6 credits.

**Joseph Riggio:** I do want to clarify what this legislative directive would do is empower our Office of Government Relations and the Board of Directors when they're at the ABTS 10 conference or any other conference that they're a part of that they would interpret the language of this bill to to represent things so it's OK if some things are vague. If we want things to be specific, that's fine too so just stating that for consideration.

**Adam Ford** moves to amend line 53 to read numbering 5 or less per week.

**Jenna Miller** seconds

**Kira McKey** objects

**Adam Ford:** it just reflects what was recommended by the sponsor.

**Kira McKey:** I would just edit that for clarity to read in class hours for part and half time students.

**Joseph Riggio:** OK, we're now in a period of debate, but I will remind that if a friendly amendment, one way of doing it is one person rescinds their objection or rescinds their motion. I would encourage maybe we can move either move the previous question, the objector can rescind or the motion maker can rescind. So just saying that we are now in a period of debate.

**Kathleen Esnaurrizar:** I think the part-time and like full-time thing doesn't need to be said in that line and the five or less per week is just meaning like right now currently five hours or less are not counted towards the 80 hours, but with this we want it to go move towards the 80 hours and I think we can just later amend the whole part time and full time thing.

**Joseph Riggio:** All right. Taking more questions, comments, motions. We are still in a period of debate and reminder we are talking about the debate to make the amendments. We can't add anything.

**Collin Saywers** moves the previous question

**Skylar Best** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Amendment approved by raised hand vote

**Ava Wahl:** I was going to, actually I have a point of information. So I see here that there's been an edit from 43 to 44. Is this one that has not been approved yet or was that approved along with this one?

**Joseph Riggio:** I can answer that. Yeah. So this, this is just a suggested amendment that Julia was drafting in anticipation of a movement. This is not anything that's been discussed yet, except when we were in a period of debate.

**Towa Nakano-Harris:** In reference to that well, it's not an amendment yet, but the suggested edit on lines 43 through 44, I would really strongly support an amendment to that just because even students who do receive or whose in class hours are counted towards the 80 hours per week they still have to meet that 80 hours per week and their number of in class hours might not fully meet the 80 hours per week. So I think it's really relevant to still reference them in here.

**Kathleen Esnaurrizar:** I'm going to move to the amendment, but I'm also going to amend what this is. I'm going to add a thing. So it said students at the University of Washington they got up to 5

to 12 like credit hours for a part-time or five to 11, I'll say 11. So that way it's specified for both full-time and part-time

**Kathleen Esnaurrizar** moves to amend line 43-46 to read. Whereas full time students at the University of Washington take on 12 to 18 credit hours per week and part time students at the University of Washington take up to 6 to 11 credit hours per week.

**Radcliffe Cushman** seconds

**Ava Wahl** objects

**Kathleen Esnaurrizar** yields

**Ava Wahl:** this is actually just a quick grammatical thing. We say take on 12 to 18 credit hours, but we say take on up to for the second one we should just get rid of up and that second time so it's like cohesive and it's the same. That's really it.

**Joseph Riggio:** You can take that as a grammatical. And with that, we are unfortunately, we are in a period of debate. So again, you can rescind the motion, you can rescind the objection, or you can move the previous question. The faster way would be rescinding.

**Ava Wahl** rescinds objection

Approved by raised hand vote

**Spencer Grubbs:** I just want to say I feel like we're making a lot of amendments that are turning somewhat vague language into something way more specific. I think that works in a lot of different resolutions, but not as much in a legislative directive. But I don't wanna shoot, I don't wanna put us into a box.

**Maggie Schoenfeldt:** Given that it's 7:10 pm and it seems that we have a lot of other amendments and discussion on this bill to get through and I don't know. Well, I don't think we're going to finish this discussion today

---

ADJOURNMENT

**Maggie Schoenfeldt** moves to adjourn

**Collin Saywers** Seconds

**Avery Kirscht:** are we sure we can't object to this ? Because I could have sworn that this has been objected to before.

General confusion before remembering that Robert's Rules does not allow objections for adjournment, but senate rules do.

**Naomi Law** objects

**Maggie Schoenfeldt:** I think we can save this discussion to the next meeting because given how many amendments have been made, I think there's probably going to be further amendments and discussion made and this is just going to be a really long conversation.

**Joseph Riggio:** For the record I have not asked for hands yet but I'll get to that later.

**Naomi Law:** I totally understand that. That makes sense. I'm not one to rush bills either, especially when something like this needs to be considered. There's two things. One, I think as open language as possible for OGR because it gives them the most lobbying power, which is very important so I worry we're severely limiting our OGRs ability to lobby. Now I do fully support making amendments, so I'm not saying don't do that. And the second thing is I want OGR to be able to lobby on this as soon as possible. So I hope if we can sacrifice a few extra minutes, but we can do that.

**Joseph Riggio:** I will say also this bill calls to advocate, not lobby. That's an important distinction I've gotten in trouble for, but we are now in a period of debate for the motion to adjourn.

**Aiden Reeder** moves the previous question.

**Kathleen Esnaurrizar** seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Approved by raised hand vote

Adjourned 7:14 pm

---

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar  
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate

---