



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

20 April 2026

HUB 337

4:04 pm

Changing rooms

ATTENDANCE

Erick Jacobsen (he/him), Speaker | P

Joseph Riggio (he/him), Vice Speaker | E

Julia Tanner (she/her), Public Relations Officer | P

Blair Yeh (she/her) On-Campus Committee Chair | P

Abigail Appleyard (she/her), Off-Campus Committee Chair | P

Pierce Wallbaum (he/him), General Affairs Committee Chair | P

Dylan Bianchi (he/him), Academic & Administrative Affairs Committee Chair | P

N/A GPSS Director of University Affairs | E

Nandana Jaideep (she/her), ASUW President | P

Detlef Gerbing (he/him), *Select Committee on ASUW Restructuring Chair* | P

TBD, *Director of Internal Policy* | E

Kate Lawson (she/her), *Director of University Affairs* | A

Jothsna Sundar (she/her), *Senate Clerk* | P

Brendan Chang (he/him), *SAO Advisor* | P

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Dylan Bianchi moves to skip directly to proposals on the agenda

Dylan Bianchi withdraws motion

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve the agenda

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved unanimously

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.

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: It is elections. Yippee. Okay, make sure you've all voted. And if you haven't yet, voted, vote.asuw.org. We have merch here from EAC. You can pick it up and you can vote. We have the voters' guide as well if you are undecided. I assume you are all engaged enough to have at least some semblance of an opinion. But you should all vote. You should all tell your committees to vote, in teams, when they get into committee, et cetera. We will, I think, designate about five minutes at the start of committee tomorrow for voting, if people want to use that. In past years, we've used the announcements period or the reports, but we do have a time-sensitive forum. So just at the start of committees, if you can tell people to vote and help people vote, and if you are a candidate, we will swoop in and take over. So yeah, remember to vote. We have no Vice Speaker's report because Joseph is away. PRO's report, Julia.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Hello everyone, happy 4/20. OK, so bonding. I sent a When2Meet in the chat. Please fill out that When2Meet, and then also respond to my message of what you would prefer. I appreciate Blair's "any would be fun," but please pick one that you prefer. And then for the reel that we were filming, my interns decided to just cancel it. And it was supposed to be like a... And then just a reminder, I already sent it in the chat as well, but I went through a deactivated registration. So if anyone's confused because they did their email, send them to me and I will be on in the on. Yeah, that was it

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Brendan Chang: The word of the day is futz, which is to waste time instead of doing something important, such as futzing about.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Erick Jacobsen: Before we move on to the approval of the minutes, does anyone want to guess how many pages the floor minutes were from the elections forum? Raise your hand, please, if you have a guess.

Radcliffe Cushman: 20.

Erick Jacobsen: No.

Julia Tanner: 40.

Erick Jacobsen: No.

Aiden Reeder: 5.

Erick Jacobsen: No, I am going to start saying higher or lower. Higher.

Dylan Bianchi: 50.

Erick Jacobsen: I think we give that to him. It's 50 and then a few lines.

Recess 4:18

Reconvened 4:28 pm

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty, we are back at 4:28. I'm 27 pages in. How far in are you, Pierce? Abigail, did you get through the 50 pages?

The Committee nods.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Nandana Jaideep moves to add R-32-14 to the top of proposals

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 3-0-2

PROPOSALS

Nandana Jaideep: says something So Brandon Elliott, our Student Director of Legislative Affairs is the primary sponsor of this bill, and Brandon's on a flight right now, so I'm helping read this bill on behalf of OGR as I'm a co-sponsor, but Brandon has a lot more insight on a lot of this because Brandon's worked closely with the WSA all year, but I'll be happy to answer as many questions as I can, but I'm going to go ahead and read it.

Nandana Jaideep reads [R-32-14 A Resolution to Withdraw From the Washington Students Association](#)

Nandana Jaideep: A little more context is the last week, I believe, WSU Pullman withdrew from the WSA as well, and Vancouver and other campuses are still considering it or have done it as more aware as the WSU Pullman's with withdrawal, but I'm happy to answer questions. This has been something that has been a conversation for a minute with OGR and Brendan did a lot of good work to make sure that our decision is in good faith and good merit.

Erick Jacobsen yields chairship to Julia Tanner due to a conflict of interest.

Julia Tanner: All right, so thank you for the further context, Nandana. Are there any questions or comments at this time?

Dylan Bianchi: Nandana, I did have a couple of questions. First of all, I guess I don't know exactly how WSA funding works with our budget. Does that come with the OGR budget? And if so, what's going to happen to the money that was budgeted for, say, next year?

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah so that's a really great question. Also, I'm really sorry, guys. I'm so sick, but that's why I'm like, excuse me if I cough in the middle. But we have historically paid WSA dues with money from the Star Fund, which is part of our WSA account. And I think last year, Naomi paid it with the ASUW budget. which was not precedent, but that was her decision. And this year, we did not allocate that money for that because I was planning on using the STAR funds in case we did have to pay those dues. But that STAR fund money goes to things like Huskies on the Hill, whether it's like

catering and legislative reception catering so we could have more money to allocate to those things now while we have, we are spending \$16,000 less.

Aiden Reeder: I wanted to ask just because I was curious is there no forwarding clause for reason of some kind? Is like, I understand that you are aware of this stuff, but I was just wondering if just for ease of GAVEL and whatnot to add those clauses in.

Technical difficulties related to audio issues.

Nandana Jaideep: I can Teams Brandon right now.

Julia Tanner: Yeah, Erick pointed out that in one of the that clauses, The second that clause says specific kind of like along the lines of a forwarding clause, so that Nandana will deliver a statement and notify Executive Director Vanessa Ponce. I don't know if that answers a little bit more, but that's for sure a question for Brandon as well. Okay, any other questions or comments?

Dylan Bianchi: Have Adan Rodriguez from Bothell or Rae Watkins from Tacoma been informed? What kind of discussions were had with our other campuses about this?

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah, we all collaborated on the audit earlier this year, so they were all signatories and they saw all of like the financials that they submitted to us after the audit was done. But now I believe there's a conflict of interest with Rae, because Rae serves as the chair of the Board of Directors. And GPSS has their own relationship with WSA as well, which reflects their needs separately. So I know that when me and Ryan have had conversations, Ryan like feels differently about the WSA and they have, graduate students kind of operate on their own. But yeah, I think Bothell and Tacoma are so far going to stay unless they should make a different decision moving forward. But Tacoma President is Chair of the WSA. So I think that's like what they're dealing with right now.

Julia Tanner: Any other questions or comments?

Francisco Dojenia: I'm looking at the final report and I'm noticing that there's no representative from the ASUW representing our association. So I was wondering. if there was anyone actually representing us during the task force meetings.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah, that's a great question. I know Brandon was talking to WSA leadership for the most part, and I was always communicating with Erick as well.

Julia Tanner: Erick, do you have anything to add to that?

Erick Jacobsen: Just for context, why she was communicating with me. I'm also in another capacity, the WSA Vice President of Communications, so I was chairing this task force, but that's also why I have the conflict of interest and why I won't be voting on this.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve into General Affairs

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Julia Tanner yields chairship to **Erick Jacobsen**

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: It is now 4:50 so we will be moving directly to the approval of the floor agenda. We have a UW PD and Campus Safety Officer Forum and a U-PASS Fee Increase Forum. I know we initially put this into Off Campus Affairs, but we consulted with Brendan and basically in past years, we've done the U-PASS fee as either a special order of the day, which we don't want to do, or as a forum with an associated discussion and vote. So now that has moved up to the forum section. That does mean that Off Campus Affairs doesn't have a piece of legislation yet. If we go back to proposals as like a part 2 section and approve more, maybe like something like Free Food Alert or Tent City would be off-campus Affairs. We can also move the WSA resolution to Off Campus Affairs. Completely up to y'all. But yeah, two forums. And I added in all the legislation from last meeting as well. Are there any questions or comments currently?

Dylan Bianchi: Do I have to motion to suspend the rules or can we just formally move the WSA bill to off campus?

Erick Jacobsen: I think we can just move it since we're still drafting the agenda. If we go through more resolutions, there will have to be at least one committee with multiple legislation pieces. So I would think about what legislation we think needs is in here that will probably pass the quickest maybe, so that we can focus on efficiency and time. If there are no other questions or comments, are there any questions, comments, or motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the agenda

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-0

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: We could go back to proposals if y'all would like, but we can also start moving on to discussion. I'd advocate for going into discussion because it seems like we

have a couple bills related to the process of Senate or steering passing legislation at Senate. Maybe it's good to have a kind of an informal discussion to start to see where everybody's at before we get into those. I'll say discussion item A is directly linked to 0A-32-06, and it will be like piggybacking off of that. That's something we could still do, but just so everyone's aware, maybe if we move on directly to discussion, we hear that first, but, or we read that. Discussion Item B is leadership elections.

Dylan Bianchi: Is that sort of time sensitive? Do we want to prioritize that at all?

Erick Jacobsen: I would say so yes.

Dylan Bianchi moves to suspend the rules and move directly to Discussion item B, senate leadership elections.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-0

Erick Jacobsen: We are moving directly to Senate leadership elections. Okay, so let me explain to you what the timeline is now. ASUW elections finish this week. The announcement is on Friday. We will start with nominations next Tuesday for Speaker. On April 28th, which is our next meeting after tomorrow. You have nominations for Speaker. Let me pull up my calendar. Okay. And then on May 5th, we will elect the speaker, and we will have nominations for Vice Speaker and Public Relations Officer. On May 12th we will elect the Vice Speaker and the Public Relations Officer, and we will have nominations for two of the committee chairs and some liaison positions. On the 19th, we will elect two committee chairs and a liaison, and we will nominate 2 committee chairs and a liaison. On May 26th, we will elect the last committee chairs and some more liaisons and then have some nominations for other liaisons. And in our final meeting on June 2nd, we will elect the final liaison. Now you may be asking yourself, what liaisons are we electing? And I do have that somewhere. Legislative steering is very important. I think we also wanted to elect our paid, our fee committee members. So SAF, STF, and U-PASS, we wanted to elect as well as legislative steering. We do have some constitutional committees, Judicial, Personnel, JCC, and F&B. Part of this discussion is do you think we should elect those in this time as well? And then part of the discussion is I want you all to be aware, if you would like to run for any of these offices, you cannot participate in the crafting of questions. And we will ask you to leave the room when we do craft those questions. If you are not planning to run for your position again I would like you all to draft up a question for that position. Senate leadership's already doing that for us and then we will discuss and approve these questions probably starting next week, and we'll go piecemeal. You can look at previous questions from the meeting in which you were elected if you would like, which is in the minutes somewhere. You can ask Jothsna or I can work with Jothsna, we can figure it out and get that info together. But that's

generally the structure. So are there any questions or comments on that? And are there any thoughts about what liaisons we should be elected?

Pierce Wallbaum: I was just going to say that's a pretty big timeline can you send that somewhere?

Aiden Reeder: I want to ask some questions on the liaisons specifically. I totally get like the paid ones and a lot of those, like, it's a lot easier for them to get started as well as legislative steering. For a number of the other ones, I remember a big, in my first year, a big, like a big opportunity for me was to get to run for some of these liaison positions as someone who wouldn't have been able to had they been voted on the previous year. I don't know enough, I think, about any of the specific positions to be able to say any of those should absolutely be in winter. But I just would want to put that consideration out for steering members to you know.

Erick Jacobsen: And this was a discussion amongst leadership on really is this something we want to do? And last year, leadership, we decided that we wanted to elect all of the liaison positions at the beginning of the year. With that, we have 21 liaison positions. It took us all quarter and then some. So we wanted to split the difference a little bit. And we also wanted to keep in mind that a paid position is probably one that it's nice to know if you're going to get that income next year. It's nice to build your schedule around it, especially if you're paid. And when it comes to legislative steering, that needs to hit the ground running right away. We cannot wait for that. We did have some delays related to that from Senate this year. And the constitutional committees, we were sort of like on the fence because they were really important. They're sort of something that we maybe want a senator who's experienced, especially like Judicial to do, but also we wanted to balance that with opportunities for new senators. We did conclude that all of the committees of the board Like Student Safety Advisory Board, Student Sustainability Council, UTSAC, PP Committee, Husky Health and Student Advisory Board, HUB Board of Representatives, all those things would be elected next year. So I think even having any liaison elections at the end of this year would help with the management of that, but it is up to us and we can consider what the ideal balance is. Does anyone have any thoughts on that?

Abigail Appleyard: I was just going to say I definitely think that doing some of these elections at the end of this year is smart because I had so many people asking me like, what is the point of Senate? All we're doing is elections. And I think it's better to be able to balance like, elections with people being able to see legislation and decide like if Senate is something that they want to commit to for, you know, a whole quarter, a whole year. Instead of it just being like 80% elections, 20% committees and legislation. Yeah.

Pierce Wallbaum: Yeah I agree with Abigail. I think doing some more elections this year would really help with kind of just that balance. It might even improve retention for next year with people having roles they might be more willing to come back. So I definitely agree that more elections this year would probably help with that.

Dylan Bianchi: It's kind of trite at this point, but we were really drowning in elections those few weeks. And I don't think members of my committee really worked with legislation, either in committee or on the floor, really, in any form, for, like, three or four weeks. I think we should avoid that if possible.

Erick Jacobsen: In that case we would elect eight at the end of this year, and thirteen next year. What do we think about that? And then otherwise it would be like 17. So do we think we want to include, I'm getting thumbs up and nods. More thumbs up and more nods. More vigorous nods. All right. Yeah.

Abigail Appleyard: Could you walk through what you just said because we can't see if you're like pointing to a screen.

Erick Jacobsen: Oh yeah. Pulling it up again, okay. So these ones highlighted, we have decided to elect in this one. We can also do these four. These other ones, the committees of the board under this section and university committees, will not be elected at the end of this year. So it's like 2 categories this year, 2 categories next year. Does that make sense?

Abigail Appleyard: Yeah I think that's a good idea.

Erick Jacobsen: Cool, okay. If we're happy with that, please draft your questions. If you are not going to draft questions because you are considering it all, if there's any possibility that you are going to run for your own position again, please message me so that we can figure out the questions about you. That doesn't mean you have to commit to running. Just, it's best if we don't do anything like that

Pierce Wallbaum: Its just one question per chair?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes. Leadership elections, us three, will go a little bit differently than usual. We will have two questions each. And for those of you who have not been here before for Senate leadership elections, we have a period where leadership members go outside or candidates go outside, you go far away. And we have a period in which you can speak in favor of a candidate if you are a senator. This is anonymous in the minutes, and they're only asked to come back afterwards. It isn't legally anonymous, but it is practically anonymous. So that's a consideration. And then if you are not running for something, obviously you can speak in favor of a candidate. You cannot speak against a candidate. That is not something that we do. We are positive people here. And it's sort

of like endorsing a candidate. You can speak in favor of multiple if you want. But that's the main difference from other elections. Does that sound good?

PROPOSALS II

Dylan Bianchi moves to suspend the rules and move back to OA-32-06 in the agenda

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-0

Aiden Reeder: do you want me to read the

Erick Jacobsen: Aiden would you like to read the bill in full please?

Aiden Reeder reads [OA-32-06 An Organic Act to Prevent the Censorship of Student Legislation](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like to provide any context?

Aiden Reeder: The intent was, this is not, it was inspired but not necessarily by Erick's, I guess, little statement on like the submission. While I think it is absolutely a positive thing to have a Senate Speaker like insight on your bill, I don't think it should be necessary for, I don't think the speaker should be able to require that, especially considering the fact that in future we may not have someone that's as discerning as our current speaker. That may abuse this power, and I want to address this before that becomes an issue. And so that is the intent of this.

Pierce Wallbaum: So just for clarification, submitted legislation would still have to go through steering, but you wouldn't have to have input from the speaker?

Aiden Reeder: It's the fact that the steering is the only check. It's not that there's additional ones, like the statements on formatting, means of submission, and processing time. Like, I did talk to, I did bring this up to Erick, and Erick was able to mention that medium of submission is a good thing on there is that this is really helpful to GAVEL and whatnot. So there are some clerical restrictions, but generally by a single individual, I don't think that should probably be followed.

Dylan Bianchi: This is kind of a parliamentary question, Anyone can submit a bill directly to the Senate by suspension of the rules, right?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes.

Dylan Bianchi: It does not have to have been approved or format or anything by the speaker to introduce it?

Erick Jacobsen: Correct.

Brendan Chang: Not really like a question or anything but I do recall. That was Jacob, actually, like 2 years ago around this time, I want to say they added that rule. I think that year there was a fair number of legislation that to steering at the time of had the opinion that there was a lot of like errors, I think, or like had like factual or whatever, something like that, and I believe that was why this was introduced.

Aiden Reeder: I just want to clarify, I don't think this absolutely should be done that you meet with the speaker. I just don't think it should be a absolute requirement, especially for other certain ones. Again, not right now with, like I personally don't feel it is the case with Erick. I'm more of the fact of this could be a tool improperly used and I don't want to see it done that way.

Julia Tanner: Okay, so I just wanted to comment that I support this legislation, like adding that specific wordage is important. And we have talked about this in leadership, kind of addressing the fact that it's wordage like that is on the website, not like this, like you have to meet with the speaker before submitting your legislation. And so we are going to address that in discussion with you all. We think this is important. And so yeah, just a general comment someone mentioned to me.

Pierce Wallbaum: I just want to say, I also do support this bill, but given, like, what was just said about maybe, like, it could cause extra formatting work to be done in steering that could take up other, that could just take time that steering could be doing for other things. Did you put somewhere in here maybe a way to like reconcile that to make sure that bills are ready to be looked at by steering? And so it's not like we're fixing a bit, but just purely going over the quality of its content.

Aiden Reeder: The statements in this is that it's formatting, medium of submission and processing time, is that it has to be done in an appropriate amount for some at least added, it has to be done through the office form and whatnot, which does a whole lot other work for you. It has to have the proper formatting, as you've already stated. I personally would perceive a lot, like, essentially a significant amount of radical errors as improper formatting which I feel would be a valid reason, percent of leadership will say, hey, no, I need to resubmit this in a better format. I would think that would be covered if you think that there is something else that needs to be seen in that specifically that allows that restriction. But I believe that wouldn't come up.

Erick Jacobsen: This is also a good time before I go to Julia to note that this is an organic act, which means that we can amend it in steering.

Julia Tanner: I will say on all of that an example that came up was there was a legislation that didn't fit the formatting or like had a title deleted or something recently. and Joseph just went ahead and reformatted it. So I think this, this like the way that this

clause is kind of worded should be okay because they're just saying that Senate leadership can have requirements over formatting, medium of submission and processing time and whether they enforce that by saying, hey, this isn't like good enough as far as formatting goes, fix it, or if they fix it themselves before reviewing it and steering, I think that's fine.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions, comments, or motions? They can be amendments as well.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-0

Dylan Bianchi: Given its somewhat time sensitive nature I move to go directly to R-32-13

Dylan Bianchi moves to suspend the rules and move to R-32-13 on the agenda.

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved unanimously

Erick Jacobsen: Dylan would you like to read this bill in full please?

Dylan Bianchi reads [R-32-13 A Resolution Endorsing the Return of Tent City 3 to Campus](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty, would you like to speak on this a little bit more?

Dylan Bianchi: I guess my suspension of the rules is a little biased. I am H for H's Senator and this is something we believe in, both because its important for UW to support a our local homeless population, because the homeless problem in Seattle is, has many causes and there are many causes for, you know, house prices rising, but one of them in the U District specifically is, you know, just the rising costs created by an actually expanding student burden. And it's important for us to support our local homeless community. One pretty easy way we can do this is by sharing largely unused space, like a parking lot next to a Condon Hall, kind of the edge of campus with this community. Yeah, this is something that H for H is going to proceed with no matter what Senate does, but it really would mean a lot to the organization. It would be really important for this letter if you could get the like full endorsement from the Senate. So maybe advocating for it. Yeah, I know this is something that probably sounds a little weird, honestly, so I'm happy to take any clarifying questions on that specifically.

Pierce Wallbaum: I have two questions. Have you spoken to anybody in administration for UW about inviting TC3 back to Campus?

Dylan Bianchi: The letter was just approved last week and I believe has just recently been sent for the first time. This is something, it's like a little distinct from like other sort of advocacy we do to administration because it's kind of iterative. This is something we've done in the past. We know administration is open to doing this sort of thing. It's just kind of a matter of coaxing them to do it this specific time.

Pierce Wallbaum: Okay, and then my second question is, I'm not too familiar with like parking lots on campus, but is Condon Hall a parking lot that students pay for?

Dylan Bianchi: I don't actually know. I believe no. It's so, do you know where Condon Hall is? So Condon Hall is kind of, it's like West Campus. It is across the street from Terry and Maple Halls. So it is very much at the edge of campus. They have, I believe, like a startup lab and some classrooms in there. The parking lot next door is rather small, like for instance, last year, not, yeah, it was last year when we had TC3 there. There's pretty minimal disruption to like employees as far as having to park somewhere else. I think it was like, it was definitely like a slight annoyance to people who work there, but it was not like debilitating to its function by any means. Also, we're not specifically saying that UW should, if they invite TC3 back, should invite them there specifically. It's just being brought up as an example of somewhere. I know they've also seen other locations on campus, I believe.

Erick Jacobsen: Fun fact, Condon Hall is where we held Senate two years ago. The parking lot in question is W41. You can Google it. It has 32 standard parking lots and our parking spaces and two accessible ones. It is not a strictly student parking lot and has it accepts. Faculty, staff permits, student permits, and carpool slash van pool permits.

Abigail Appleyard: I was just more of interest than anything, but I was wondering, like, are the people who live in that community always the same, even if the community moves around? Or does like the population living there change as they change where they are based off?

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah that's a really good question. It's sort of a ship of Theseus thing because it is a group, it's a really important community organization within like the local homeless population because it tends to stabilize people and help them get permanent housing. So they don't, they tend to shed some members and gain some members when they move around, but generally they are gaining and losing members just through the year. So as people gain access to permanent housing, they'll move out. There's 100 slots within TC3 and new people are then able to like apply to enter. It's completely like run by a leadership committee within the encampment. So they're partnered with an organization called Share / Wheel that, like, I think it kind of coordinates like financing and a charity efforts for them. Like when H for H donates to them, we usually do it through Share / Wheel, but the actual administration of the

encampment, where they move, that's all run by democratic decisions within the encampment. To my knowledge, there's no one who is like a permanent member of the encampment because no one wants to be permanently homeless. But there are people who tend to take more senior leadership roles who've been there for maybe a couple of years. Yeah, so kind of what I want to say, to some degree, they significantly change leadership or not leadership, sorry, membership when they move, but there's often like kind of a core group of people who are consistent location to location. But over time, there's never been like a permanent member of TC3. Also, for what it's worth, there used to be four tent cities, now there are two. Tent City 1 and Tent City 2 I don't actually know specifically what happened to them, but I think they just kind of fell by the wayside. Tent city 4 still exists on the same model of democratic kind of moving about.

Blair Yeh: Okay, I just wanted to answer the question about the parking at Condon Hall, but I think it was already clarified kind of, but I just wanted to like say it's a staff only parking, but student staff are allowed to park, but it's just like regular students are not allowed to park there.

Julia Tanner: Ok so I lived in Maple last year and so we didn't get any like official notice that Tent City 3 would be set up there until there was a survey sent out after it closed down of like how the experience was for residents. And so I'm completely in support of this, but my question is, is, does H for H have any intention on working with HFS or other entities to kind of notify students who are residing or in the area of the tent city? And also, do they have, do you have any intention of reviewing those survey results in kind of seeing like how the students are feeling about the last time it was set up?

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, so we have reviewed the survey results. There was also a forum conducted last year, like there was like a virtual forum where students could go to voice opinions on, I believe, all that was happening that was not super well-advertised. So context for last year, students were not alerted, I'm going to blame HFS on this one. like Huskies for Housing sent something to HFS to say, hey, you should send this to students. HFS did not send it. Now, partially that was because last time the stay came together kind of at the last minute, the University and the city tried to block it at the last minute because of like a fire code thing. TC3 and H4H tried to like bring in a lawyer and then we managed to get it reviewed and the city backed down. And so the actual agreement to like have TC3 come was only finalized like two or three weeks beforehand. So a lot of the final steps were kind of haphazard in a way that should not happen this time because we've gone through that relatively recently. So HFS should definitely make it a priority to communicate much better with students this time. Part of the problem with results last year is that while some students said, like to be honest, while some students said that they thought it was fine, they didn't really notice, there were some problems with students, but they had no real ability to distinguish between residents of TC3 and just any other homeless person. So there were a few accounts of aggravated or

intoxicated behavior that we were able to determine was not TC3 members, especially because TC3 is a sober encampment and they enforce that quite effectively. So that kind of made it difficult to parse. Also, when I say like we got feedback, I think I don't know what the exact numbers were on the feedback form, but I know we got like 3 people came to the forum. So it'll be a priority to communicate it better this time. And last year, there was just kind of, it was kind of a mess because everything came together so last minute.

Erick Jacobsen: And these are also things that if any member of steering wants to add it, like a suggest edit, and that can be discussed in committee. Something like "that HFS notify or that HFS and RCSA notify residents through all popular channels" or anything, that would be something that you could leave as a comment.

Abigail Appleyard: This is also just like more information to know but I was wondering like where this fits in the timeline of people picking their housing at UW, because I'm wondering like if some people would kind of have a bit of a fit if they like picked a dorm on West Campus and then found out about, you know, this like living situation, so I'm just wondering, like has that happened already? Is that something that like HFS might want to notify people of if this does go through? I don't think it's a bad thing, but I'm just wondering, like, I'm sure there are some freshmen who like do not want to live in a new city for the first time by themselves. And I'm sure their, you know, parents would also be like really freaked out if they found out they were living next to a homeless encampment. And that's not to say that that's the correct opinion or, you know, that they're totally justified in that. But I can understand like some people maybe emailing, you know, whoever and trying to, you know, get all worked up about it. So I'm just wondering like how this fits with The HFS like housing timeline and stuff.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah I don't know a ton about the HFS housing timeline. One thing I will say is that I would off the dome say it's unlikely that administration formally agrees to this before fall quarter. I know last year we started it, the last time this advocacy started in spring quarter of the 2023-24 year, since spring quarter 2023 again, like I said, formal approval not gotten until pretty late into fall quarter 2024. So it would be unlikely that this arrangement gets fully sorted out. And yeah, honestly, that you know, it's like a legitimate concern for students who are moving in. Again, Julia raised a really good point. Like, communication needs to be better this time with students, especially since like, it's the big difference if you communicate to students what like, what TC3 really represents as an organization and sending like, "Hey guys, there's a homeless encampment across the street" which was kind of like the whole thing last time. Yeah.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions comments or motions? Keep in mind we have 3 minutes left.

Dylan Bianchi: Can I share one more piece of information? I will also say TC3 is very conscientious of communicating with students. Last year, they had a policy where in certain hours any student could get a tour of the encampment and was like able to walk around. They met with classes, they actually went into lecture halls and talked to various classes about homelessness. We had, I think, multiple grad students who like did like a master's thesis about the TC3 stay, so TC3 is very willing to partner with students on campus.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve into On-Campus affairs

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 4-0-1

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURNMENT

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 3-1-1

Adjourned 5:29 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
