

House of Representatives Biennial Hearing Minutes

Tuesday, October 20, 2026 | 6:00–10:12 p.m.

Presiding: House Speaker Jayden Alonzo-Estrada | Minutes: Caleb Bishop, Chief of Staff

I. Call to Order

House Speaker Jayden Alonzo-Estrada called the Associated Student Government House of Representatives biennial hearing to order at 6:00 p.m. in UC 213.

II. Roll Call and Establishment of Quorum

The opening roll call was recorded as follows:

<i>Representative</i>	<i>Present</i>	<i>Excused</i>	<i>Unexcused</i>
Bragg, Jamal - Minority Students		X	
Clark-Scott, Jess - At Large	X		
Garcia, Zaira - At Large	X		
Livengood, Cory - Students with Disabilities	X		
Martinez, Andre - Student Safety and Mental Health	X		
McWilliams, Nathan - Transfer and International Students	X		
Meyer, Devin - Student Ideologies	X		
Rogers, Triston - Student Athletes		X	
Ruehmann, James - At Large		X	
Alonzo-Estrada, Jayden - House Speaker	X		

Seven of ten representatives were present, constituting quorum. Representative Bragg joined the roll at 7:50 p.m., bringing attendance to eight. Representatives Rogers and Ruehmann remained excused.

III. Approval of the Agenda

Action: The agenda was approved without objection.

IV. Executive Reports

Chief Financial Officer Guerin Smith, Senate Leader Logan Wilson, Student Trustee Danica Kremidas, and Chief of Staff Caleb Bishop had no reports.

Vice President Jessalyn Gallegos: Gallegos encouraged members to listen with an open mind, review the materials provided, ask relevant questions without repeating information already presented, and remain respectful.

President Elijah Jaden Lorica: Lorica encouraged recesses during the anticipated lengthy hearing and constructive feedback for scores below five. He reminded members that comments would be public and directed them to review the stipend breakdowns and position responsibilities in Microsoft Teams when preparing questions.

House Speaker Jayden Alonzo-Estrada: Alonzo-Estrada reminded representatives to wear professional attire and submit their feedback by midnight Friday, noting that it would be public.

V. Public Input

No public input was offered.

VI. Biennial Budget Presentations

a. MavRides

Request: MavRides presented a \$342,580 budget request to support nighttime transportation, the CMU Tech shuttle, staffing, vehicles, and a new ride-request application.

Presentation: Presenters described free Thursday–Saturday nighttime rides, weekday CMU Tech transportation, and the fleet’s use by other Student Life organizations. They emphasized safety and access to classes. Outreach included social media, residence halls, campus events, Admissions, and Campus Safety.

The proposal included \$125,000 for student assistance and \$20,000 for stipends: \$9,000 for the director and \$5,500 for each of two assistant directors, one focused on CMU Tech.

Proposed commitments were ten office and twelve duty hours for the director, and eight office and six duty hours for each assistant. Duty hours included being on call.

Proposed changes included a second CMU Tech shuttle, Wednesday nighttime service, and an application for ride requests, GPS tracking, and wait-time updates, with fewer dispatchers over time. A \$14,000 club allocation supported proposed 9:00 p.m.–midnight shifts paying \$100, plus Saturday vehicle-return compensation. The \$106,080 Other Costs line covered another shuttle, state fleet charges, debt repayment, and future vehicle or event needs.

Questions and responses — staffing and accounting: Smith asked how ridership was measured, how often on-call staff were actually called to work, and how earlier spending was assigned to budget lines. Presenters clarified that their statistics counted rides rather than unique students and described app exports and driver head counts. They explained the on-call responsibilities but did not provide an established average of active call-out hours.

Martinez asked why vehicles were rented rather than purchased and what the \$33,000 non-capital computer equipment line covered. Presenters cited state fleet purchasing requirements and identified the application as the intended expense. Wilson questioned the classification of computer equipment, phone purchases and cellular service, the rental increase, and outside fundraising. Presenters described phone trade-ins, shared fleet use, additional vehicles on the road, and unsuccessful requests to businesses, public agencies, and potential sponsors.

McWilliams asked whether prior losses totaling approximately \$114,000 were the debt to be repaid and how the shuttle purchase related to the Other Costs line. Presenters explained that several Student Life organizations had contributed to purchasing the Ford Transit. In discussion, Smith distinguished accumulated annual operating losses from the current negative account balance, which he put at approximately \$39,000–\$40,000.

Lorica and Kremidas asked about hiring, Lyft integration, service limits, and safety. Presenters described Workday recruitment, work-study limitations, overflow ride options, dash cameras, and de-escalation practices. Drivers could end unsafe rides at known, well-lit locations. Current rides transported only the requesting party, without combining unrelated groups. In response to Kremidas, presenters said they had no ADA-compliant vehicles.

The Speaker suggested a CMU Tech shuttle subscription. Presenters preferred student fee support and cited inconsistent ridership and subscription enforcement costs. Lorica asked about lower ridership and recurring vehicle costs; presenters discussed vehicle availability, club participation, and the proposed one-time shuttle purchase.

Discussion: The Speaker supported the safety and efficiency benefits of the application and the revised club fundraising opportunity. Lorica cautioned that the club allocation itself was decreasing and sought further explanation of the substantial overall increase. Smith asked for a clearer distinction among recurring operating costs, vehicle purchases, debt repayment, and reserves. Smith and Wilson discussed the value of on-call availability, late-night work, and fair compensation.

Action: A motion for five minutes of cross-talk with executives and presenters was seconded and adopted at 7:35 p.m.

Participants distinguished leadership stipends from student assistance for drivers and dispatchers. They discussed active work, on-call availability, nighttime hazards, and whether carnival and tailgate work should count toward compensated duties. Lorica encouraged representatives' input and planned further review. Presenters explained vehicle occupancy and the use of larger vehicles for groups.

Action: A motion to extend cross-talk by five minutes was seconded and adopted. Cross-talk concluded at 7:45 p.m. A motion for a five-minute recess was seconded and adopted; the House reconvened at 7:50 p.m.

Action: A motion to add Representative Bragg to the roll was adopted without objection at 7:50 p.m.

Action: A motion to enter cross-talk with executives and presenters indefinitely was seconded and adopted at 7:51 p.m.

Discussion returned to the proposed student assistance increase, the number of employees scheduled each night, wages, the additional shuttle, and anticipated dispatcher reductions. Presenters described expanding from five to seven employees per night and the additional CMU Tech service. Smith requested calculations connecting the staffing and operating assumptions to the requested amount.

Action: A motion to exit cross-talk was seconded and adopted at 8:00 p.m. A motion for a five-minute recess to relocate was seconded and adopted. The House reconvened in UC 222 at 8:06 p.m.

Action: Representative Clark-Scott's motion to enter cross-talk with executives and presenters indefinitely was seconded and adopted at 8:07 p.m. The Speaker ruled that an objection from a non-House member could not prevent the House from entering cross-talk.

Members and presenters reviewed the staffing worksheets and the hours and wage assumptions for current service and the proposed expansion. Trey Downey recommended that Student Life staff and MavRides meet again to verify the calculations before further consideration. Smith also requested a fuller description of duties beyond on-call availability. The Speaker said those questions could be continued by email.

Action: A motion to exit cross-talk was seconded and adopted at 8:15 p.m.

Follow-up: Martinez requested another in-person discussion after the figures were reviewed. Bragg and Lorica discussed scheduling before final deliberations; Livengood cautioned against relying on the short November 2 general meeting. Clark-Scott planned individual follow-up. The Speaker committed to coordinating email communication and considering a return appearance if needed. No return date or motion to table was adopted.

b. Literary Review

Request: Literary Review presented a \$35,800 request for its annual full-color anthology, student staff, outreach, events, software, and professional development.

Presentation: Presenters described a free publication of student creative and academic work, volunteer editing opportunities, monthly outreach events, and the annual launch celebration. They reported a record 143 submissions, 71 attendees at the previous launch, and distribution of 767 of the 1,000 copies printed. Printing and the launch were major costs. The proposed stipend increase would recognize additional creative director work on design and layout; other changes supported printing, events, and conference participation.

Questions and responses: McWilliams asked why software had not appeared as a separate line and how the launch was advertised. Presenters said software had previously been paid from other lines and its annual cost had fallen from \$750 to \$150. Outreach used posters, email, the Stall Street Journal, departmental contacts, monthly events, and communication with contributors.

Martinez asked about submissions, selection standards, and the managing editor's fifteen weekly hours and editor-in-chief's thirteen. Presenters described merit-based review of writing and construction, rather than general censorship of subject matter, and explained event planning, outreach, tabling, and publishing work. They said the established hours came from the previous constitution and reflected experience; the creative director's proposed additional hours reflected the work being performed.

Lorica asked about distribution, hour tracking, and the limits of a physical publication. Presenters described free copies at events, their office, and other campus locations, along with general work logs and regular team communication. They prioritized access to peers'

work and the campus community over developing a website. Smith questioned the absence of a non-capital computer equipment line, and presenters discussed a \$150 computer reserve.

Discussion and follow-up: In response to the Speaker, presenters described planned Horizon coverage, collaborations with the Sustainability Council and Writers Guild, and efforts to connect with local bookstores. Livengood suggested outreach to high school literary programs; presenters welcomed the idea. Martinez supported the presentation but suggested reviewing compensated hours. Smith asked how those hours had been established, and presenters reiterated their constitutional and workload basis.

c. Programming Activities Council

Request: Programming Activities Council (PAC) requested \$172,716, including \$38,000 for professional services, \$43,520 for student stipends, \$70,000 for supplies, and \$9,000 for out-of-state travel.

Presentation: PAC described weekly programming, larger welcome and Homecoming events, campus partnerships, and events serving both large crowds and students seeking smaller settings. Presenters reported \$158,840 in FY2026 spending, including \$61,429 in supplies and a \$15,000 transfer toward a shared vehicle. They explained that expanded Centennial programming and event materials had affected spending across several lines.

The stipend proposal aimed to compensate staff at approximately \$10 per hour for office and duty work. Presenters described the physical setup, planning, marketing, and staffing required, including unusually long Homecoming weeks. They explained advisor oversight, staff accountability, and a performance improvement process that could withhold a stipend when responsibilities were not fulfilled. The supply increase was intended to improve event quality and serve students who previously arrived after supplies ran out.

Questions and responses: Smith asked whether office hours could be reduced. Presenters said current commitments already understated the work and that reductions would require fewer events. Meyer asked who would use the \$9,000 travel line; presenters said the whole team would attend a college programming conference to evaluate performers, compare programs, and obtain event-booking opportunities.

Martinez asked about dues, memberships, and software. Presenters described office computers and marketing software and were willing to revisit the dues line. Smith requested more detail on the \$9,000 software maintenance allocation; PAC agreed to send it by email. Lorica asked what the larger supplies budget would support and whether future directors would maintain weekly events. Presenters cited a possible return of the haunted house, expanded giveaways and Grocery Bingo, and continued weekly programming, while acknowledging that the constitution did not prescribe an exact weekly event count.

Livengood asked about constructing the haunted house and suggested help from the Construction Management Club. Presenters welcomed that possibility. Lorica asked why conference travel remained in PAC rather than PAC Concerts; Student Life staff explained the historical budget arrangement, and Smith and Meyer noted that the conference supported general programming as well as artist selection.

House discussion: Livengood, Bragg, McWilliams, and Clark-Scott described PAC's value for student connection, campus engagement, and retention. Members supported its expanded events while recognizing the size of the increase. Clark-Scott wanted further consideration of the out-of-state travel line.

Action: Representative Martinez's motion for a five-minute recess was seconded and adopted at 9:04 p.m. The recess ended at 9:09 p.m. His motion for four additional minutes was seconded and adopted; the House reconvened at 9:13 p.m. No further PAC discussion was offered before the separate concert presentation.

d. PAC Concerts

Request: PAC Concerts presented a \$293,000 request: \$280,000 for professional services, \$7,000 for supplies, \$3,000 for advertising, and \$3,000 for insurance.

Presentation: Presenters described the spring concert as a separate PAC budget serving students and the community. They reported \$189,427 in FY2026 expenditures and explained that rising artist and production costs had required use of reserves. The proposed professional services allocation would cover an artist, staging, security, and related production needs. Supplies, advertising, and insurance were shown separately to improve budget transparency.

Questions and responses: Smith asked about the separation of costs and ticket revenue. Presenters agreed that approximately \$10,000 in ticket sales could be budgeted, with revenue depending on the artist and attendance. Smith proposed using that revenue to reduce the student fee request to \$283,000. Vice President Gallegos questioned revising the submitted request during the hearing. After discussion of the requested and approved budget columns, the Speaker asked that the proposed offset be recorded as a comment rather than changing the request field.

Martinez asked about attendance and non-fee revenue. Presenters estimated approximately 3,000 student attendees for the 2026 concert; in response to Lorica, they estimated approximately 1,800 attendees for the 2025 concert. They explained how stage requirements and venue limitations affected location and costs. Outreach included campus displays, social media, and a related event at Montrose. They also discussed the range of artist prices and strategic booking. In response to Bragg, presenters said CMU's lease arrangement allowed use of the concert venue without an additional charge.

House discussion: Bragg supported considering a larger concert and said the additional student fee could be worthwhile for the experience. No budget allocation or reduction was voted on during the hearing.

e. Unified Greek Council

Request: Unified Greek Council (UGC) requested \$11,500 for campus programming and supplies. Presenters stated that UGC had no paid or stipend positions.

Presentation: Representatives of the member chapters described collaboration among five fraternities and sororities serving approximately 300 members. Plans included broader participation in Greek Week, a carnival, tailgates, food trucks, philanthropy, and a possible fall

concert. They emphasized opening events to the whole student body, improving organization and recordkeeping, and creating a more reliable transition between leadership teams.

Questions and responses: Martinez asked about participation metrics, chapter dues, and the UGC constitution. Presenters estimated approximately 300 attendees at a prior outdoor event despite poor weather and described new social media outreach. They explained that chapters had their own structures and dues and that past leadership transitions had failed to preserve institutional knowledge. Garcia was helping locate and revise the UGC constitution with Student Life.

Lorica asked about historical printing expenses and future events. Presenters associated those costs with banners, shirts, and other promotional materials and described plans for tailgates, broader Greek Week participation, and joint service projects. The Speaker asked how the individual chapters related to UGC; presenters explained their separate national affiliations, governing documents, values, and philanthropic priorities, alongside their common campus goals.

Kremidas asked about professional development and whether student fee funds supported private chapter parties. Presenters described networking, leadership conferences, résumé preparation, and officer responsibilities. They stated that private chapter events were separate from UGC and funded through chapter dues. Student Life staff added context about fraternity and sorority life and the organization of the campus chapters.

House discussion: Lorica expressed optimism about the current leaders' efforts to improve coordination and use the budget responsibly. Garcia described work on the constitution and her own leadership opportunities. At the Speaker's invitation, Meyer, Clark-Scott, Livengood, and Garcia described academic expectations, service, networking, event planning, and personal development gained through their chapters. Meyer supported UGC's work and suggested that more funding could benefit the campus. The Speaker favored giving the current leaders an opportunity to demonstrate their plans; Clark-Scott cautioned against increasing the request before seeing sustained improvement.

Martinez asked how members' chapter affiliations would affect the final funding vote. House Speaker Alonzo-Estrada asked affiliated members to abstain from votes on the UGC budget. Clark-Scott expressly asked that the record reflect his intention to abstain on votes pertaining to UGC. No vote on UGC funding was taken.

VII. House Discussion

No additional House discussion was offered.

VIII. Announcements

Rubrics were due by midnight Friday, October 23. At Clark-Scott's request, the Speaker agreed to clarify a MavRides extension by email pending further information. He encouraged UGC feedback and confirmed separate PAC and PAC Concerts evaluations.

The next hearing was announced for Tuesday, October 27, at 6:00 p.m. in UC 222. Gallegos was working on a larger room and longer reservation, with changes pending.

IX. Adjournment

House Speaker Alonzo-Estrada adjourned the hearing at 10:12 p.m.

