

**Western Washington University Associated Students
Green Energy Fee Committee Meeting**

Wednesday, February 1, 2012

VU567

Committee Members Present: Sara Richards, Chair (AS VP Strident Life), Fabiola Arvizu (AS VP for Academic Affairs), Nicole Brown (Faculty Senate Representative), Grace Wang (Faculty Senate Representative), Neil Baunsgard (Student-at-large), Rick Benner, Evan Fowler (Student-at-large), Kevin Majkut (Director of Student Activities), Kathryn Freeman (GEF Grant Program Coordinator), Seth Vidana

Committee Members Absent: Jason Austin (ESP Director)

Guest(s): Sarah Philips (GEF Education Coordinator), Hilary McGowen

Sara Richards, AS Vice President for Student Life, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

MOTIONS:

GEF-12-W-01 Approve the Minutes from November 16, 2011 *Passed*

GEF-12-W-02 Approve the Minutes from November 30, 2011 *Passed*

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. REVISIONS TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION GEF- 12-W-01 by Wang

Seconded by Fowler

Approval of Minutes from November 16, 2011

Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

MOTION GEF-12-W-02 by Fowler

Seconded by Arvizu

Approval of Minutes from November 30, 2011

Vote: 7 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

IV. PUBLIC FORUM

V. ACTION ITEMS

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Project Update from Kathryn

Freeman reported that the solar panel project began construction in December. She said that there has been a small hang-up on the LED lighting project. New fixtures are in the process of being searched for. The Dyson hand dryer project began construction this week. The paper towel project has been operational. The Hydration Stations have also been implemented, but replaceable filters were installed in addition. This poses an issue because the Green Energy Fee Funds does not allot for

continual spending on a project. Benner asked about progress on the water bottle refilling station signage. Vidana said that there was a concern as to where to put the display. Benner expressed that he never approved of having a full a kiosk as a display. Majkut said when the project terms are up, a report is supposed to go out. He asked what the committee would do with the reports. He wants to discuss who will make those decisions and come up with standards for how this happens. Wang expressed the continuity issue and she said that it is important to maintain continuity within the committee though it does change overtime. Vidana suggested including an online archive to post information as well as gain feedback from. Freeman agreed that this would be a good conversation to have. Freeman reported that none of the projects are closed out at this point. Fowler asked if the funding would be rolling for new filters for the water bottle refilling stations or if this would be a lump-sum for a certain number of years. Freeman said that there was an error with installation. A filter was not supposed to be placed into the refilling stations, but one was. Freeman explained that because of this error, there are several concerns standing on how to deal with a red light on the machine that indicates that a new filter is needed.

B. Proposal Guidelines

Freeman explained that the three main challenges from the year 2010-2011 were transparency and communication, regular ongoing and support for applicant teams and “work rushes.” She explained that these are all taken care of in the new process. She explained the different stages briefly over a Power Point presentation. Wang would like to see more dates included in the plan. Freeman summarized each stage of the process. She said that once the project is completed and close, there would be a Post-Implementation and Review. Regarding Wang’s concern, Freeman said that the only part of the proposal with hard dates is the conceptual stage and it would take about the length of one quarter. She said that design and estimation time length will depend on the complexity of the project and the project team involved. She wanted a no-due date process in cases of large complex projects. Freeman said that the goal would be to start the new RFP at the beginning of spring quarter. She hoped that these documents would be voted on by the committee as soon as possible so that the committee can push for getting an RFP out this spring. Vidana pointed out that focus on projects will not be on funds but picking a good project and be able to pick something that could move the campus forward. Vidana said that he and Freeman are looking forward to more contact with the project teams. He explained that one of the benefits of this new process was that the teams will be able to adapt the timeline as it needs to sufficient their project.

Freeman said that she spoke with Career Services about implementing an internship program. Wang explained that the internships would be taken on by departments rather than by colleges. Freeman expressed that she wished the internship could be campus wide. Brown said that this has posed as a problem in other departments and colleges as well. She said that Freeman should document this concern. Freeman said that just for the first year, the project process will probably require for projects not to begin until the fall so there is time to create the internship over the summer. Freeman said there are not any specifics in the new process document about the internship/stipend system and this was intentional. Majkut said that he believed that these decisions should be made at an appropriate level. In the case of the committee,

a balance needs to be found between taking care of too much of the business and small detailed nit-picking. He liked the idea of the flexibility being given to students with this model. He thinks the internships are important but are showing to be a quagmire right now. Wang said that she thought it should be up to the majors and major advisors on how the internship should function for the students. Brown said she thought that there may be an equity issue. Wang asked McGowen how many hours she spent working on the project she was involved in. McGowen said that during the grant writing process, anywhere from 5-15 hours per week we spent on the project. When the project was being implemented, she was working significantly less. Her suggestion to address academic opportunity equality would be to approach each department with an information packet that would direct students on the Green Energy Fee project and process. Freeman reiterated that she left the option for a paid or credited program open in the document. Brown suggested making this a 'pilot year' to see how well students can make the new program process happen. Vidana agreed that piloting this year and also having maximum flexibility will be beneficial to the program in the future. Richards said that the summer will be the optimal time to work out the details. Philips' expressed that her role marketing the GEF program would be tough because students are going to want information on the internship/stipend system. Vidana suggested the use of the word "contract" to let prospective participants know that this is a real commitment. Freeman said that the application itself takes 12 weeks and then from there it depends. She said that Philips should report an approximate two quarter commitment. McGowen asked if the GEF process could be made a class to get over the internship program issue. Wang explained that creating a class is not too complicated. Brown expressed that there would be a conflict in deciding where the class if created would be placed for registration. Philips agreed. She said that a goal of the Green Fee is to spread to broader student involvement. Freeman noted that the timing of the class and project openings won't always be consistent. Freeman also wanted to add that once a project is a closed a new "may" RFP would be open, as this will be determined by funding availability.

McGowen asked about the GF Logistics Coordinator position. Vidana said that he is currently considering the workloads of the GEF Program Coordinator position and the Logistics Coordinator position as well as the intent of the program. He sees student involvement with the Green Fee on all levels - student staff level, team level, and students in contact with the projects on campus. He wants to consider taking the hours given to the Logistics Coordinator and giving extra to the Program Coordinator instead. He is leaning toward having that money going to Program Coordinator position because of functionality, simplicity and consistency. McGowen asked if the GEF Grant Program Coordinator was given those hours if the position would be stretched too thin. Vidana explained that the Logistics Coordinator position acts as a subset of the Program Coordinator. Philips said she likes this idea. She has worried about how successful the training for the Logistics Coordinator would be in the middle of the quarter. She also expressed that her desire to offer a student job. Philips said that with splitting the job up into two positions, it is important to consider that there would be added time for communication between the people holding those positions. Freeman added that another consideration to make is that a position of only 20 hours per week would not allow for optimal

availability to help project teams. Majkut said that he does not have a sense of what the new workload would be and what the new hours would look like. He questioned if the intermediary position would be giving the necessary support function in regards to project. Arvizu said she is more in favor of including the staff position and though the turnover weight of student employment would be not as well. Richards agreed with Arvizu, but is also back and forth as she wants to see more student jobs. McGowen liked the idea of creating an assistant position. She also asked if 35 hours per week would be enough to fulfill the job needs. Freeman said the goal is for this to be manageable. Vidana said the position would be looking at more like 25-29 hours per week for the position. Freeman expressed the urgent need for the committee to decide on this. Richards suggested the suspension of the GEF bylaws in order for this to be voted on at the next meeting.

C. REC Updates with Seth

Vidana said that he has a meeting to meet with several people on the purchase of RECs on the calendar year, as most University budgeting functions run on the fiscal year. They are trying to change the contract to reflect the fiscal year instead of the calendar year to make the process easier for those involved.

D. Memo of Agreement

Majkut reported that there needs to be a Memorandum of Understanding between all of the partners involved in this process. This would include policies of shared governance and clarity of authority. He said that the appropriate roles and responsibilities of the university, the AS, etc. need to be outlined. He said that he wanted to get rid of the project 'final decision' requirement being made by the AS President and to the University. Arvizu said that this requirement was made for the Board. Richards viewed this differently now that we have a rolling process; she would like to see the Board of Directors approving the support of a certain amount of funds allocated to projects rather than specific projects themselves. Majkut would like to see the process streamlined.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE: February 15, 2012

VIII. ADJOURN

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 2:55 P.M.