

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

Wednesday April 11, 2012

VU567

Committee Members Present: Sara Richards, Chair (AS VP Student Life), Iris Maute-Gibson (AS VP for Governmental Affairs), Kathryn Freeman (GEF Grant Program Coordinator), Seth Vidana, Evan Fowler, Neil Baungard, Sarah Philips

Committee Members Absent: Nicole Brown (Faculty Senate Representative), Grace Wang (Faculty Senate Representative), Kevin Majkut (Director of Student Activities),

Guests: Hilary McGowan

Sara Richards, AS Vice President for Student Life, called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. REVISIONS TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No minutes to approve.

IV. PUBLIC FORUM

V. ACTION ITEMS

A. Replace Vice Chair, Fabiola Arvizu

Due to a schedule class, Arvizu will no longer be able to attend meetings.

MOTION GEF-12-S-01 by Wang

Secinded by Arvizu

Approve Iris Maute-Gibson as the new Vice-Chair of Green Energy Fee.

Vote: 4 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

B. Update of the Approval Guidelines

Freeman explained that it was discussed between her and Richards to remove the language regarding stipends.

MOTION GEF-12-S-02 by Austin

Secinded by Fowler

Approve to strike the language in the Green Energy Fee Proposal Guidelines pertaining to stipends.

Vote: 5 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

Richards said that in the future she sees stipends being able to occur, but she did not think that the Green Energy Fee was ready for that step, yet.

C. Partnership Agreement

Freeman said that this agreement is the same as last year's with the extended room for the team to define roles and responsibilities. She said that this is an outlined agreement between the advisor and the project team and each step of the project. She said that the agreement is pretty straight forward. She did have a concern about the implementation and review part. She wanted to remove this because many students would be gone by the time the review process was reasonable. Richards suggested adding evaluation of pre-development stage. Maute-Gibson suggested "development of project and review of process." Freeman said that she thought that if there was a change in scope the changes would always be based around the input of the project team. Benner said that if we give the project teams an example of what we want them to review, then the committee can set the stage for what we expect. Austin thought that this might be daunting. Fowler said that within the responsibilities it can be clearly stated that you're expected to see it through within your tenor at Western. Freeman explained that it is stated in the application that there has to be a legacy left for people to take over the project and for review. Freeman said that if this wanted to be changed it would have to be reflected in the other documents as well. Philips asked if it would be unrealistic to bring in more team members later in the process so that the teams don't run into the problems of having students graduating. Freeman said that she sees Philips' suggestion being a solution. Austin felt that the issues the committee is facing now will manifest solutions elsewhere down the road.

MOTION GEF-12-S-03 by Austin

Seconded by Fowler

Approve the Green Energy Fee Partnership Agreement as is.

Vote: 5 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

D. Scoring Guides

Freeman explained that scoring guide is similar to last years. She said that the questions stayed the same but the point weight was a topic of discussion. Freeman changed this system over to a standard rating scale, and then multiplied by weight. She explained that the points for education and awareness sections combined were outweighing those points for environmental impact. That was a main change she made. She is hoping that this can get approved today. It was discussed at the last meeting that the questions were good but the weight was off. The committee then read through the scoring guides. Freeman reminded the committee section one corresponds to the GEF mission statement. Section two envelopes need, solutions, measurable outcomes, application. Freeman said that technical considerations will apply. Austin said that he was not sure if "significant" was clear enough language and he was thinking about how the educational component is more important to address. Freeman suggested "if the project were to be scaled, would the anticipated environmental impact be significant?" Richards suggested adding "if implemented campus wide." Sarah suggested "If this project were university wide would the reduction be significant?" (*Baunsgard entered 3:57*) Austin asked how the committee felt on the weight of environmental impact over the broader educational experience. Philips agreed with what was currently present in the scoring guide. Philips said that she did not see the need to send every group's scoring sheet to every team. Richards agreed. Baunsgard said that he thought it was helpful to receive the other team's score. Benner said that the scorer is anonymous and aids in privacy. Maute-Gibson said that she thought it would be beneficial to offer the scoring matrix of each

team and offer teams the ability to email Freeman with their questions. Baunsgard agreed. Richards explained that each team would receive everyone in the committee's scores for themselves and also access to the other team's results. Freeman asked if the team would be given each committee member's score or the overall score. The committee decided to provide all scores individually. Benner suggested putting the scores online. Richards asked if the final score with all individual comments would be more important to students. Freeman then clarified that each team would get their final score and the comments from each scorer. Richards directed the committee back to the topic of questions. Richards clarified that the committee was happy with the weight of the questions. Freeman explained that this scoring matrix is for the conceptual stage. Benner asked if the groups are told up front if their project is scalable. Freeman said that this has been explained in the project idea labs. Fowler asked if the GEF has a mechanism to save project ideas for future students. Freeman said that there was, but with only one project year under the committee's belt, it's not large. Baunsgard said that he would like to see all project proposals, successful or not, be accessible to the public. Philips asked if it was possible to hold a project until there is another opening in funding. Freeman said that this was possible. Austin asked what the question under 2.1 was in reference to. Freeman said that there are current things on campus that can be built upon and worked towards unification with, and this question addressed that. Austin wanted to know if 2.4 should be weighted more heavily. Freeman said that she is open to the committee adjusting the weight. Austin thought that entire section two should be a greater weight. Philips said that she agreed with the weight of section one and section two being fairly equal. Fowler explained that adjusting the weight by a small number won't make a significant change to the scoring matrix. Richards moved the committee to reviewing section three. Freeman said that section three was very similar to last years. Since there had not been many changes made, she asked the committee if they had any suggestions. Richards said that she agreed that this section also needed to be scored. Benner said that it was important to give the project the merit it deserves and not make this an interview competition. Freeman asked if the highest scoring projects were the projects chosen. Benner said that last year there was a consideration for funding availability. Freeman concluded that the committee's individual comments should be reflective of why projects were chosen.

MOTION GEF-12-S-04 by Austin

Seconded by Fowler

Approve the Conceptual Stage Quantitative Scoring Matrix with an addendum to the second sentence on section 1.1 and the addition of a comment section.

Vote: 4 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Update from Idea Labs

Philips said that many great ideas were presented. Austin said that he thought the 'green dorm' project was good. Other project ideas included a solar thermal at the pool, and the addition of hydration stations, LED lights on the PAC main stage and an educational display in the library on the GEF. There was also a bike share program presented.

B. Timeline

Richards directed the committee to the calendar that Freeman created. Richards said that last year the projects and voting committee members were brought in on a Saturday. Richards asked the committee if they wanted to see the proposals in a presentation format or in more of an interview format. Fowler said that there are merits to both ideas. Austin said that he received a lot of positive feedback from last year's presentation format. Freeman liked the idea of an interview offering a two-way street between the committee and the presenters. Freeman said that there will be about 2-4 questions that the presenters will be provided beforehand to be addressed within their 15 minute presentation and then a question-answer session with the committee. Richards said that she wants the presentation to show their passion and drive to do the project. She wants to see a two way dialogue between the committee and the project team. Freeman said that it will also be beneficial to see how a project team works together. Philips said that it will be easier to tell what we need regarding time once we know how many projects we are dealing with. Richards asked the committee to keep Saturday June 2, 2012 open in their schedules for the Saturday meeting time.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE: April 18, 2012

VIII. ADJOURN

IX. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 5:00 P.M.