

**Western Washington University Associated Students
Green Energy Fee
Wednesday, November 7th, 2012**

VU 567

Present: Katie Savinski (Chair, VP for Student Life), Victor Celis (VP for Academics), Nicole Brown, Grace Wang, Ed Simpson,, Michael Gore (AS Green Energy Fee Education Coordinator), Regan Clover , Jacob Lesser, and Ashley Selvey. **Absent:** Nina Olivier (AS Environmental & Sustainability Program Associate Director) and Seth Vidana
Advisor: Kevin Majkut
Secretary: Kaylee Galloway

Katie Savinski, Chair of Green Energy Fee Committee, called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ADDITIONS/CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

II. REVIEW OF THE MINUTES

IV. PROJECT UPDATE/PROPOSAL DRAFT

Proposal Draft: Clover explained that there are three stages to the process. First is the conceptual application where students submit applications for their projects. Second are the preliminary project cost estimates and design. The last stage is when the project is presented to GEF to decide how much money will be granted. She said after the third stage, students can then finalize their proposal. The conceptual draft application is brief and broad. Later, students develop a more detailed and specific plan. Clover presented the draft she designed of the final proposal document. She said January 30th is the deadline, which is arbitrary because the projects will get their estimates the first week in January. She said that the application deadline may be moved to January 23rd. Clover said that something to think about is whether the team applications should be submitted all at once or rolling. She said the team members were asking whether their apps will be viewed electronically or in paper. Clover went over the different sections of the document. Lesser confirmed that GEF last year went through all of the proposals. Clover said she would email the project proposals that are being worked on right now; the ones that were approved and accepted. The section for a Project Poster was added because Clover thinks that it will be a great resource and a way for teams to show their projects. The Metrics and Measurability section was based off of the first year's proposal process. Clover thought each team would submit a final report but noted that Seth Vidana has said that getting a final report from each team might be too much to ask for since students are getting ready to graduate and writing their theses. She said case studies will be where the teams go over whether their projects were successful. The section that has a budget breakdown and fund allocation of the project was taken from the first year's proposal. Clover said the Project Scalability section allows the teams to be flexible and list a couple project scenarios and the cost for each. She gave the example of the green dorm and said that the team can create a budget for one room, for several rooms, and the whole floor. She said the signatures section is from the first year's proposal and will be required for a completed proposal. Clover said the teams have not seen this document yet. Brown said the document seems very clear and organized. Lesser wondered about the process in place for collecting metrics after the students graduate, which is especially relevant for post project data. Brown asked how versus when the data will be collected. Wang asked who measures and collects that data. Lesser said it could be someone who is not a team member. Celis asked if students are getting their estimates back in January, and the deadline to submit the final proposal is January 30th, will that be enough

time for students? Clover said that students are pretty far along right now and they are excited to get the ball rolling with these projects. She said there might be a team or two not ready. Simpson wants them in as soon as possible. Regan will keep everyone posted on the date. Simpson said that rolling applications would work better. Selvey said it would seem more reasonable to look at all of the final proposals at the same time because there is a fixed amount of funding to distribute. Lesser said that if a team has a problem with the deadline and needs extension, it can be discussed at that time.

Project Updates: Clover said the dashboard team, comprised of four students (computer science students) and two staff members (facilities management staff), are currently creating a test website. There has been a campus site inspection for the three sites for where dashboards would go. She said this group has been collaborating with other groups such as the Wilson Library hydration station team. The hydration station team is completing their estimate. Clover gave the team a list of information that they will need to consider in the process. This group has created a really detailed kiosk design. They are also getting information from the library stakeholders. The hydration station team asked the dashboard team if there could have a small screen displaying the dashboard on the library kiosk. The eco dorm pilot has written out their educational model, are doing price research on the exact products they are going to use, and are taking measurements of their rooms. This group has been having meetings with housing officials. Western solutions have been filling out the guidelines for information they need before getting an estimate. There were questions after submitting their conceptual application so the group is following up on those. They are continuing their research.

Y. AASHE CONFERENCE UPDATE

Gore said AASHE was great. He said the conference took place October 13th -14th in Las Angeles, California with about 1700 participants from 16 different countries. He said that there were several sessions held throughout the day. He said that during the sessions, universities would discuss topics such as what they were doing, their ideas, their marketing strategies, their sustainability planning, and green fund initiatives. Gore said making personal connections with other people has been helpful. He said that he had discussed with other individuals about their university green fee and their system. He said that the conversations he had at the conference have been a great starting point. There was discussion on a unified marketing concept, and having one design for everything to make it is clear that it is all a part of the same program. Overall, Gore said it was a success, that he learned a lot, and met a lot of great people who are experts in the field. Clover said that the University Vermont coordinator wrote a thesis on green fund programs on college campuses. She learned at the conference that many colleges charge \$5 per student per quarter or \$12 per student per semester. Schools range from three student committee to 20 member student-staff committee. She said that the trend is to move away from calling it a fee; rather, it should be called a fund. Linguistics might be something we want to think about. Another idea is inviting classes to do a life cycle assessment or audit of previous projects. One of the goals of wrapping up the budget succinctly is to reduce eco clutter on campus. University of California Berkley had a great marketing tactic and message. University of Illinois alumni office is soliciting funds from alumni to match students funds to the green energy fund. University of California Berkley and University of California Las Angeles pay for student internships. Engagement and communications session was good to understand branding and figure out what Western's brand should be. A great example was thoughtful reductions. Project ideas include greenhouse herbs that would go to a café on campus and GPS phone app to track usage of recycle bins on campus.

VI. DISCUSSION CONTINUED: What does this committee want to address this year?

A. Prioritize

See document titled "Discussion Topics". Lesser wanted to address giving smaller grants to smaller projects. When Wang asked about the budget for projects, it was said that the budget is still undecided. Clover said ongoing maintenance issues and the fee comes up a lot. Savinski said independent study arrangements are for creating internship opportunities. Clover said some of the students are not receiving credits from these projects. She said she encourages students to go to their department heads to get credit. Wang said some students want to do this for credit or some students just want to do it. Celis said there is a lot of educational experience and knowledge from these projects and so if students want credits they should be allowed that possibility. Or students who don't want credits will not be required to get them. Clover said that the committee should think about having the GEF fund the credits. She said that there are still students who don't want credit. Savinski said that it will be important to give students the options. Wang said that as a professor in Huxley, she would be willing to do an independent study. Lesser said that this should definitely be a discussion. Savinski said that reviewing the Rules of Operation will be taken care of at the December 5th meeting because the committee has already looked at. It will be a matter of changing the language and making other changes. Lesser suggested that maybe people can break into sub committees and have a few people work on each issue. Clover said that University of California Santa Barbara has six sub-committees. Savinski said that the committee needs to decide conceptually what kind of timeline it is going to do, especially if the application process to approve proposals is going to be rolling. Lesser said that #3 and #7 are similar and Savinski agreed. Lesser said that when students want to do a project, they put out an RFP request for the proposal, and the committee has a specific criteria for how to decide what projects to find and so #6 would be just refining those. Wang said there was some difference of opinion over last year's criteria process. Celis said that the criteria process is important to look over, but not necessary as a whole group. Wang said that last year's criteria worked fine, but that there is always room for improvement. She said that #6 is not as high of a priority because it cannot be done until #3 is taken care of. Savinski said that the committee can still address the criteria process as it did with the final proposal form. She said that changes and concerns could be addressed, but that it wouldn't have to be discussed with the whole group. Celis agreed that it was not that high of a priority. Wang said the four projects that were funded were the top ranked projects. She said that there were some that were not funded and were not ranked highly because of the rating tool. The criteria process was a little biased, and therefore, didn't give some projects adequate consideration. Wang suggested making #6 a sub bullet of #3. Savinski recognized that revisiting the criteria process could not be completed without a timeline and scales for new projects. Celis thought the three issues chosen are great. Wang said the students pay for the recreation center as a part of the fees, even if they don't use it, and they cannot opt out. Savinski said that has been controversial. Wang would like to see the grants for smaller projects before our next meeting so it can be looked at.

B. Set timeline and goals

Wang is concerned over the timeline of the project given that our next meeting is Dec 5th. And then the next meeting would be January 9th and then again on January 23rd. Regan will email the current project proposals to the members.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE:

December 5, 2012 @2:30pm VU 567

VIII. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20pm