

**Western Washington University Associated Students
Green Energy Fee
Tuesday, January 15, 2013**

YU 460

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

Advisor: Kevin Majkut

Secretary: Kaylee Galloway

MOTIONS

GEF-13-W-01 Approve the minutes from December 5, 2012. *Passed*

GEF-13-W-02 Approve and recommend to the board of directors to establish a small grant pilot program. *Passed*

Katie Savinski, Chair of Green Energy Fee Committee, called the meeting to order at 12:04 pm

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ADDITIONS/CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION GEF-13- W-01 by Celis

Approve the minutes from December 5, 2012

Second: Wang

Vote: 6-0-0

Action: Passed

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Medium Projects Pilot/Application

Regan said that she focused on medium sized projects, and small size projects will be worked on next year. She prepared a document with project guidelines. She also prepared the application and discussed what students would be filling out. Wang wondered the difference between the small and medium sized projects because she was worried about the timeline. Clover discussed some examples. She said she is not sure of the time line. Wang said that it will not be known until it is tried. Clover suggested having the applications due February 27th as oppose to March 6th. Selvey asked if the whole project would need to be done in order for GEF funding. Clover said that there would have to be an evaluation. Wang said that there is only a medium risk for a big reward. Vedana said the key will be getting the word out about the process and the opportunity. He said there are many students who would like to use the GEF funds, but do not have the time or have missed the opportunity. He said there is a fair amount of opportunity especially with the paperwork and process. Wang said she is teaching literacy and that students are doing group projects. She said that some of the projects in the past would fit in line with this process and can get the ball rolling. Olivier said that class raps would be done to spread the work. Celis said he would be really interested in trying the pilot project this year. Vedana said that his largest concern is making sure the projects chosen represent the fee. He said with the shorter process, there is an increased likelihood that there will be more applications. He said that with more projects, there may be weirder projects. Wang was wondering if there can be a cap on the number of applicants. Clover worried that it would limit the number of students who would want to apply. She said that she could review all of the applications and present the top 10 to the committee. Vedana said that the committee needs to determine what role they will play and how to go about the process. Savinski said the

committee talked last quarter about doing a consent item like the board does for committee assignments. She said that all of the consent items would be passed together. She is in favor of that because she wants the committee allocating the funding, but does not want to talk about all of the allocations especially if they are smaller. Clover said created a grant metrics that she is happy to share. Wang said that she does not want to push too much work onto Clover. Clover said that she will have to test it out to see what everything entails to get a better idea of the work load. Savinski said that the committee was created to handle the funding, and that it is being changed with this process. She said she would appreciate approval from the board of directors. She is working on the language. Majkut said that the committee is to approve and recommend the projects to the board of directors. He said that the money aspect should not be of worry. He said that a medium grant process is smaller and more simplified than the conventional process. Majkut said there is enough money to not have a substantial effect. Celis said that the committee would approve the whole medium project pilot and recommend to the board. Savinski said that the committee will be allocating the money for a specific purpose as oppose to having it openly available. Majkut said that there is some change and so the board would want to look at that. Clover said that it could be considered small this year and have medium for next year. The committee agreed to call this pilot small project pilot. It will be going to the board of directors next week.

MOTION GEF-13- W-02 by Celis

Approve and recommend to the board of directors to establish a small grant pilot program.

Second: Selvey

Vote: 6-0-0

Action: Passed

V. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Maintenance Costs: Project Owner Form

Clover said that in the current grant application, there is a section for stakeholder and project collaborator, which basically says that the stakeholder approves of the project. She said that other schools have their stakeholders approve the project, work on the project, and fund operational costs of the project. She said that one of the invested stakeholders has reservations because they said they would pay for it, but wondered how much and for how long. Clover said she revised the form, then sent it to the facilities director for revisions. She said that this form is the byproduct from feedback given from a few stakeholders. She is wanting to establish a process that would determine who will pay and for how long. She said there are a lot of new questions on the form that need to be considered by the committee. Clover went over all of the questions on doc 2. She has included the issue of maintaining operational costs. Simpson said warranty would cover wear, but not vandalism. Vedana said that these funds are to create projects and it is important to keep the projects running and achieving their intended purpose. He said that the intended purpose can be achieved with the current projects. He does not think the maintenance crew will sign off on some of the projects because of the operational costs. He wanted to make sure that the money is going towards quality and useful projects. He said that successful projects will give GEF a better reputation. Wang said that there are costs, but that there are benefits and the university is receiving some savings. Savinski said the GEF, as a part of the funding, would be funding a one-year warranty. Clover said that sounds right for these sorts of projects. Majkut said it is money that is actually going to be spent for maintenance costs. He also mentioned the replacement costs. The money would be rolled back into the fund if it was not used. Clover said that there would be money allocated for each project separately. Simpson thought that the solar panel project had a warranty. Majkut said it might be problematic if the GEF has responsibility to the owner for a long period of time. He said the owner would determine the costs of maintenance. He interpreted it that the fee would be responsible for the projects. Vedana said the focus was on removal if there was not funding. He said the GEF would cover the first year, and then the owner takes from years 2 to 10. He said the question then is

who would take responsibility and pay for maintenance for that 11th year and beyond. Majkut said it would be good to clarify. He said it seems that GEF would be holding money. Wang was curious if it incurs interest. Majkut said there would be a small amount of interest because the funds are included in the university's funds. Vedana said that the initial grant money is a grant and that the project owners should be responsible for funding maintenance. He said there might be projects where neither the owner nor GEF wants to pay for the maintenance costs. Olivier suggested rewording the sentence to say: "I agree to take over the operational cost and take responsibility to administering the costs after I can no longer take the costs over." She said that instead of placing a cap on the number of years, the stakeholder could pass it on to someone else. Clover said the number of years is important. Vedana said that the responsibility would remain with the unit and would not disappear because of the project owner retired. Simpson said there might be a way to simplified. Olivier is not in favor of having a time requirement. Vedana thought there would have to be a year mark. Wang said that it should not be open. Celis thought that would be covered in the estimate of the project lifespan. Vedana said the concern is with a 20 year lifespan where GEF pays first year, and owner pays until year ten, then who would take responsibility for the maintenance for subsequent years after 10. Celis said that if there is a 20 year lifespan, then the stakeholders take the responsibility on knowing the lifespan. He said that after the first year, then the subsequent 19 will be covered by the unit. Majkut said that GEF will be a granting agency and then the project owner is responsible for everything after. He said that by going beyond that, it would be the case that the GEF would own the project as oppose to the university. He said it becomes a negotiation. Majkut wondered if there were provisions on state dollars in that things can only be replaced if they were allocated from state dollars. Simpson used the Biology building as an example. He said that the building was built and that it said that supply services for future autoclave. He said that there was a grant for the autoclave, then the biology department is responsible for the maintenance of the autoclave. He said that if the Chemistry building were to buy an autoclave with state funding, then facilities management would be responsible for the maintenance. He is not sure if it is a hard law that is written or a policy that has been evolved over time. Majkut said that GEF is a separate fee on top of tuition so it would be locally generated state dollars; it is not state allocated money. He said there are different rules associated with each type of funding. Simpson said it gets confusing because sometimes it is considered state money. Savinski said that she, Clover, and Vedana will work on the form and present it the GEF to approve.

VI. OTHER BUSNIESS

A. Application Review for Funding Schedule

Savinski said that she and Clover discussed moving the deadline to give more time with project teams to discuss with the project owners. Celis said it gives more leeway to discuss maintenance. He said this would be the only thing changed. Olivier said that a week is plenty of time. She said she is working on a project and that drafts are due to Clover tomorrow. Committee was in favor of changing the deadline. Savinski thought that adding a year warranty might also have to go to the board. Clover said there are some really big projects and that the owners are afraid of the costs. Savinski said that it would be too late to bring it to the next Board meeting since this committee has not made any decision. Majkut doesn't want to delay the process more than necessary. Savinski said that the committee should think about how long everyone wants to review over the projects. Savinski said there are four projects

VH. NEXT MEETING DATE: January 22, 2013 @ 12pm in VU 460

vii. ADJOURN

The Meeting was adjourned at 1:01pm