



# SUSTAINABILITY ACTION FUND COMMITTEE

Monday, May 1st, 2017, 9:00 AM. VU460

**Members:** *Present: Wayne Rocque (ASVP for Student Life), Mary Moeller (ASVP for Business and Operations), Greg McBride (Assistant Director of Viking Union Facilities), Anna Kemper (Environmental & Sustainability Programs Director), Jasmine Goodnow (Faculty Representative), Keiko Beteker (AS Sustainable Action Fund Education Coordinator), Jose Rios-Sanchez (Student at Large).*  
*Absent: Jacob Keith (Student At Large), Johnathan Riopelle (SAF Grant Coordinator), andlzy Juell (Student at Large).*

**Advisor:** Greg McBride  
**Secretary:** Cora Cole  
**Guests:** Anne Gordon (VP for Student Life Elect)

*Wayne Rocque called the meeting to order at 9:05 am.*

## **I. Introductions**

Because we had the new ASVP for Student Life present for the first time, the committee members all introduced themselves.

## **II. Discussion Items**

- a. Rubric:** Wayne had everyone take a minute to look at the rubric draft 2.4 and justifications for changes. For April 27 edits, Wayne asked how people would like to see a definition of Environmental and Social Impacts. Greg asked how sustainability and social impact work together, what impacts we would want projects to have on social sustainability. Jasmine asked if we had a definition on the webpage or charge and charter, we looked at the SAF page which lists the offices goals and the charge and charter, neither of which had a clear outline. Wayne said social impact would center the voices of communities that are usually unheard in conversations of sustainability. The secretary said that projects that prioritize “just transition” away from dirty energy so that the impacts don’t weigh extra heavy on the shoulders of people who are low income. Anna said that the MicroAdventures project would be an example, Greg agree. Jasmine then brought up the concern that having multiple definitions of sustainability would make the social impact section something of a double barrel. Greg said that using the word ‘accessible’ has multiple meanings and that could be confusing, Wayne clarified he was referring to practical accessibility for students with disabilities. Addressing the definitions, Greg said that having a continuum rather than a definition would create a better ability both for the definitions to change over time and to make sure that there is always a way for projects that do good work to receive credit for their social impact. Wayne suggested that we establish a baseline for environmental impact and then move on to social later potentially, Jasmine said that could include anything from recycling or decreasing any harm of the

environment, and the 'Does not yet meet criteria' could be not doing much, and the 'Exceeds Criteria' would look like the buildings that are now solar powered. Greg said we can think about it as a question of if the project moves us to a more healthy earth, reduction of harm. Jose said that keeping it really broad will make it easier to address while still maintaining genuine initiative in the projects. The committee said that having a specific item addressing emissions reduction is still really important because that is one of the goals of the committee and it really is separate from the definition of environmental sustainability. For social then, Keiko said that would be about centering healthy communities, Jasmine suggested phrasing it as "do no harm". She went on to voice concern with how creation of National Parks has typically harmed indigenous communities. Wayne voiced concern with the specificity of the social impact, Greg said we could remove the word community from environmental impact and have it in social to be clearer. We will keep talking about this for the next couple weeks, but the ideas that people had today were helpful. Wayne asked if people had any further input, Greg said we should address the ongoing costs of the project in economic impact. People were generally comfortable with the 10 point scale for projects as well as beginning on 1 instead of zero. Greg said that "doesn't yet meet criteria" rubs him the wrong way. Keiko interjected that saying 'doesn't yet meet' probably helps with that, Mary asked if we were still interested in adding a 4<sup>th</sup> column for projects with negative impact. Keiko said that it isn't necessary because it would be caught before coming to committee through the SAF. The committee agreed that the rubric would be used primarily to give an even playing field for projects that get pitched, not as a baseline for what they have to do. After a couple small edit suggestions, the committee agreed to continue discussions the following week.

***Wayne Rocque adjourned the meeting at 9:43 AM.***