



# SUSTAINABILITY ACTION FUND COMMITTEE

Monday, May 9th, 2017, 9:00 AM. VU 460

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

**Advisor:** GregMcBride  
**Secretary:** CoraCole

*As Neither the Chair nor the Vice-Chair were present there was an informal discussion of the Rubric beginning at 9:09 AM.*

## **I. Discussion Items**

- a. **Rubric:** Anna and Keiko met last week to talk about definitions for environmental, social, and economic sustainability. Environmental sustainability means that a project promotes and preserves the health of the environment, built and natural. They defined social sustainability as how we protect environment without putting marginalized communities in jeopardy, possibly uplifting them. Economic sustainability means recognizing limits of a finite system, financially self-sustaining systems that respect student dollars. Johnathan asked about the positive or negative lenses. Keiko talked about the way that historically environmental projects have negatively impacted- Johnathan said that a neutral score would be no negative or positive a 1 would be negative and a 7-10 would be positive impact. Anne said that the committee had talked about a scale last week, using the word harm specifically and having it be explicitly positive or negative. Greg said that we could have the minimum of knowing that your project has a social impact, even if we don't explicitly address it. Johnathan asked if economic was strictly financial, Anna said that it was more about resources, whether that is money or time or school/natural resources. Most important thing is stewardship of student dollars. Keiko said that we should start by looking at the SAF's mission because that looks at those three criteria and the rubric reflecting that would be beneficial. Johnathan said that the SAF is trying to implement a fourth category, Greg added that the SAF predates the university goals and we would need to formally shift our mission focus if we want to reflect that change. Johnathan asked the committee if, "offsetting emissions" warrants a separate score or if it would double up points for

some projects. Anna said that it was different impact, Johnathan asked if it might throw off the teams who are using the rubrics. Anna said that the SAF team would be able to address those concerns. Johnathan asked if it could be a yes/no question Keiko said that it could be a yes/no question without losing the effect. Greg said that it sounded like the environmental impact but that it would have to be described to the committee. Anna added that having it as a sliding scale achieves that description forcing them to think about it. She went on to explain the way that she hopes it will guide the teams who are using the rubric,

- b. FIXIT Sample Project:** Anna and Greg began by discussing whether the project added to or worked in tandem with any other campus initiatives, goals, or projects. Anna said she didn't want to answer yes or no but somewhere in the middle, Johnathan asked why it wasn't a yes and she said it didn't explicitly state what projects it added onto. Anna said that students should look on the SAF website in the same way that she has to see if there are any projects that it would work with. Answers to the question about information availability were easier to find because the project revolved around being accessible. The stakeholders didn't sign off because the application was older, but Anna said it looked like they were engaged. Greg said that we would need more information and he and Johnathan asked how the committee would make that information available. The project was led by students and was new to campus. The long term viability question is another sliding question, they thought this project met it. Greg said he would like to see metrics for groups' evaluations, the secretary asked how he would like that to be presented on the rubric and he was unsure, the group didn't have much in the way of suggestions. Theoretically it would have significant impact on increasing bike use, but in the proposal, there is very little direct impact. Social impact would depend on the Bike Education position which could include a lot of outreach to people who don't frequently bike around campus. Both social and environmental impact would depend a lot on how it is implemented.

*The meeting ended at 10:02 AM*