



SUSTAINABILITY ACTION FUND COMMITTEE

Wednesday May 31st, 2017, 4:00PM. 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), Seth Vidana (Sustainability Manager for Western), Johnathan Riopelle (Sustainable Action Fund Grant Coordinator), Jose Rios-Sanchez (Student at Large).*
Absent: Jasmine Goodnow (Faculty Representative), Keiko Betcher (AS Sustainable Action Fund Education Coordinator), Jacob Keith (Student at Large), and Izzy Juell (Student at Large).

Advisor: Greg McBride

Secretary: Cora Cole

Guests: Kattie Winkelman (Next Year's ESP Director), Spiro Pappas (SAF Projects Coordinator), Kate Rayner Fried (Keiko's replacer), and Annie Gordon (VP for Student Life Elect).

Wayne Rocque called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM.

I. Introductions

II. **Amendments:** Wayne said that we would be doing an electronic vote on the York Farm since there was not quorum and nobody submitted any questions about the project.

III. Discussion Items

a. Summer meetings:

IV. Action Item

a. Rubric:

- i. Lowering Emissions Category: The committee agreed that there was a consensus for keeping the category as numerically measured.
- ii. **Negative impact Categories:** Wayne asked if Mary's suggestion of having a negative category would be salient for any of the categories. The committee was as silent as the grave. Mary suggested a 'sub-rubric' for 'offsetting emissions' and the committee looked at the examples from other universities, after some contemplation, she suggested using the Stanford model as an example. Wayne asked Greg about some comments he had made at the last

meeting about technical versus abstract measurement of impact. Greg responded that there was a strong technical capability for the Offsetting Emissions' and looking at the SUNY rubric for their tracking feature could be valuable. Wayne asked if having a subcommittee in the summer would even work to make a sub-rubric and Johnathan responded that having the rubric honed and tested as well as looking at well as working on that project would be very valuable, even if the whole committee isn't possible. Greg said that they couldn't make formal meetings or decisions but that having a working group had happened before and could happen again. There was some discussion on what should be on the sub-rubric versus on the application in terms of implementation/measurement of emissions offset. Wayne asked if there are any other concerns or ideas other than those with the emissions idea. Spiro recommended, in economic impact to move, unmatched funds to 'meets criteria' because most projects don't meet it. Greg added that the funding's technical capability to meet things is frequently set by non-student groups like faculty. Johnathan added that he was concerned economic impact is being conflated with financial feasibility. He thinks that a separate issue is whether we can afford to do it as a committee and the economic impact should be about how it impacts the community. Wayne asked how to set bounds to prevent those issues being conflated. Johnathan said we need to determine what a project would do to not just save money but assuring economic equity. Jose added it should be is it a good use of student dollars not is it feasible. Greg said we could address does it allow people to get involved in sustainability who have not previously been there. Johnathan said the having cost benefit analysis on this row could be confusing and having it somewhere else would be highly beneficial in order to analyze them effectively. Anna said that the SUNY rubric looks at hard savings and soft savings and that would be beneficial. How you talk about this around financial stewardship without it being about cost benefit is a difficult question. Wayne suggested changing the tag on the category to 'Economic Stewardship' and then have the questions of feasibility be on the SAF Office or committee. Mary said that having a second category could be good but that she can't quite put her finger on why, and that the rubric now is pretty good. Spiro said that we could have two categories. Engagement and Marketing addresses the questions about long term management pretty well and Anna said that we could add something about long term management to that, as is done in the SUNY rubric. Johnathan asked how much detail she would like to ask for there and she said that there didn't have to be much, just enough to remind them to keep in mind that part of the issue. Greg said that SUNY's rubric doesn't outline a high score, it just asks for a good outline from the group. Anna and he both said that having it as a yes no question about whether it is effective on the long term could address the issue. Wayne said that having too much detail might force people into ineffective pathways for projects. Anna said that she had been able to incorporate long term benefits in her presentations, but she also recognized she was repeating somewhat older issues. Greg added that project benefit should include "the capacity to ensure that something happens. Having that capacity would be important for measuring thoughts. Wayne asked if anyone had any further thoughts on

social impact or environmental impact or offsetting impacts. Johnathan said that he maintains his concerns about having offsetting emissions as a separate category. Wayne suggested that it be a hovering category, only for technical projects that revolve around construction, Johnathan said that would be feasible. Greg asked if we could incorporate offsetting emissions in the tracking of success, Spiro responded that environmental impact sounds more like environmental awareness and he would like to see reword. Jose said that we should consider that split, and have a more detailed rubric for each of the items Greg agreed that the sub-rubric could be more specific, and leaving the rubric itself open would be effective. Johnathan said that it the emissions category is a means to an end, with the impact categories being the end. Wayne suggested that we keep the social, economic, and environmental impacts as they are and then have the technical as separate. Greg responded by asking how to offer the same level of value discussion for different kinds of projects. The environmental impact would be more awareness and soft impact and the emissions would address the hard impact. Johnathan said we should go back to the question of what is the rubric, is it a lens for perspective or a grading tool. He doesn't want to see a lens that is so specific it keeps people from being able to propose a project. Spiro said that he thought we should change verbiage to have 'emissions' be environmental impact and Environmental impact could be moved to the second page and be awareness focused. He mentioned that habitat restoration would be a problem that isn't addressed by that and asked if it should be addressed. Johnathan said that the Office has been struggling for a while with how unquantifiable some of the projects are. Spiro said we could maintain environmental impact and offsetting emissions could be held under close inspection over the summer and next year. Johnathan thanked Annie for coming to the meetings and asked for her feedback. She said she hasn't been here enough to know enough to make a decision yet. Greg asked for the progress that people think we are strong on and the areas that we want the next committee to focus Annie said that having a list of what people like a lot and what they want to work on more next year. The secretary asked for the lists: Johnathan said the offsetting emissions needs more work and everything else was great, Mary thought econ could be improved but the rubric was fine the way it is.

V. Discussion Items

- a. Summer meetings:** Annie said she would like to be here. Greg said that the ESP director would be here but generally students at large won't. Jose said he would be pretty busy but he is willing to be a part of the process. The committee generally agreed that having monthly meetings would be a good idea. The secretary promised to put together meeting times.

VI. Discussion items

- a. SAF office reports:** Johnathan said they have closed for the year, except for ongoing projects and one curiosity. He said that E-Bike pilot program still has a large amount

of funds and the advisor has come to the SAF asking to apply for a separate grant or use the funds for something outside the initial scope. They would be writing a grant for \$3,000-4,000 dollars to expand the e-bike pilot exponentially. If the funding happened it would have student impact but the actual SAF grant would not have any grant. Greg explained that historically, the money would not be able to come back to SAF if it were granted. They would like the SAF money soon but there is no bright line so the committee could vote in the fall or they could give advisement now. Wayne said he would like that to happen when more committee members can hear about it so either way, he should re-submit in the fall.

VII. Thanks!

Wayne Rocque adjourned the meeting at 6:26 PM.