



Western Washington University Associated Students  
**Sustainable Action Fund Committee**

Monday, October 30th, 2016 4:00 M VU 567

**Members:**

**Present:** *Annie Gordon (ASVPfor Student Life), AlexLaValle (ASVPfor Business and Operations), Greg McBride (Assistant Director of Viking Union Facilities), Katie Winkleman (Environmental & Sustainability Programs Director), Johnathan Riopelle (AS Sustainable Action Fund Grant Program Coordinator), Kate Rayner Fried (AS Sustainable Action Fund Education Coordinator), Jasmine Goodnow (Faculty Representative), Jordan Lucia (Student at Large), Crow C (Student at Large), Pauline Mogilevsky (Student at Large), and Scott Dorough (Representative from Business and Financial Affairs).*

**Absent:**

**Advisor:** *Greg McBride*

**Secretary:** *Chloe Callahan*

**Guests:** *KP Hartman, Jillian Hardy, Logan Fletcher, Aden Nevier and Patrick Shive.*

**Annie Gordon called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM.**

**I. Introductions**

- a. Gordon started the meeting by recognizing that the committee had new students at large and stated that since the committee had a lot to cover during the meeting she was only able to provide a short overview of what SAF does. Gordon stated that the committee is responsible for handling the sustainability fee that students pay and the committee is tasked with deciding what to do with the money in terms of student proposals they are presented with. Gordon then asked people to go around stating name, pronouns, role within the committee and position at Western. Gordon provided context for the members stating the tiered process for the proposals. If the proposal is under \$5,000 then it does not have to go through the committee and instead goes to the Office of Sustainability and Riopelle and Seth Vidana decide. The large budget proposals, over \$5,000, are what come to the committee for a vote. Conceptual proposal are the groups rough draft, their first proposal, the committee then provides feedback and the students can come back for the committee to vote on.

**II. Information Items**

**a. Right to Risk conceptual grant proposal**

Gordon noted that the committee did not have the documents to look at before the meeting so they would be listening only and no decisions would be made by the committee. Gordon stated the in the future the documents were to be submitted by the Thursday before the meeting. The student group introduced themselves; KP Hartman, Jillian Hardy and Togan Fletcher. Hartman opened by sharing their project title Right to Risk: Providing Outdoor Recreation for Marginalized Populations. The program will have three components. The first component will be a focus group; there would be two different focus groups because the project is intended to reach two specific populations. During the focus group they will

determine enablers, barriers and motivators as well as what type of experience they would like to have. The second component will be micro adventure, providing the participants with the experience they discussed in the focus group. The third will be follow through with a documentary created by the participants and a showing of this documentary on campus. The program will be a full research project that they hoped to present at Tedx at Western and other therapeutic recreation and outdoor recreation conferences. Hardy stated that their focus group would be based on womxn of minority and breaking down outdoors barriers. The goal is to create accessibility to enhance view of outdoors and provide a free adventure to show how barriers can be broken down and possibly get the participants recreating more. The outcomes will be broad and based on what participants want to do in the wilderness. Fletcher stated the other group would be students with disabilities. Fletcher mentioned that access for people with disabilities in the recreation fields was nuanced because disability is a diverse population. Some barriers are resources, adaptive equipment can be expensive and hard to come by, more people needed, social barriers and recreation providers sometimes write them off as a risk. Fletcher quoted the CDC stating, individuals with disabilities are more likely than individuals without disabilities to report poorer overall health, as well as physical inactivity. This can be directly countered through recreation if they figure out how to create a channel for them to follow their pursuit for recreation. Through the focus group they want to figure out the motivators, enablers, and barriers, and then find the most ideal recreation pursuit. Hartman stated they chose the two different populations, because a literature review on who is not participating recreationally showed a disproportionate amount of papers on womxn of minority and people with disabilities. In many of the papers there were calls to action but no follow through. The group wanted to provide a socially and economically equitable experience for these groups. Hoping to spread it to the larger recreational area. Riopelle asked them to clarify the budget and amount of students that will be participating. Hartman stated around \$30,000 including cost of focus groups, conferences, and running micro adventures (including contracting out the WWU Ree Center and Outdoor Adventures for All based in Seattle, which has a lot of adaptable equipment). Hartman said the initial focus group for people with disabilities will be about 6 people and then once the group decides what they would like their experience to be. Then they will create a second focus group which would include professionals within that field to be a part of the study. Hardy stated their focus group would have 8-12 participants for the womxn of minority, found through outreach, through ESC and other clubs. Goodnow asked how many students would be impacted by this grant, direct participants and the video outreach. Hartman stated the immediate students and immediate peers will be affected, assuming publicity for the documentary goes well, they would like to fill Frasier Hall 102 and spread the word to as many students as they could. Hardy said they hope to spread it for more than just Western's campus. Hartman said the actual number of people impacted would be hard for them to get. Winkelman asked about the status of their WWU Tedx application. The group said it was in the process. Winkelman wanted to know more about how they will accommodate folks of all disabilities, Fletcher stated they didn't know what types of disabilities they would need to accommodate for. However, he had experience with Outdoors Adventures for All the past summer, he learned no matter what the populous you

can accommodate. Since they didn't know what activity they would be facilitating, they don't know exactly what they will need yet. Goodnow asked for examples from his internship. Fletcher provided a few examples on how adventures such as kayaking and cycling can be accommodated. Goodnow asked what populations he worked with that summer, in regards to abilities. Fletcher said all across the spectrum such as, kids and adults with autism, limited range of motion, limited sight. Hartman had been in contact with David Brunner, the director of Disability Resources Center on campus, making sure the whole experience from start to finish is accessible. They would continually work to adapt and accommodate as needed. Scott asked if they were looking at activities involving public land or local activities. Hardy said they would stay semi local, having as least environmental impact. The hope is to remain local to show the participants the resources that are close to them. The group stated they have a lot of options for public and local lands. Gordon asked for any final questions and told the group that they will be brought back as an information item again due to the documentation being late. This would also allow the student body and the committee more time to review the grant proposal.

**b. Tool-Lending Library conceptual grant proposal (29.30)**

The group started by introducing themselves as Aden Nevier and Patrick Shive. Nevier said the proposal for a tool lending library is based on a similar one in the Smart Building Center in Seattle. Place where anyone there can check out energy efficiency tools and monitor their energy usage. Shive said they want to help students in economic burden of their utility bills and with an interest in saving money. They want to provide the tools and education for students to increase their energy efficiency. Nevier stated they are requesting this grant money to fund the purchasing of the energy efficiency tools and staff a small location on campus to store and check them out. Other than learning more about their individual utilities, there is a professional development involved because these are the same tools used in the professional fields. So they can use these skills in their potential careers. The tools could also be used in university courses, there are only a couple available on campus and a professor had to purchase them with their own money. Shive explained the costs would include purchasing the tools, providing space for the tools, hiring and training staff. Shive stated they are hoping to spend \$2,000-\$7,000 on purchasing the tools, \$5,000 for parttime student. They expressed they would save money because they are using the same loan structure already put in place by the Smart Building Center in Seattle. Nevier stated they had been talking to institutional researchers to see how many relevant majors there are that would be impacted by this program. The team was planning on researching the potential interest on campus to see who would utilize this service. They also reached out to students and staff to see what classes could use what tools. Shive stated that they were only looking at about 500 square feet to house the tools in a locker and space for the staff. Nevier stated that they want to make sure that more than a few students have access to using this services, so they want it an easily accessible location. Shive stated they were also looking into longevity, hoping that people will still use this beyond the first year or two and that people can get repeat usage out of the tools. The university would only need to buy the tool once and it can then help generations of new students. Nevier stated that the grant would provide about one to two years of funding: 2-3 months of planning and data gathering, one

month to purchase tools, 2 months for training employees and some time for promotion and outreach. This was not a concrete timeline. Nevier asked if anyone had any questions. Lavallee asked if they have looked into space availability on campus and if they had talked with ATUS to see if they had space available. Nevier stated they had looked at ATUS, but they might not have the necessary space to store the tools. Nevier said they have also looked at the many of the Graduate TA labs around campus that have extra space. Lavallee asked how long a student needs to use this equipment to get useful data. Nevier stated it depended on what the student was looking for. The Smart Building Center in Seattle loans out their tools for about 2 to 3 weeks per check out, which they plan to imitate. Goodnow asked what happens if the tool causes damage when a student is using it and if they had talked to risk management about the liability of lending out these tools. Nevier said they were looking at purchasing data tools and there was not much that can go wrong but the tool breaking. They had planned to talk with the university about the liability aspect. Winkelman asked if they had done any initial research on baseline interest. Shive said they had asked students from their major and in their classes and most students were aware of these tools. Nevier mentions there were 100 students in the energy major and three energy groups on campus. Based on their research so far, people were interested and want to see more. McBride asked who the project owner and sponsor was and how the project would be sustained after they graduated. Nevier informed the committee that this project was similar to a lot of the functions the institute for energy studies was already doing. They had already been working with Joel Swisher and Charlie Barnhart, they believed that this was something they could pass off to other students. Gordon informed the group that this team would come back again as an inform item because the documents were not submitted on time and she wanted to give the committee and student body the proper time to review.

**c. Grant Development for Electric Research**

Gordon said the reason there is no group present at the meeting was because it was a small grant that did not need to be voted on by the committee. However, this was brought to the committee because Riopelle wanted their input on this grant before making a decision. Riopelle stated small grants, \$5000 or less, fall under Seth Vidana and his jurisdiction; when they don't know what to do they bring it to the committee. This grant was brought because there was no real precedent and didn't want to approve or deny. Instead they wanted the committee to make a determination. This grant request would provide funding for an individual on campus, who is seeking to create a proposal for an external grant, worth half a million dollars. The money from the external grant would be used to create an on campus E-bike research program. Riopelle state he thought the long term plan was interesting, but the grant they are requesting from the committee did not guarantee that the E-bike research would actually occur. The grant requested from the committee did not directly impact students. The further grant did fall under the large umbrella of sustainability, but the current grant they are faced with did not. Goodnow stated that she could not vote on this item because she was involved in this research, but she could answer any questions they had about why the individual would be asking for a grant when faculty members typically did not. Goodnow shared that as a faculty member the job had three distinct aspects: teaching, engaging in research, and service. She informed the committee that the

person in administration was requesting money because this was outside her normal job duties. The faculty is not asking for money because it was already part of their job, which they were paid to do. The admin member would not be able to work on the grant proposal during her normal work hours unless she buys out her time. The team working on the research met every Monday for two hours and during that time she is not at her desk so she has to make up that time by working late. Faculty can buy out time by applying to grants for someone else to teach a class, this individual applying to the SAF grant did not have opportunities like that. Riopelle stated that the individual would not get paid to help on the larger grant unless the committee accepted her grant proposal to pay her. Gordon clarified that if the grant didn't get approved, then the SAF put out empty money. She wanted to know what the probability of the group getting the large grant was. Scott said a simple way to look at it was that this proposal was a way for the SAF to make an investment. They would be investing in the probability that this would return a larger amount than what the committee was putting into it. Lavallee clarified that it was not a requirement for this person to do this research for their job. Goodnow said the individual was a researcher, but her research was not on E-bikes. Lucia asked as they were looking at the application, should they be looking at the end goal grant and checking the validity of receiving the grant and should they be evaluating that grant in making their decision. Riopelle stated that it might be a good route and he urged them to do research on the large grant, but they would be investing in a probability. Vidana and Riopelle didn't want to assess the probability, but instead looked at whether the grant fit what the fund is for. Lavallee stated that the financials in the request don't add up properly. He wondered how the hours were calculated for the proposal because the grant came so close to the small grant line and would not show up in the committee. Lavallee wondered if it was trying to be kept from the eyes of the committee. He asked how many people were already working collaboratively on the large grant proposal. Goodnow said it was 10 hours a week for two quarter. Lavallee said he was unfamiliar with the research around E-bikes. Goodnow said the individual posted research questions in the report in section 4b, the section stated the desired outcomes of the project. The researcher wanted to investigate patterns of E-bike use and doing a transportation mode shift. Looking at the idea of creating a movement during college age, hoping to lead to more students adopting E-bikes for their life. Lavallee mentioned how most companies are claiming their fleets will be all electric by 2025 and wondered if the campus needed E-bikes if the vehicles will soon be all electric. Winkelman stated they already had a bike education coordinator funded through the SAF and wondered if they could combine the positions. Goodnow stated that that individual was already a part of the project. McBride said he didn't understand what the grant was. He said it sounded like this would be a grant to create a temporary position for an existing staff member for a temporary project of interest to them. McBride wondered how the individual would work with their current job to accommodate for this grant proposal project. Goodnow stated they believed the individual would be working weekends and nights on the project. Riopelle said that she would potentially seek a reduction of hours to pursue this interest. Riopelle then stated that when she was doing the work was all noise, the questions was whether it was appropriate for this committee to fund her position.

Winkelman asked for more time to look over the grant documents. Riopelle stated they would look into getting the person to come. McBride said they need to make sure they do not make a decision that would get the committee in trouble with personnel. Gordon stated it was important to give time for people to look into what they want, in order to make this kind of decision. People should feel comfortable to bring their thoughts to the table in order to be a good steward of the fund. Lavallee said he wanted more info on the larger grant before they could make this decision. Gordon said that she wanted to provide more time for people to review the proposals.

*Annie Gordon adjourned the meeting at 5:10 PM.*