



Western Washington University Associated Students
Sustainable Action Fund Committee

Monday, November 13th, 2017

4:00 PM

VU567

Members:

Present: *Annie Gordon (ASVPfor Student Life), Alex LaVallee (ASVPfor Business and Operations), Greg McBride (Assistant Director of Viking Union Facilities), Katie Winkelman (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 Chloupek (Student at Large), and Pauline Mogilevsky (Student at Large).*

Absent:

Advisor: *Greg McBride*

Secretary: *Chloe Callahan*

Guests:

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

I. Introductions

Gordon introduced the meeting by asking the committee to go around and state their names, pronouns and position. After introductions Gordon walked the committee through how to find the documents on the AS website to make sure they had access to the information. Gordon informed the committee that they would be meeting weekly for the rest of the quarter. Gordon clarified that the committee would not be voting on any of the items that meeting because the documents had been received late the first time.

The committee reviewed the process of how teams apply to large and small grants and the process in which the grants are approved. In brief the teams work with the Office of Sustainability to create their proposals. If the grants is a small grant, under \$5,000, they are reviewed by Riopelle and Seth Vidana for approval, occasionally they are brought to the committee. The large grants, greater than \$5,000, are submitted to the committee as a conceptual proposal, if the committee agreed the conceptual proposal was good, it comes back as a final application for approval. The approval of the final application is what officially approved funding.

II. Information Items

a. Right to Risk conceptual proposal

Gordon asked what people thought of the proposal. Tucia stated that he was a fan of the idea, but felt the group provided very specific numbers in their budget when the potential microadventure could be very broad in terms of what they do. Winkelman wondered where they were getting the numbers for their budget. She stated that they believed TedxWWU was no cost and didn't see how other conferences could cost up to \$1,300 if they were within Washington State. They would have liked to see where the \$17,000 for the microadventure would be going, a more detailed breakdown, because Winkelman stated they have seen them done for a lot less. Tavailee asked if this was something we should expect to be seeing in the conceptual applications or would this detailed data be seen in the final proposal. Riopelle stated that for the

conceptual application proposals the groups only provide rough estimates. The conceptual application is not intended to be extremely detailed. Riopelle said the question for the committee was whether or not this idea fits the intent or the committee. Gordon added that it was okay to go back to the team and ask for more detail. The committee talked about the rubric that had been created the previous year. It was determined that the rubric was a guiding tool to frame thinking and create dialogue for the committee to evaluate the proposals. Lavalley wondered if this proposal was doubling the \$150,000 grant that was given to the Outdoor Center the previous year by the Board of Directors for training for the trip leaders. That previous grant was to make recreation more accessible to the populations listed. Lavalley stated that when they had examined the cost of the microadventures in comparison to the benefits and potential education and did not feel the benefits outweighed the cost. Winkelman stated that the proposal team had discussed attachment to the environment. Attachment leads to valuing a place more and treating that environment better. Goodnow stated that the idea behind microadventures are about staying close to home. It was about eliminating travel and creating sustainable designs. The direct benefits are beyond the specific students participating in the microadventure, it also was looking at the exclusion these populations were experiencing in the recreation field and trying to counteract it. Riopelle wanted to remind everyone that an application did not need to have an environmental impact to be a valid proposal. Gordon reminded everyone of the four pillars of sustainability the Office of Sustainability tried to embody: human health, economic equity, social equity and environmental protection. These were all lenses to look at the proposals through. The applications did not need to cover all. Winkelman stated her concern was that the application didn't shine in any of those four areas. She mentioned the documentary was not brought up much in the proposal and wondered if it was an afterthought. Lucia mentioned that they would like to give the proposal the benefit of the doubt because the idea had value and would have liked to see more detail about the concerns that were brought up by the committee. Lavalley stated that even their title Right to Risk, made him wonder whether or not they were putting the students at risk and who would be the leaders responsible for their safety. Goodnow said that it all went through Paul Muller from the ree program. McBride mentioned the university department that would be sponsoring the microadventure would be responsible for the risk. Goodnow stated that the Outdoor Center had members trained in these areas. Gordon recapped that the committee thought the idea was good but they wanted more information on the budget, logistics and safety. Riopelle said he was the one that would go back to the team with what they need to improve on their proposal for the committee. Goodnow stated the final grant the team proposed the previous year was about 14 pages long and provided line item budgets. Lucia stated that they would really like to see a line item budget,

b. Tool-Lending Library conceptual proposal

Gordon asked what the committee thought about the tool-lending library. Lucia stated they thought the proposal would be valuable to the Western campus in theory. However, they thought the estimation of students that would use the tool was overestimated because they were highly specialized item. He would have liked to see more of an education and outreach focus in the proposal. Potentially holding a class to teach students what the tools were, how to use them, what the data means and how to make changes to energy usage. As a general student they would not know where to start with this process so they would need more education. Choloupek said the team

had stated they would have trained staff to teach students on the spot. Lucia said if he didn't know how to use them they would not seek out the library to check them out. He would have liked to have seen outreach and education included. Lavallee said that it might have been beneficial to create YouTube videos for that education. He wanted to know if these tools were used in homes what would be the tangible impact of the knowledge. He wondered if students seek out the resource if it would only save a few dollars each month. Also stated it would be nice to have an itemized budget and an explanation of what would happen if the tool was stolen or lost. McBride said that the fund in the past stated it had been perceived more beneficial to be give the tools to faculty to utilize in their classroom, because it was a more directed impact with students. Winkelman said as an energy student they have used the tools in class. She stated that because energy was so cheap in Washington it would not be that beneficial for her to have made a change. There was a system already in place for students that were interested within the Energy Institute, with the professors. She didn't know if having a library and funding a student job would be necessary to reach a similar benefit. Lucia noted that a lot of the benefit of the proposal was giving the students the agency to realize they are in charge of their spending. The benefit was not exactly monetary but showing students that they can make positive change in their personal budget, and create a potential snowball effect. Goodnow stated the tool-lending library might be the gateway for students to analyze their energy use and the environmental impact of that usage and hopefully encourage action to reduce energy usage. Lavallee wondered if budget or lifestyle changes would come from the accessibility of the tools or would a student need the educational outreach to be successful, to show how it can be environmentally and fiscally beneficial. He asked if the committee could offer a smaller amount than requested by the proposal and then based on the usage of the tools could the committee provide more money down the line. McBride mentioned that more than half of the grant was student employment and promotion, so how do they look long term at paying for the student employee when the grant ends. The team should come back with how they will sustain this employee beyond the grant. Riopelle stated they thought the team was aware that the training was a big part of their budget and had looked at how they would need to turn into more operational in the long run. Gordon clarified that these two items would be brought back as action items the next week to be voted on. Gordon stated if the conceptual application is approved it just means the team would provide a more detailed application for the committee to review later.

Annie Gordon adjourned the meeting at 5:08 PM.