



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

Wednesday, March 14th, 2018

5:00 PM

VU567

**Members:**

**Present:** Annie Gordon (ASVP for Student Life), Kate Rayner Fried (AS Sustainable Action Fund Education Coordinator), Johnathan Riopelle (AS Sustainable Action Fund Grant Program Coordinator), Katie Winkelman (AS ESP Director), Spiro Pappas (Sustainable Action Fund Projects Coordinator), Scott Dorough (Campus Energy Manager), Crow Chloupek (Student at Large) and Pauline Mogilevsky (Student at Large).

**Absent:**

**Advisor:** Greg McBride

**Secretary:** Chloe Callahan

**Guests:** Hanna Bridgham

**Motions:**

- SAF-18-W-22 Approval of the minutes for March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2018. **Passed.**
- SAF-18-W-23 Approval of moving the Majora Carter final application from an information item to an action item. **Passed.**
- SAF-18-W-24 Approval of the Majora Carter final application. **Passed.**
- SAF-18-W-25 Approval of the Eco-Shuttle conceptual application from an information item to an action item. **Passed.**
- SAF-18-W-26 Approval of the Eco-Shuttle conceptual application. **Not Passed.**
- SAF-18-W-27 Approval of the H2O Flow conceptual application. **Passed.**
- SAF-18-W-28 Approval of the Tap the Tap conceptual application. **Passed.**

**Annie Gordon called the meeting to order at 5:02 PM.**

**I. Introductions**

**II. Approval of the Minutes**

**a. March 7<sup>th</sup>**

**MOTION: SAF-18-W-22 by Chloupek**

Approval of the minutes for March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

Second: Mogilevsky Vote: 5-0-0 Action: **Passed**

**III. Information Items**

**a. Majora Carter final application**

Bridgham said the general plan was to fly Majora Carter in for Earth Day weekend. The event would incorporate 5 aspects, one of which would be a speaker series where Majora Carter would be the keynote speaker, with her talk on hometown security. She said the entire event had a lens of community and that was why the ESP had picked Majora Carter. She mentioned Majora would be in Bellingham for a few days because they wanted her to be involved in class raps, environmental

club leader dinner, workshops and one more activity if time. She said they were requesting \$11,500 from SAF for support in this event. Winkelman said they had started to work with the PC to get a rough outline of the promotional plan. She mentioned that Huxley College of the Environment, the Office of Sustainability and environmental clubs on campus would be stakeholders of the event. She asked if anyone had any other concerns about the grant proposal. Dorough applauded Brigham for her working in getting outside funding. Winkelman asked if it was possible to vote on the final application that evening. Gordon felt that the committee had seen the application enough to move it to an action item that meeting. Rayner-Fried felt that the documents had been up long enough for students to review and thought the committee could vote.

***MOTION: SAF-18-W-23 by Chloupek***

Approval of moving the Majora Carter final application from an information item to an action item.

Second: Mogilevsky Vote: 5-0-0 Action: ***Passed***

***MOTION: SAF-18-W-24 by Chloupek***

Approval of the Majora Carter final application.

Second: Mogilevsky Vote: 4-0-1 Action: ***Passed***

**b. Sustainability Period conceptual application**

Chloupek felt the only pieces the group had changed were the date they planned to use the bus. They felt it did not address the concerns about using accessibility as a buzz word and whether or not the SAF was the best source of funding. Winkelman mentioned how there were already similar programs and thought the project would only be useful for a year while the students were at the university, but would have to be operationalized in the Outdoor Center. Gordon felt there was a lot of liability within this grant and didn't feel comfortable moving it forward at that time. She recognized that a similar program was in place and it might not be a good use of student funds to recreate a similar program. She thought the group needed to be clear on whether or not they wanted to be an accessible opportunities service or a shuttle service. Winkelman pointed out a few points she felt were missing from the proposal budget: maintenance, repairs, insurance and an employee to plan the adventures and drive the bus. Pappas said they had sent the group a list of feedback and if the group had not addressed the feedback then they should not move forward. Riopelle noted that there was a lot of work that occurred between the conceptual application and the final application. The committee had to decide if they thought it would fit the values of the SAF. Riopelle thought all the feedback questions could not be answered within the conceptual application. Winkelman had wondered whether the proposal was an added benefit to students when there were many programs that already did the same thing (shuttling, excursions, microadventures, etc). She was worried that it did not address the structural problems within the proposal. Alexander said he saw a program that would end up costing \$50,000 + a year once operationalized. Dorough thought it was odd that the SAF would fund a conventional fuel vehicle.

***MOTION: SAF-18-W-25 by Winkelman***

Approval of the Eco-Shuttle conceptual application from an information item to an action item.

Second: Chloupek                      Vote: 5-0-0      Action: ***Passed***

***MOTION: SAF-18-W-26 by Chloupek***

Approval of the Eco-Shuttle conceptual application.

Second: Winkelman                      Vote: 0-5-0      Action: ***Not Passed***

**IV. Action Item**

**a. H2O Flow conceptual application**

Gordon recapped that the application was looking at replacing indoor water fountains with water bottle refill stations. Winkelman wondered with the similar application whether indoor or outdoor stations were more necessary. Winkelman wondered the advantage to an outside fountain versus an indoor fountain. Pappas said this application had been looking at an indoor and outdoor application. He reminded the group to try to look at the applications as two separate entities instead of comparing them. Winkelman said she felt fine funding both applications, but wanted to make sure they were reaching the most students. Pappas said the H2O Flow application would be honing in on replacing low use or non-functioning water fountains with the water bottle refill stations. He felt the Tap the Tap mentioned a water bottle refill station mentioned a model that would be accessible and included a dog water bowl. Dorrough asked about freeze protection in the outdoor water stations during winter time. Pappas thought the group had asked the manufacturers those questions when looking at water bottle refill station models. Gordon noted that adding a water bottle refill station would have a focus of making it more convenient for students and wondered if that was what the SAF wanted to spend their money on. Alexander asked if the groups knew how the water bottle refill stations would be operationalized. The committee stated that the group was not able to address that yet. Gordon refocused the group and asked whether or not they thought the applications aligned with the SAF values. She said that the argument could be made that the SAF had already spent money on a water bottle refill station and from that perspective it should be operationalized by the university. Pappas brought up that in the outdoor stations, there was a need for more frequent filter replacement. Dorrough noted the freeze issues, running plumbing costs and vandalism issues that an outdoor station would encounter. He felt an indoor station would be more reasonable. Riopelle said the installation costs were estimates from a 2016 previous conceptual application asking for 4 outdoor stations. He thought the Tap the Tap application was very similar to the previous one and in fact had the same advisor.

Riopelle mentioned that the group had used the Bicycle repair station at Western as a case study and that those stations had not been vandalized much.

***MOTION: SAF-18-W-27 by Winkelman***

Approval of the H2O Flow conceptual application.

Second: Mogilevsky                      Vote: 5-0-0      Action: ***Passed***

**b. Tap the Tap Outdoor Water Refill Station conceptual application**

***MOTION: SAF-18-W-28 by Winkelman***

Approval of the Tap the Tap conceptual application.

Second: Chloupek Vote: 4-1-0 Action: ***Passed***

***Annie Gordon adjourned the meeting at 5:48 PM.***