



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

Friday, May 4th, 2018

9:00 AM

VU 460

**Members:**

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

*Absent:*

*Advisor: Greg McBride*

*Secretary: Chloe Callahan*

*Guests: Gwen Lamed. Patrick Shive, Aden Nevier*

**Motions:**

**SAF-18-S-7** Approval of the minutes from April 27<sup>th</sup> 2018. *Passed.*

*Annie Gordon called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM.*

**I. Approval of the Minutes**

**a. April 27<sup>th</sup>**

*MOTION: SAF-18-S-4 by Chloupek*

Approval of the minutes from April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

Second: Winkelman Vote: 6-0-0 Action: *Passed*

**II. Information Item**

**a. Future Waste at Western final application**

Lamed shared that this grant would continue to add more Big Belly Waste station on campus. She shared that these stations were really taking off in big cities around the country. These stations compact the waste and report back to facilities when they are full, reducing the amount of time and money spent emptying the bins. She noted they could add signage on the sides of the bins to discuss how to sort your waste and advertise what was compostable. She said the bins would mn along the whole campus and would set the mood on how Western's campus respected waste. She said the grant had increase a little since the conceptual due to advertising and incorporating taxes. Winkelman asked if Lamed had started to communicate with Facilities Management. Lamed said she had talked with the Facilities Management manager and confirmed with him that he was on board for this change. She also added the timeline for implementation; if the grant was approved this quarter, then they would be able to implement the station this summer and have a huge advertising boost in the fall. Mogilevsky asked if they would be replacing the current trash bins. Lamed said yes they would be the only outside bins on campus and would replace all 30 trash bins currently in place.

**b. Tool Lending Library final application**

They were basing their project off the NW Energy Efficient Council in Seattle. They were hoping to build professional development, easy, efficient way to empower students, useful for students, courses and other university purposes. The team was working with Institute for Energy Studies (IES) and SBC to purchase the tools. The tool lending library would be student run and the upkeep and staffing would be done by the IES. They would use the SMATE stockroom to store the tools and would post the available tools on the SMATE website. They stated that at the time students were looking for some of these tools that would be in the Lending Library, for their class projects. They created a survey for students to evaluate whether or not they wanted the Tool Lending Library on campus. The results, of the 14 person studied, showed that the majority would like to see the library on campus. The important concern the team had was making sure people were utilizing the tools. They planned to reach out quarterly to make sure use of the tools was consistent. They would ask students to self-report their experience with the tools. The team wanted to set up the tool lending library over the summer so that the minute students come on to campus in the fall they would be aware of these tools. Dorough asked if they had any matching funds for this project and they said no. Riopelle asked what happened if a tool disappeared. The team said they would have accountability set in place, such as fees to rent out the tools. Winkelman mentioned that ATUS required people to go through training for some of the expensive equipment and suggested the team look into something similar. Gordon asked why students were charged \$60 to utilize one of the tools. The team said it was for the purpose of security. They said they would work with students in the IES to create training videos on how to use those tools and link them on the SMATE websites. Dorough asked about how the project would be operationalized for the future. They said it would be the job of the student employee to check the status of the tools. McBride noted that the student position was only for one year and asked what would happen after that. The team said they would work with the IES to operationalize the employee and if they could not the team would come back for another grant.

**III. Action Items**

**a. Campus Community Collaborative with Sustainability conceptual application**

Gordon thought it was great to hear from students that had a good experience and wanted to bring that opportunity to more students. Winkelman liked the focus on connecting the students to the community. She thought it was a good program that would help build relationships with the community partners. Rayner Fried said they had reached out to the partners and already laid the ground work for the project to be successful. Winkelman mentioned how she thought it was fine to pay the student \$ 14/hour if the fee had the capacity to do so. Riopelle asked what standard of employee payment the SAF wanted to hold. Winkelman felt it varied project to project. Gordon felt they didn't have enough knowledge on the proper level of payment and felt more comfortable if the group presenting did the research on what a fair wage was. Winkelman felt it was fine for the SAF to not follow the Western HR standard of employee brackets. McBride stated the HR standards provided a range of duty for the type of work, and some of those standards were already set. It might be the responsibility of the team applying for the grant to look

at the range and state that the job falls within a specific range. LaVallee wondered with hourly employees if they would acquire sick leave or if this position was stipend. He wondered about how the hiring process would work.

***MOTION: SAF-18-S-4 by Winkelman***

Approval of the Campus Community Collaborative for Sustainability conceptual application.

Second: Mogilevsky Vote: 6-0-0 Action: ***Passed***

**b. Supporting All Menstruators final application**

Gordon stated they felt pretty confident in this project. Riopelle stated this project was a pretty low cost at around \$14,000.

***MOTION: SAF-18-S-4 by Winkelman***

Approval of the Supporting All Menstruators final application.

Second: Mogilevsky Vote: 5-0-1 Action: ***Passed***

**IV. Consent Items**

**a. Small Grant approvals**

**i. Oceans in Our Blood**

**ii. Cold Water Saves**

Riopelle said Oceans in Our Blood brought two indigenous poets of Oceania on campus to speak to classes and host an evening event. The event was in collaboration with UC Berkley and University of Washington. The SAF provide \$1,500 of the total cost, and the department was able to find other funding for the rest. The Cold Water Saves grant was less than \$600 grant. This grant provided means to print large scale posters that would be laminated and put in all the laundry rooms on campus to show what the change from hot water to cold water could do. The individual would be looking at doing a larger grant somewhere down the line.

***MOTION: SAF-18-S-4 by Winkelman***

Approval of the consent items

Second: Dorrough Vote: 6-0-0 Action: ***Passed***

***Annie Gordon adjourned the meeting at 9:42 AM.***