

Campus Sustainability Fund

Committee Meeting Minutes

December 6, 2013 - 11:25am - Gerbending 26

Agenda		
Time	Item	Presenter
11:25am	Approve 11/22 Minutes	Elizabeth
11:26am	Approve 12/6 Agenda	Elizabeth
11:27am	Discuss LOIs	Committee
12:23pm	Wrap Up, Next Week's Agenda, Adjourn	Elizabeth

1) Discuss LOIs

a) Biodiesel Coop—PASS TO FULL PROPOSAL

- i) Large ask, limits who else can give money to
- ii) Can't pay for UW staff (self-imposed rule)...but can pass with contingent
- iii) One phase of ongoing project, just wanted to see future phases, and match
- iv) Question was more about quality of biodiesel: any discussion if the fleet would actually be willing to use it as compared to stuff getting from OR? Check for confirmation that the fleet would still be on board for sourcing from them.
- v) Where exactly will this be located on campus? Somewhere where closer to kitchens so people will walk by a lot or totally of campus? Also would many see it? [near Transportation fleet, across from UW]
 - (1) Promote as lab space, needs to be accessible to students. Helpful for tours, classes. If something to support, should be on main campus more.
- vi) History of their having interactions with environmental health and safety...where do they stand?
- vii) Do they have other groups to help fund them as well? High ask, but good, and much will be benefited from this.
- viii) Selling it back for profit or just to cover costs? How is this lab sustainable? How will they select students to help and keep them coming back so this doesn't just die?

b) UW Tree Inventory—NOT PASSED

- i) More expensive more area they cover, maybe set some parameters so we know?
- ii) Seemed this was focused on certain interest groups. How will it impact the greater campus community? Important task, but what will having this technology to help benefit campus?
 - (1) Nothing really tangible to off-set cost.
 - (2) Good to document this data, though.

- iii) Since more research-oriented thing, should be other sources of funding, not student money
- iv) Primary contact submitted two LOIs, would rather see one GOOD proposal [they also did restoration of SEFS; also funded other projects, and have outstanding funds. Nothing against giving more while they still have some]
- v) Only half for software, other was paying students lots of money. Student component, and educational components was weak.
- vi) Only thing of merit was that it could possibly leverage UW to apply for tree campus. Within scope of something that they want to do in the future.
 - (1) We are a tree campus and have been for several years.
 - (2) Inventoried and tagged in a campus
- vii) How much are all involved groups working together?
- viii) Red flag: salary level is not within acceptable ranges of hourly rate of employees
- c) UW FARM Mercer Court—NOT PASSED
 - i) Funded already in past
 - ii) Good hands-on benefits for students. Getting as many students involved would be great.
 - (1) Lots of mentors in place so they seem to know what they are doing
 - iii) Want to hear what the lifespan of the irrigation system is, to know the longevity.
 - iv) Both greenhouse and this are strong, but which one do we want? Collectively lots of money for one group.
 - (1) If toying with fund one and not the other, mercer court items are already there; greenhouse comes with irrigation system
 - (2) May be stronger to fund the greenhouse, b/c mercer court farm is currently being watered by students anyway. Mostly about not wanting to water things by hand.
 - v) See some kind of match would make them more competitive
- d) UW Farm Greenhouse--YES
 - i) Budget questions: difference between kit and supplies? Aren't they using \$4000 to build greenhouse?
 - (1) How did they choose the specific kit? What are the potential alternatives, that is, what made this the best one?
 - ii) Assuming monthly cost, electricity/water/etc. do they have a separate fund to pay for that?
 - (1) Greenhouse manager that funds will be paid for?
 - iii) When we funded the botany greenhouse, there were already some plans to rebuild it. Same idea here?...
 - iv) How are they leveling the area? Who is doing that? How are they connecting to the electrical/water pipes?
 - v) Seeing some kind of match would make them more competitive
 - (1) HFS will be benefiting from this, maybe they can help a little?
- e) Zero Center—NOT PASSED
 - i) Lot of fluff, no hard facts or data.

- ii) Structure itself was ambiguous, where would the money go?
 - (1) At the end, just had \$50,000
- iii) Could rent a locker overnight and charge your things, but would worry if your belongings are safe
 - (1) But need these things to do homework and such....
 - (2) Who would leave their items overnight?
 - (3) Pair with renting center and how rent out laptops?
- iv) Want it to be a catalyst to aim for net-zero campus policies.
 - (1) Put money in all buildings to do it themselves?
- v) Lower school's average emissions..but only by adding a zero-net building...
- vi) Did like online storage library for sustainable ideas, but CSF kind of does that already.
 - (1) Maybe online we could have something where students could submit their sustainability projects
 - (2) Collaboration was interesting
- vii) Most nervous about budget because it wasn't explained at all. Skeptical could make net-zero building for \$50,000.
 - (1) Location issue was biggest problem with this
 - (2) Sites not set or confirmed, so high possibility could fall through
- viii) If they had answers to all these questions, would love to see full proposal, because it IS a good idea
 - (a) Don't make it seem like it would be practical. Not sure on background of this, if they have any sponsors
- ix) This group also applied for Green Seed Fund, and have a much better flushed out proposal, which doesn't help us much....
 - (1) Relying heavily on us for funds, \$250,000 total budget.
 - (2) There is a bigger picture!
 - (3) They should have mentioned it....
- x) We like this conceptually but as an LOI it was not detailed enough.
- f) By George Recycling—NOT PASSED
 - i) Already have bins and signage, would like to know how much is not diverted?
 - ii) How important is to change the system that is already there? Whole back portion is now closed, now mostly HUB.
 - (1) HFS is redoing that back space entirely; will be VERY different from before (??)
 - iii) So will this matter?
 - iv) Smaller number as compared to other, but 6 bins for \$1000 each?
 - (1) Same ones in the new stadium
 - v) Concern: one student doing project, involve more students??
 - (1) Especially interviewing lots of people?
 - (2) Two different approaches: physical survey, and visual waste audits
 - (a) Can visual waste audits do the same as a survey?
 - (3) Better coupled with process of the changes to By George?
 - (a) Assessment is invalid once it is re-done?

- vi) If want to put in bins, HFS will buy own or get someone like us to pay for it. LOI is about saying if we want to SEE it happen or not, not to say if it is feasible or not. Send them to get information if we want.
- vii) Don't understand necessity of getting these different, expensive bins. Even if he/she is going to do a waste audit and talk to people, would want to do that for current bins before changing the system. No way to compare that.
- viii) Pointing to stadium for doing better, but different ideas behind it.
 - (1) Different comparison, people in a rush to get to class vs. mix of people from on/off campus; no rush
- g) SER-UW Pathways—NOT PASSED
 - i) Completing restoration area, adding art
 - ii) Like Kincaid ravine project, would want to diversity of project?
 - iii) What are they spending \$7000 on?
 - iv) Near Denny Field and tennis courts
 - v) Good idea, not good time and placement
 - (1) Loud, tennis balls hitting your head (when restoring found lots of tennis balls)
- 2) Meeting again Noon next Thursday to finish discussions!