

## Campus Sustainability Fund

### Committee Meeting Agenda

Monday May 5, 2014 – 4:30pm – Husky Union Building 238

Agenda		
Time	Item	Presenter
4:30pm	Approve Minutes from 4/28/2014	Elizabeth
4:31pm	Approve Agenda for 5/5/2014	Elizabeth
4:37pm	5 <sup>TH</sup> Year Celebration with CSF	Graham
4:43pm	Discuss Project Proposals	Committee
5:28pm	Wrap Up, Next Week's Agenda Items, Adjourn	Elizabeth

- 1) Approve 4/28/2014 Minutes—APPROVED
  - a) Graham will add what the ?? are (75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of...)
- 2) Approve 5/5/2014 Agenda—APPROVED
- 3) 5<sup>th</sup> Year Celebration with CSF
  - a) Need help with:
    - i) Program elements
    - ii) Menu-related items—UW Club is providing menu and facility fees, or Bay Laurel and rental for some place. But the former has more options ☺
  - b) Email Graham when you can come in and help!
    - i) Considerations of “this vs that” given constraints
    - ii) Thursday 12:30-2:30 or Monday 12<sup>th</sup> from 11 to 4
  - c) Getting money from ESS (hopefully)—Sean will talk to Claudia about it ☺
    - i) This will be a recognition event, where certain parties who helped us will be thanked!
    - ii) Combination of people who originated CSF, people of projects who have gone well
  - d) Teos will “hit up [her] buddy Jay” (nope...sadly....)
- 4) Discuss Project Proposals
  - a) Sustainable Stormwaters
    - i) Finally gave it the right note/title of an assessment than for a project
    - ii) Showed good example of how it is an issue and how this can open more doors to make this happen
    - iii) Many components of UW that this position would help ground
    - iv) Broader scope than before, but has the capability to have a stronger impact for campus as a whole. Reconsideration of it was well timed.
    - v) Not really sure what the RSO would do; question was not really answered via email
    - vi) Presentation “this is the project, this is the intern”. Seems like person who is coordinator is the head of RSO. Working through and with RSO, instead of really branching out
      - (1) People who are interested will show up to meetings

- (2) If there are people who are interested in creating an RSO, then why doesn't an RSO start?
- (3) Once the RSO is started, maybe a project can form from it, instead of the other way around
- vii) Site designs—coordinator makes designs, wouldn't people who are stepping up to do such a project want to create such designs?
- viii) The purpose of this project seems to be the feasibility study, and the RSO could do it with help from our \$\$
- ix) If feasibility comes forward with coming forward with ideas, wouldn't be bad either
- x) Original group that proposed Sustainability Stormwater in N5 would be the RSO, who would help do the job of the coordinator?
  - (1) Split because this is the same group of people,
  - (2) Give outreach potential
- xi) If pass this, would feel more comfortable adding a component of need to work with faculty—since they are also so excited about it, want this position to happen, bring it all together!
- xii) Feel like paying people to coordinate people to do things, not really do much. Have strong faculty backing.
  - (1) Sounds like someone's capstone project
  - (2) Feel we should table at least for today, until we can clear conditions made, or talking to the group about what they envision
- xiii) Our questions:
  - (1) Why is it necessary to have a coordinator of an RSO, when RSOs usually get started by like-minded people wanting to change something?
    - (a) Break-down of how the 20 hours will be spent per week
  - (2) How will the RSO and feasibility study work?
  - (3) How will the RSO and coordinator interact?
  - (4) How will this project change if we reduced the amount of funding?
  - (5) Since SEFS is backing this project, does the budget for the RA assume it is a full tuition waiver [graduate vs undergraduate], or would SEFS have to pay it? What is Tuition A?
  - (6) On the timeline in the full proposal, please specify for each task if it is the coordinator, RSO, or both doing it.
- b) SEFS Restoration
  - i) The emails from Kristine Kenney and Howard Nakase contained strong words, and very much changes my mind about the whole thing!
    - (1) Is this really a project that identifies a solution to a sustainability concern on campus?
      - (a) No limbs have fallen; sets out more like a graduate research project, which is more for the Green Seed Fund
      - (b) Like the restoration aspect of it
    - (2) Long term maintenance—he was hoping to develop course-work from it, try new techniques, hopes to become a professor and watch over it, could use it as a lab. Would place a foothold in his future hear
      - (a) Would take years and years and years to see return, if any

- (b) Most projects we have contain tangible results, or at least bring some information from it
- (c) Same way, the land is changing, is this money well-spent?
- (d) If he doesn't become the professor, seems like Grounds will be working on making sure this continues to look good. So many weeds that could potentially grow ("large weed reserve")
- (e) Because this is a specific approach to restoration, there is no partial way to do this project, it seems
- (3) Can the trees be trimmed for maximum old growth and not clear all the ivy and put all the cuttings from the ground
  - (a) Is there a permitting issue?....
  - (b) Don't feel like we know enough about tree pruning to say anything
- (4) What would it look like in the interim phase? People might think, "Why would they pay to make it look bad?" But then we would need more signage on why this is happening
  - (a) Safety hazard, beauty?....
- (5) It is infinitely better than last time, but not sure if it is exactly where we want it to be to fund it
  - (a) Want to give the project the benefit of the doubt, but uncomfortable to say yes
- ii) Like restoration idea, but not really any student involvement ways.
- iii) Would not be comfortable moving/we cannot move forward without Kristine Kenney and Howard Nakase's support
- c) Digital Apiary
  - i) Like fact focus on bees, since haven't seen yet
    - (1) Tracking bee colonies would be cool, esp if hive has cool design.
      - (a) Smart Citizen in hive would be interesting to see
      - (b) Feel like two things are disconnected. Bee population wouldn't effect ie nitrogen levels, other way around
      - (c) But could see what conditions are best for bees
    - (2) Other Smart Citizen components are not strong enough, and presentation didn't say anything on why it is good/necessary
      - (a) No real focus on why, if anyone would use it
      - (b) Said could make it inconspicuous, but rather want it to be obvious
      - (c) Feel like too many sensors in too many one place. Need much larger area to compare. Better to compare
  - ii) Figure out what is happening with Bee Club, or the Beekeeper Association
  - iii) For amount of information from having the sensors, there weren't any tangible pay offs—maybe reach out and ask people, if they had this information, what would they do with it?
    - (1) Didn't interact with groups that wanted it
    - (2) If nail down groups and come back to us with list/letters of support, would feel more comfortable re-looking at it
    - (3) Primary focus being UW groups
  - iv) If you had less money, what would you do with it?—revised budget without the Smart Sensors

- v) Do you have any UW student/faculty/staff letters of support? Not just from someone not on campus?
  - vi) This project is \$6000+ more than the other two combined...what changed?
  - vii) Hive maintenance per season is \$150 for 2...is someone being paid to do this?  
Or how is this being broken up?
  - viii) What happens if you don't get funded?
- 5) Wrap Up, Next Week's Agenda Items
  - 6) Adjourn ~5:34 PM~
    - a) Good work team! Be ready for more fun next week!
    - b) Thanks Elizabeth for bringing Chex Mix!