

Campus Sustainability Fund

Committee Meeting Agenda

February 20, 2014 - 4:40pm- Gerbending 142

Agenda		
Time	Item	Presenter
4:30pm	Approve 2/10/14 Minutes	Elizabeth
4:30pm	Approve 2/20/14 Agenda	Elizabeth
4:31pm	Budget Subcommittee Report and Discussion on SAF Ask	Alissa/Elizabeth/Kayla
4:37pm	Discuss Project Proposals	Committee
5:27pm	Wrap Up, Adjourn, Addition's for Next Week's Agenda	Elizabeth

- 1) 2/10/14 Minutes APPROVED
- 2) 2/20/14 Agenda APPROVED
- 3) Project Discussion
 - a) Green Liver
 - i) Didn't like that they were still in their feasibility study
 - (1) Current location will be remodeled within the next few years (potentially)
 - (2) No concrete location is iffy
 - ii) \$2000 extra for the Ribbon-Cutting was iffy
 - iii) Like the idea, but from LOI to now it was still vague and no people that were for sure talked to that we could see from the Proposal
 - iv) No letter of recommendation for Kristine Kenny (as we could see)
 - (1) She has reservations for how rain gardens are implemented on campus—Patrick
 - v) Feel uncomfortable if they haven't talked to key stakeholders and don't have a concrete timeline
 - vi) Would perhaps entertain their Feasibility Study
 - vii) Learned a lot from the HSS issues
 - viii) Too many variables that is unknown with this project to make it a good one to fund for this much
 - ix) Maybe entertain seeing this in the next phase of LOIs, but it would need to be worked out much more
 - (1) Next deadline is only 2 weeks though....quick turn-around to make it worth our while ><
 - (2) Give our concerns to make it more concrete before they come back
 - (3) At this point if they don't have the major parts under way to make it happen....

- (4) Might be strategic to do a feasibility study, for there WILL be rain garden-asks in the future
 - (a) Future applications could use
 - (b) More practical to create an LOI for a feasibility study in 2 weeks than a whole new project
- (5) Encourage to diversify their team
 - (a) Get more Undergraduates!
- (6) What is the actual cost to put IN the rain garden?
 - (a) In a feasibility study, would want to see different variations
 - (i) Ie just a rain garden, then with monitoring systems, etc.
 - (ii) In 5 years, add something new [ie the monitoring system]
- b) Green Wall
 - i) Would be uncomfortable to say yes to this if they don't have a letter of recommendation from a group that would help in maintenance next year
 - ii) Partial funding?
 - (1) [Like idea of signage, but would need to get approval from the staff of the Dean's office of the College of the Environments....iffy they don't have it yet]
 - (2) Haven't heard much support of the tank's water level
 - (a) Never talked about the heat belt, so that was sudden
 - (b) Never said that it WAS necessary, but answers to our questions make it seem like it really is
 - (c) [which begs the question...IS all this really necessary?]
 - (3) Other issue with monitoring that it is critical to maintain the site as facilities takes over...but again no letter of support.
 - (a) In their favor, Howard is difficult to get ahold of.
 - (4) They didn't say that if they don't get the CSF funding, would that affect their Green Seed Fund money
 - (a) Bulk of their money from the Green Seed Fund, based on a question previously, was for the monitoring, and our money would be for looks
 - (b) IF we don't fund them, shouldn't be too difficult to tack on their water level to their Green Seed Fund money
 - (5) Committee has never said that we won't fund them unless we get the letters of recommendation, but it would work!
 - (a) But encourage future projects to get such letters so it doesn't happen again
 - (b) Maybe can say they can start working on the bird perches, signs close to the Wall, but keep things that are in a similar vein together (ie all signage)
 - (i) Maybe it is cheaper to get all signs at once?
 - (c) Dean is not necessarily the person, but they do need Grounds and Facilities for some of the signs
 - (d) Incentive to get all these forms in....
- c) SER UW Restoration

- i) Surprised to see if they cut down funding, they said they wouldn't buy tools
 - (1) It wasn't that they were cutting specific things, they took half of everything-ish, instead of prioritizing certain aspects
 - (2) But at the same time, with that in mind could they really get a good product from that, instead of channeling their efforts into a specific things
 - (3) Would also rely more on volunteers, to change from restoration to trail-building
 - (a) Though like they still want to get their work done
 - ii) Looks like they didn't really ask other groups before they chose Earth Corps, which is why we are waiting on only one other group on an ask
 - (1) Ie when looking for a place for the cheapest, best auto fix, you look at different places.
 - iii) There is a lot of foot traffic ("clearly non-UW"), and it is an area to hid illegal activity, so it would be good to clear it out
 - (1) But even though there is foot traffic, that doesn't necessarily mean people would stop and utilize the area
 - iv) Anecdote: Great to see transformation, brings people together
 - (1) But in terms of plans for where they want funding to go, still need a little more persuasion
 - v) Not crazy about funding speakers or food/drink that could go to restoration
 - (1) Do like idea that engages a hands-on group
 - (2) Really like art into the benches
 - (a) Big lack in incorporating art into other groups!
 - vi) If only half-fund, not necessarily good in longevity of site
 - (1) More in favor of not food/beverages, but could be talked out of speaker series
 - (a) Need to think about precedent...if fund speaker series here, could be asked later to do a series again later
 - (2) Just because don't give money, doesn't mean they can't do it
 - (a) Speakers can be found for free
 - (i) EVEN THEMSELVES who are good speakers, it seems, and have been with this project since the beginning
 - (ii) Even other students not involved specifically, perhaps
 - (iii) Or some professor who likes this project, is involved, etc.
- d) Greenhouse
- i) Seems like they tried to make their proposal their best in terms of the least amount of money they could use. Probably most prepared [even cents in their budget!].
 - (1) Their takes in reductions would means they would not be happy
 - (a) Obviously, as they are passionate in their project 😊
 - (2) Doing a great job in being sustainable!
 - (a) Went above and beyond to make sure they were doing so

(3) Yet interesting that they didn't cut out the intern and just make it volunteer works, which could make this good ☺

(a) Incentive to have someone come in

(i) But then again...do they need to incentivize someone? So many people in UW Farm!!!!

(ii) They know they are being paid, that they are responsible for it, so more work [assumption!] would be done

(iii) Is important, even if they didn't make it seem as such

(b) They didn't really make it seem that important in their presentation that the intern was necessary

(c) They seem so prepared, probably okay that they get their intern

(d) Only supposed to be for the first year

4) Move to adjourn

a) 5:32