Committee Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, April 7, 2015
3:30-4:30 pm
University Center, SGA Office
Voting Committee Attendees: Zack Waldroup, Emily Moore, Jill Duffner, Adam Pharr, Jill Dufner, Julian Jones and Emily Ranson
Non-Voting Committee Attendees: Lauren Bishop, Adam Cometti, Lee Smith, David King, Jennifer Cooper, and Andy Coburn

- Thoughts, Questions, and Comments Regarding proposals
  - Nature Based Sculpture (NBS)
  - Electron Garden on the Green (EGG)

- Emily Moore – NBS: Score – 88 she thought the project was more educational driven than environmentally driven. EGG: - 95 energy savings were a big plus, however, concerned with the implementation strategy and non-understanding completely of the sustainability of the project.

- Zack Waldroup – NBS: Score – 89 The project is unique and aesthetically appealing to our culture and history. It also seems to have strong leadership from and accredited artist. However, concerns regarding funding after the closed loop structures have degraded to build more structures are present. Not exactly what was envisioned as a project for this fund but he would still like to see the project happen. EGG: 89 The long lifetime is a plus along with the addition of the garden which goes beyond the initial scope of the project. Concerns were due to the placement of the project and how the proposing group planned to make the project more aesthetically appealing.

- Lauren – stated that there is enough funding for both projects.
- Emily Ranson – NBS: 68 She wanted a lot more information and noted a few possible additions to the proposal form for clarification. She was concerned in a gap of funds and where the money was going. Questions of estimated timeline and of PR and marketing also arose. EGG: 73 Payback over time was a large concern.
- David– Clarified that due to low cost of energy here that an actual payback was unreasonable.
- Emily R – stated that it would be a good idea to help applicants tailor proposal for executive function after SEI approval.
- Julian – concerns over the durability of panels in regards to recreational activities that take place in the proposed site of the EGG. Footballs, Frisbees, etc.
- Jill – though both projects were great but the EGG is more towards what she envisioned for the committee. A question of upkeep in regards to the NBS. Statement was made stating how green energy projects make us look responsible and sends us in a direction in which we want to go. NBS: 80 EGG: 82
- Emily M – Question of continuation of program (NBS) after degradation of closed loop
- Jennifer – EGG – good technical information but would like to have seen a budget. Location is also important. EGG matches her vision of the direction of this committee and she likes the aspect of the integrated garden. Concerns with the short life of the NBS.
- David – concerns with the looks of the NBS half way to ¾ of the way through its lifetime. EGG – concerned with detail and wants more information.
- Julian – rehashed same concerns and how the EGG is more to what we are looking for. EGG: 79 NBS: 67
- Zack – wanted a clarification on reapplication status of projects that do receive SEI funding. For example, if the NBS did receive funding could they reapply later for more funding? If so would there be a time restriction on reapplication? Matter to be determined at a later meeting.
- Lee – what is the environmental impact of building the EGG. How much greenhouse gases are produced in making the materials and building the structure. Proposal of adding that aspect to the proposal application form.
- Adam C – rehashed and stated that it is important that we delegate someone to be in direct contact with the proposal groups for help. NBS: 81 EGG: 87
- Zack – motion to shortlist both projects
- Adam P – seconds motion
- Adam C – all in favor
- Motion passed 7-7, meeting adjourned.