**RELF Working Group**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday April 28th, 2010 3:00-4:00 UC 224**

**Members Present:** Robin Saha, Alex Zimmerman, Erica Bloom, Len Broberg

Patrick Rhea

**Members Not Present:** Jake Armstrong, Emily Schembra, Amanda Summers, Nick Bowman

**Visitors:** Cherie Peacock

|  |
| --- |
| **RELF Proposal Funding Decisions** |
| **BEAM Discussion:**   * The BEAM group strongly favors Lucid. They presented a side by side comparison for Lucid and Noveda. Lucid is less expensive at $17,327 and Noveda is $26,373. * Behavior change component of the system—teaching dorm residents about the systems could be part of Eco-Reps job description at orientations and throughout the year. * Alex talked to Lucid this week.   - Lucid launched a new system with new applications. Lucid starter package could be upgradable this Fall. Could configure raw data in new ways.  -Alex things Lucid is comparable to Noveda. He likes Lucid from a facilities point of view, but students and staff might not be as interested in this data.   * This budget is too big to fit into the educational part of the budget. Lens think it should be a hyrbid of some sort in order to convince administration and students that it is a loan fund and the fund is not losing money. * BEAM thinks it could work as a payback system. Rosi Keller could negotiate with dorms and see how and if they could payback. But the committee needs to provide direction for the meeting between dorms and proposal groups. A contract would need to be ironed out. * **Vote:** 3 people voted in favor to approve amended BEAM proposal for $17,327 for Lucid Technologies energy monitoring system in Jesse Hall and Aber Hall, as per amended proposal (with 2 additional years of software hosting service and maintenance fees), with the caveat that Resident Life will be asked to payback half of the grant ($8,665.50) in three years, otherwise RELF will fund the project for two years total, i.e., for only one additional year. * **Explanation**: We cannot fund the full project as an educational grant.  Those projects can only total $15,000 for this budget cycle.   Annual service and maintenance charges for the Lucid system are $2000, so funding for one less year, two years total, would bring the total budget to nearly within our cap (to $15,327).  The presumption is that Resident Life would fund the amount above our cap.   **Genuine Draft Discussion:**   * The group only amended their budget to include one metering system for one AC hour meters. We don’t know who would read it and put it in. They needed two meters for AC and two for lighting dataloggers. * Alex thinks their energy savings looks solid.   **Vote:** 3 people voted to approve $2,250 for laundry room fan heat-switch, motion-activated light sensors, and installation costs in Jesse Hall and Aber Hall, with addition of 2 AC Hour Meters and 2 Light On/Off Dataloggers.  **Explanation:**  Genuine Draft was asked to research energy monitoring for this project.  That equipment added a few hundred dollars to the project cost.   The project has an approximate 3 ½ year payback, which will be negotiated with Resident Life.  **Operation Clean Laundry Discussion:**   * The group amended their proposal to include more information on energy savings from residential household. Made a good case that there would be energy savings in the dorms, but did not provide hard data on energy costs in the dorms. * The models in the dorms stopped being made in 2000. * This could be upgraded to more dorms if Res. Life sees fit.   **Vote:** 2 people voted to approve the project for $10,400 to replace 16 washing machines in Jesse and Aber. 1 person abstained voting.  **Explanation**: The project proposer provided some additional information and made a better case for there being substantial energy saving but still did not provide hard data based on energy costs to UM, granted that is difficult for washing machines that use electricity and hot water.  Like other projects, payback will need to be negotiated**.**  **UM FLAT Prius Effect Discussion:**     * At the last meeting the group asked what the educational value of this system is. Derek spoke to this. Saying it is a model for education and other groups. * Would approach the provost for energy savings. * Can the FLAT show that the main building is resulting in energy savings?   **Vote:** 1 person voted, 2 absented to approve UM FLAT Proposal for $456 for energy monitoring system for second house.  **Explanation**: Educational and other values of project have been better identified to the satisfaction of committee members.  All proposals passed through the committee, still waiting to get votes from members not present. |
| **RELF Future Proposals** |
| * The committee only used less than half of the funds. * One suggestion is that an intern under facilities services could propose projects and get other buildings involved. * We need to revise the application forms. * The committee can contact professors in COT, business department, and Economics. * Alex can submit a list of descriptions of projects he has and be used for next year. * A suggestion that Nick brought up in the first meeting is that we have a RELF proposal meeting for all interested students. They can learn about ready to go projects and get the rundown on how to submit a proposal. |
| **Action Items** |
| * All members not present please vote over e-mail. * Erica will draft letter to professors that can make RELF proposals into a class assignment for fall 2010. * Committee needs to set up meetings with Residence Life to develop a contract and final approval on these projects. |