**KRELF Committee Meeting Minutes**

*Date*: 4/7/2015

*Time*: 2 to 3:30 pm

*Location*: UC 117

*Members*: Brian Kerns (Facility Services), Robin Saha (Environmental Studies), Dennis Daneke (Missoula College), Rosi Keller (Admin. and Finance), Peter McDonough (Student), Sam Thompson (Student), Grant Myhre (Student), Abby Huseth (Student), Morgan Eichwald (Student), Chris Olsen (ASUM Sustainability Coordinator)

**Minutes**

1. Update on Finances
   1. Chris gave an update on how much money the committee has to distribute for projects.
      1. The current balance of available funds is $34,825
   2. If there are more projects we want to fund than we have money for, we may want to research the possibility of allocating some of the salary reserve or large project reserve
2. Discussion of Proposals
   1. Variable Frequency Drive Proposal – Rec Center/UM CAN
      1. Brian mentioned that the math in the Project Description section does not match the math in the Project Costs section. This will need to be revised and checked for the final proposal
      2. Chris wanted to know why a certain amount of funding as requested as a grant – especially since this seems to have a good payback. Chris will ask for clarification on the grant amount in the feedback he sends to Gillian.
      3. Brian mentioned wanted to see the calculations behind the energy savings and how this was determined.
      4. Abby and Brian both wanted some clarifications on the Environmental Impacts section. There was a discussion of both a slowed GPM and a faster GPM in the section. Clarification of what these terms mean and if both are possible.
      5. Brian also mentioned wanting some clarification of the wording in the Energy Savings section
   2. Water Bottle Filling Station
      1. Brian started out by addressing Robin’s concerns over Sentinel. He has no worries over Sentinel being used for the project. Facilities Services is currently over-booked with projects and it is probably best to work with a contractor.
      2. Chris wondered what the 8% internal assessment was and would like to see some clarification on this in the revised proposal.
      3. Chris stated that he likes water bottle fillers on campus, students use them, but we really do need to start labeling them and asking students to incorporate that into the proposal cost.
      4. Brian wanted to see the Steripen source used in the Environmental Benefits section.
      5. Chris and Abby discussed wanting to see a new Abstract, since what is currently written is not an abstract.
   3. UM Dining Services and Lommasson Center 10 kW Solar PV Array
      1. Brian started off by saying he thinks this was a great proposal. The students put a lot of time and effort into it and it was very well put together. One of the best proposals he has seen.
      2. Brian did have some questions about the students discussion of USB – Self-Directed funds
         1. Most USB funds to go projects with a shorter payback
         2. USB is operated through Northwestern and the university usually gets about $45,000 per year
      3. The students have not actually received any USB funding yet, but they do seem to be anticipating it.
      4. There was one small numbering problem in the Project Goals section for revision.
   4. PV Array for West Campus
      1. Dennis mentioned that no loans can be used in state-owned buildings and all buildings at West Campus are state buildings. So the loan portion of this proposal would not be able to be paid back.
      2. The committee was also curious to hear more about the fundraising – Where is the money coming from? How much has actually been raised (as opposed to projected)?
      3. Dennis also mentioned the new building plan for West Campus – Will the campus still be there in 5 to 10 years? Are the students aware of this new building plan?
      4. Brian wanted to see some clarification in terms of how they talk about RECS vs. Offsets. The students seem to be monetizing the savings in terms of offsets (when they should be monetizing in terms of RECs). There appears to be some conflating of figures. For example, the $10 per MTeCO2 is too high for the savings calculations.
      5. Chris mentioned that they need to revise their timeline, as it does not fit with KRELF deadlines
3. Update on Next Steps
   1. Chris will send feedback to student groups this week. The students will then submit their final proposals by April 24, 2015.
   2. Chris will contact the committee to schedule another meeting to discuss and approve/reject final approvals.