

<p>Proposal</p>	<p>the initial meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The community councils will identify 10-15 potential participants for the meetings <p>- Hiring a contractor to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Facilitate these meetings ○ Compile the data gathered at the meetings and provide that data to the EPA to “guide their investigative path.”
<p>Dan S.</p>	<p>Dan S. brought up the question of funding the community meetings. The Utah Inland Port Authority (UIPA) has made a tentative offer to provide the funding for the community engagement phase through the Westside Coalition. From Dan’s perspective, this environmental justice assessment is an opportunity for the WSC to be involved in something important. Additionally, having data codified by the EPA that shows the disparities in environmental justice on the west side will support the WSC and other organizations’ efforts to reduce those disparities. However, the Inland Port is a controversial entity and is not well-understood by many. Dan feels that it is worth considering the optics of the WSC accepting such a large donation (\$25k-\$30k). Dan also expressed concern that the current WSC does not have sufficient infrastructure to take on this project and another entity may be more equipped to do so. Terry seconded Dan’s concerns about accepting money from the port. He believes that the Port will use any association with the WSC as a PR piece, which will reflect negatively on the WSC. At the time of the meeting, Maria Garcia was planning to propose to the NWSL board that NWSL accepts the funds from the Port. Terry believed the WSC should postpone its decision until Maria has presented the proposal to her board.</p>
<p>Group Discussion</p> <p>Terry</p>	<p>Richard has volunteered to work with the contractor, and he does not anticipate any additional labor from the Coalition or the community councils. Charlotte asked if Coalition members would be allowed to be involved in this part of the assessment. Richard confirmed that interested Directors would be involved as much or as little as they wished.</p>
<p>Richard, Charlotte</p>	<p>Addressing concerns about associating with the Inland Port, Richard told the Board that in his conversations with the UIPA’s Executive Director Ben Hart, Hart has stated that he does not want this donation to be an advertising point for the UIPA. Richard feels that “it is time to take a stand instead of worrying about optics. We need a seat at the table.”</p>
<p>Jason</p>	<p>Jason countered Richard’s claim that Richard and the contractor would be able to facilitate the meetings without any help from the Coalition. He shared his experience working on a similar community engagement piece for the Human Rights Project involving community listening sessions. Based on the tremendous workload from that project, he believes that the EPA assessment community listening sessions will require heavy involvement from at least half of the Board. He also reminded the Board of how much time and work the Coalition invested into the Candidate Forum.</p>
<p>Nigel, Kevin, Billy, Charlotte, Jason, Dan S.</p>	<p>Nigel, Kevin, Billy, Charlotte, and Jason further discussed pros and cons of the WSC leading the assessment. Points in favor were:</p>

<p>Terry, Darin, Esther</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - leading this assessment is in line with the Coalition’s goals and mission statement - involvement in a project such as this will elevate the Coalition’s visibility and establish our reputation as an organization that advocates for the west side - the money from the Port cannot directly benefit the WSC because its sole use will be to fund a study conducted by a neutral party - involvement in the assessment will ensure that the Coalition is not left in the dark. A seat at the table gives us more power - the WSC would be up-front about having accepted \$25-\$30k from the UIPA to fund the study <p>Points against were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - potential risks from accepting money from the UIPA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Terry and Darin emphasized that the WSC’s constituents will perceive us as endorsing the UIPA - potentially burdensome workload - the money cannot be used for other WSC expenses
<p>CJ, Charlotte, Richard</p>	<p>Additionally, a few Board members requested clarification as to why the Port cannot pay the contractor directly. Richard explained that a) if the WSC does not trust the Port enough to accept their money, we should not trust them to manage the contract, and b) the UIPA initially offered to pay the contractor directly, but the EPA requested that the funds be given to a community organization to reduce the Port’s entanglement in the assessment and to allow the community to have a role.</p>
<p>MOTION</p> <p><i>Against</i></p> <p><i>Against</i></p> <p><i>For</i></p> <p><i>Against</i></p> <p><i>For</i></p>	<p>Charlotte made a motion for the Westside Coalition to accept Richard’s proposal that the WSC accept \$25k-\$30k from the Utah Inland Port Authority to fund the community engagement phase of the EPA environmental justice assessment. Darin seconded the motion.</p> <p>Speaking against the motion, Terry asked again that the Coalition wait until Maria Garcia brought Richard’s proposal to the NWSL board.</p> <p>Rick also spoke against the motion, saying that the WSC should add a caveat to add a 20% surcharge for administrative work.</p> <p>Daniel T. (for): we can determine the details of the contract at a later date.</p> <p>Dorothy (against): this much disagreement means the Board is not ready to decide. Because the WSC is an advocacy organization, we need distance from the Port but we also want control over the assessment. The WSC’s intentions behind accepting money from the Port is not what matters; what matters is how accepting those funds affects our operation.</p> <p>Kevin (for): we would be missing an opportunity to ensure that the UIPA’s \$25k-\$30k is spent correctly if we do not accept their offer.</p> <p>Esther expressed that we appear to have too little information to make a motion to</p>

<p><i>MOTION and VOTE to close debate</i></p> <p>VOTE</p>	<p>accept Richard’s proposal. Richard clarified that Maria and NWSL are “plan b” and that his preference is for the WSC to accept the proposal and lead the assessment. However, he will proceed with “any resources necessary and available” if the WSC votes against. Dan S. added that we cannot have more details about the contract until we accept and move forward.</p> <p>Dan S. moved to close the debate and vote on the motion. Rick seconded, and the Board voted to close the debate.</p> <p>The Board then voted on Charlotte’s original motion. It passed with twelve (12) in favor and two (2) opposed (Terry and Dorothy).</p>
<p>Item 3</p>	<p>Budget Presentation</p>
<p>Rick</p> <p>Rick; Group Discussion</p> <p>Dorothy</p> <p>Jason</p>	<p>Before presenting the budget draft, Rick made a motion to take a 3-minute break which was seconded by Marisa. The motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>After the break, Rick presented the draft budget. Prior to the meeting, a Google Sheets link was emailed to the Board. Rick clarified that some of the revenue and expenses listed were aspirational, and that he would allow two weeks for Board members to add comments, line items, etc. Rick will present the budget again at the next Board meeting (January 3, 2023) where it will be revised and finalized. The timeframe for this budget is January 2023—December 2023.</p> <p><u>Revenue</u></p> <p><u>Microgrant and ACE Grant</u></p> <p>The Coalition hopes to receive funding from a few of the same sources as in 2022. Rick believes the WSC could likely receive another microgrant (\$1000) from SLC as well as another ACE grant (Dan S. working on application). There was some discussion about increasing the amount of anticipated revenue from the ACE grant and which tier for which the Annual Meeting would qualify. Jasmine reminded those at the meeting that the WSC could apply for multiple ACE grants if each application was for a different event.</p> <p><u>Board Member Contributions</u></p> <p>Another source of revenue included in the draft was a suggested Board member contribution of \$50 (Totaling \$900 if all 18 Directors made that donation). The contribution would be non-compulsory and Board members could secure funding from a third party in lieu of making a personal donation. This line item was added at Blake’s suggestion with the intention of encouraging more buy-in from directors. The group discussed whether a suggested donation was appropriate. Dorothy questioned if the community councils would be obliged for that donation since each council’s chair plus one appointed member are required to participate on the WSC Board of Directors. Additionally, an annual contribution would remind the community councils that they have a vested interest in the WSC. The WSC would in turn be reminded of its obligation</p>

<p>Billy</p> <p>MOTION AND VOTE</p> <p>Rick</p> <p>Jason</p> <p>Charlotte</p>	<p>to represent the interests of the community councils. Jason added that before requesting a contribution from the community councils, the WSC needs to consult the councils.</p> <p>Billy emphasized that Board member contributions should remain a suggestion rather than a requirement; westsiders are disproportionately impacted by financial concerns and a mandatory financial contribution could prevent community members from participating on the Board.</p> <p>Dan S. moved to strike the member contributions line item from the budget and add \$1000 to general fundraising goals. Rick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.</p> <p><u>Other Contributions</u></p> <p>Rick emphasized the need for a dedicated fundraising team.</p> <p><u>Cash</u></p> <p>As it stands, the WSC has just over \$29k.</p> <p><u>Expenses</u></p> <p>Expenses listed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intern to take care of administrative tasks (a “pie in the sky” expense) - Microsoft Office (3 licenses at NPO discounted rate) - West View Media - Community Sponsorships (advertising with other organizations, i.e. a little league team; aspirational) - Community outreach - Tabling supplies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Jason raised the question of storage—if a storage unit is deemed necessary, that line item will require discussion with Board - Issue Area Manager training - Annual Meeting (could qualify for ACE grant funding) - Candidate Forum - Community grants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Different from the Community Sponsorships line item in that these grants would be awarded to individuals or entities. The grant would be spent on a project benefitting the community. o Charlotte recommended asking a corporation to underwrite this grant. <p>Expenses totaled \$26,714 on this aspirational budget.</p> <p>Rick also noted that the Coalition should also consider how to fund our operations going into 2024, and that not all the expenses listed on the budget</p>
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sara will send out a flyer for the Board to share among their networks.
Item 5	Public Comment
Noemi Molina	<p>Noemi Molina from Utah Clean Cities (UCC) introduced herself to the Board. At a future WSC meeting, she would like to make a formal presentation about some of the work that UCC is doing with communities near the Inland Port. She will get in touch with Dan and provide more information about the project.</p>
	Tabled/Not Discussed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Issue Area updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There were no pressing updates this month and the meeting had gone overtime
Item 6	Adjourn
	<p>Dan S. moved to adjourn, seconded by Nigel. All voted in favor.</p> <p>Next Meeting: January 3 (First Tues.; December meeting postponed one week due to Christmas and New Year's Day holidays) 5:30 PM at same NeighborWorks location</p>
Future & Pending Tasks	
<p>Rick: Continue making changes to draft budget and have new draft ready to present at the January 3rd meeting.</p>	
Upcoming Meetings & Events	
<p>December 24 (Sat): Christmas Eve December 25 (Sun): Christmas Day December 31 (Sat): New Year's Eve January 1 (Sun): New Year's Day January 3 (T): Next WSC Board Meeting at 5:30pm at Neighborworks Salt Lake</p>	