iCAP Working Group

August 28, 2014

1:30- 3:00

Present: Lowa Mwilambwe, Rob Fritz, Nancy O'Brien, Ben McCall, Matthew Tomaszewski, Nishant Makhijani, Kevin Duff, Morgan Johnston

Updates to SWATeam recommendation template – adding a rationale, connection to iCAP goal and perceived challenges – approved.

SWATeam charges went out yesterday.

2 main discussion items:

Wind PPA, iCAP SWATeam deliverables

Wind PPA

In discussions with Facilities & Services (F&S), we asked for additional information. F&S has asked PEI to undertake a Request for Information (RFI), and a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the purchase of energy from wind turbines – RFI released on August 15th with return date of 2 weeks, so theoretically tomorrow.

PEI – in principle does what F&S and other campuses request them to do in terms of buying power and gas.

Ben went to look for info about power purchase agreement – average in 2012 was around $43.00/MWh

Morgan found that the budgeted rate for purchased electricity for this coming year is $45 per megawatt-hour

PPA prices steady in 2012 and 2013 in Great Lakes region - this might actually be a cost savings for the campus – we need to decide if we want to submit the recommendation directly to F&S or whether we want to transmit to Sustainability Council.

What do we want to recommend. The Sustainability Council has not yet been constituted officially. That group will probably not meet until November.

Maybe this issue not as impactful – and we can just submit to F&S.

Is there a cap on the amount of wind power we can purchase? Logistically, no. The relevant consideration is financial, it would not make sense to purchase more than we use – surplus would not be valuable.

There is plenty of capacity out there to be purchased – if it's cheaper why wouldn't we buy as much as we need – complexity re: the shape of demand.

Is 100 million kilowatt hours a modest proposal or a bold proposal? It is not in danger zone, but fairly aggressive.

Timeline for RFI/RFP put forward by PEI could perhaps be more aggressive, range in RFI was in 5 million kWh increments

iWG recommendation could send a signal that campus sees this as important – try to get them to move more aggressively. There is some sense of urgency because of incentives running out.

Kent Reifsteck has various concerns, wants to pursue it, but he has not enunciated those concerns, and an iWG recommendation may help facilitate the conversation.

Recommendations should be accompanied by a cover letter – allowing 2 weeks for response to the recommendation. Keep in mind that there may be occasions where two weeks is not enough time.

Does the document match what the committee wants to recommend?

Don't see a negative – should just move forward.

Lowa concerned about accuracy of information – next move is to go to F&S and future dialogue will result in more accurate information.

Cover letter should not ask unit for their opinion, but rather ask for a response to the recommendation.

Is pricing information from historical data, trends? Price budgeted at 4.5 cents per kwh for FY15, but the file looks like we paid 6.38 cents/kwh in FY14?

Any changes wanted in document? Softened, strengthened?

Schedule proposed by PEI appears somewhat relaxed – would be nice to try get it moving faster.

Last point, a bit controversial – working group is recommendation team, but not decision makers. Original language in draft recommendation does not follow along with the sustainability procedure document. iSEE and the iCAP Working Group should be informed and advised, able to give feedback.

Communicating with committee – the drafters of documents need to build in time for review.

Request at least 2 days when possible, to allow feedback from the group. Ben would solicit input from committee when possible, and otherwise if too short turn around, then Ben would inform committee of action already taken.

Need to fill in recommendation form. Want to send forward to F&S tomorrow.

Vote – all in support of moving forward – unanimous.

iCAP/SWAT team deliverables

Climate action plan written by a team of people in 2010. Agreed every 5 years that we would update document.

Excellent projects have moved forward because of it, some things have not panned out.

SWATeams will make recommendations to iCAP Working Group, who will then synthesize into formal plan. What does it mean to synthesize it?

In update, we are going to revise goals and timeline.

Review of draft outline.

Are there SWATeams to work on the education, outreach and research?

Let's work with Madhu on education, Evan on research. Do we need to write a letter to Madhu or Evan – official ask?

Why not follow the outline already in iCAP? - Because there is a certain amount of repetitiveness.

Did you look at other documents, at other institutions? When first draft was written, that was done, but it should be done again.

Ask SSLC to submit information about projects to feature in iCAP?

Do we want the whole committee to review and synthesize the chapters, do we want to nominate a subgroup – google docs, box documents, procedurally as a group of 10 people, how do we write a book?

Have the staff pull it together, and committee review it?

We would like someone who is first round review. Nancy will be happy to help.

SWATeams have received their charge – updated analysis…this piece due in September is about where we are.

In update/revision due in October we want specific goals, objectives, and strategies.

Ben wants to send outline, and content suggestions to SWATeams tomorrow.

Draft revisions due by Campus Sustainability Day, October 22.

Everybody comfortable with this? Yes.

Other business. iCAP Forum, October 22, 1-4pm, Illini Union, room 314.

Adjourn 3:00 pm