1. **Status of our recommendations to iWG (Marian & Morgan)**
2. Marian recapped the email regarding the iWG minutes, emphasizing the success of the team’s ILO recommendation. Morgan clarified that the recommendation now goes to ISEE who will decide whether and how the rec will be implemented.
3. Morgan inquired as to the iWG minutes formatting and the team’s input; all agreed the minutes are informative and well done.
4. **Review of Illini Lights Out over the past year (Marian & Alex)**
5. Mentioned the success Alex accomplished with ILO and congratulations.
6. Marian asked for feedback that could be passed along for future use in the ILO program
7. Alex shared recommendations to have an informational flyer to give the students during the event.
8. Yun inquired as to the availability of a digital page to refer the students to, saving printing and being easily updatable, Morgan mentioned ISEE has a landing page that might be utilized for this purpose, upon checking, the page would need modifications to be easily findable.
9. Marian added, it would be nice to provide educational information regarding what they are doing, Fred also agreed, stating we could include some little known facts about the building they are covering and sited a handful of them as examples.
10. We revisited the engagement factor and student recruiting for ILO, the team clarified the SWAT team is very supportive of the program but is not responsible for it. A line needs to be clearly identified as to the SWAT team’s involvement and support verses implementation. We felt APO and other student groups would be great sources of recruitment, Morgan said Micah would be interacting with the students facilitating ILO.
11. All agreed ILO is a great way to introduce students to the campus sustainability environment along with Certified Green Office and Eco-Olympics programs.
12. Motivational suggestions were made to incentivize APO members, getting them to bring other students along and introduce them to ILO, reminding the students that ILO is partially funded by SSC builds a connection and feel good factor for them.
13. **Any final thoughts, recommendations for Eco-Olympics (Paul)**
14. Paul pointed out a major factor in Eco-Olympics student engagement success this year is marketing, marketing and more marketing with lots of incentivizing.
15. This brought about a conversation regarding the iCAP objectives, Marian inquired into how the “units” for iCAP objectives are measured and concluded. For example, the iCAP states a goal of 50% of campus units will be Certified Green Office s by 2020 Morgan elaborated on the definition of a unit, the creation of the objective and once the unit is achieved the status of the objective will change to completed. She adding her interpretation and goal is to have every department, group, college layer etc. including housing members doing great sustainable initiatives and keep improving upon them.
16. Further meeting iCAP objectives, we could use targeted marketing efforts to gain sustainability pledges for energy conservation and get commitments, Morgan pointed out most faculty/staff don’t know about commitments and gave an example ISEE is developing to bring faculty and iCAP objectives closer together, involving research funding, grants and link them to the efforts on campus. To introduce the idea and promote awareness there is a proposal to have a faculty retreat.
17. **Progress on building energy standards (Fred)**
18. Fred introduced draft 2.0, a proposal created by him and Professor Willenbrock, to amend the UIUC building energy efficiency standard based on ASHRAE 90.1-2016. He explained the premise behind the proposal is to establish a guideline for building energy efficiency standards that continues our current standard, which exceeds that of ASHRAE 90.1 and ensures we will continue meeting higher levels of energy efficiency for years to come. The proposal identifies a minimum of 30% energy reduction in new buildings and 26% in in major renovations, this percentage is based off the 2007 baseline.
19. Morgan asked for verification of the baseline, Fred verified the 2007 standard as the baseline and stated changes in performance could easily be updated as you go with less obstacles.
20. Yun, inquired as to where did the 30% come from and how do we compare the 2007 baseline to the 2016 standard. His concern was regarding what if the standard and baseline are not in sync, one being higher or lower than the other, referencing a chart displaying progressive reduction levels for ASHRAE standards he points out the standards keep changing at different percentages. Fred agrees and mentions the percentages vary quite a bit to include being less in years past. He concludes stating the goal is to come up with new percentages reflecting different levels of improvements with the idea to adjust the performance standards with each ASHRAE change. We are shooting to be better than ASHRAE at all times.
21. Everyone agreed it was a great idea, and we reflected on the improvements over LEED certification citing Memorial Stadium as an example of how it isn’t always necessary to get LEED certification in areas that get used only a few days a year leaving money to be used on other improvements; e.g., some areas of Memorial Stadium.
22. Fred plans to facilitate the adoption of the proposal as University policy.
23. **Updates on the revolving loan fund (RLF) projects (Marian for Karl)**
24. Marian shared Revolving Loan Fund information on Karl’s behalf, reflecting $820,000

worth of energy efficiency and water projects receiving approval. The RLF has grown to $4.9 million. The goal of UIUC is for the fund to be comparable to peer universities, which means the fund needs to be about $10 million.

1. **Turning off computers. Change in policy, at least at F&S. Implications for Certified Green Office Program?**

Marian briefed everyone on the new F&S computer policy. In short, computers and monitors can be left on during the week and allowed to go into sleep mode. This is the policy in other departments, such as in LAS. In LAS we are told to log off at night, but leave the computer on. Because energy consumption with IT is under the purview of our team, it behooves us to stay current on these policies. These changes may affect CGOP because there are specific suggestions for users related to computers in the self-assessments to become a CGO. We advise that Micah review the requirements in CGOP. Marian also shared that the main campus is working toward a centralized management system for campus computers. Technology Services is also planning to revamp the IT security systems.

1. **Building level energy consumption report summary (Diliya).** Diliya presented her report, highlighting key findings, noting certain aspects of Lincoln halls energy consumption. An excerpt of her report is below. The full report can be accessed on the iCAP portal under the ECBS SWATeam.
2. **Good-byes and thanks to departing members.** Departing from the team are students, Alex Dzurick, Dhara Patel and Diliya Murtazina, faculty, Marian Huhman and F&S staff, Fred Hahn. Marian hopes to help next academic year in some capacities, such as ILO.

From Diliya’s report:

**Energy Usage Intensity by Year (BTU/GSF) in Lincoln Hall**

Calculate the specific iCAP goal for Lincoln Hall.

iCAP Objective Status Lincoln Hall:

* FY20 reduce consumption from FY08 baseline by 30%
* FY08 actual = 12,695 MMBTU
* FY20 goal = 8,887 MMBTU
* FY16 actual = 14,066 MMBTU
* Change from FY08 to FY16 = INCREASED by 10.8%
* FY08, FY20, and FY16 for EUI:
* FY08 actual EUI = 74,187 BTU/GSF
* FY16 actual EUI = 79,990 BTU/GSF
* Change from FY08 to FY16 = **INCREASED** by 7.8%
* FY20 goal in EUI = 51,931 BTU/GSF = 9,132 MMBTU