iCAP Working Group

May 7, 2015

Rob Fritz, Morgan Johnston, Ben McCall, Lowa Mwilambwe, Nancy O'Brien, Matthew Tomaszewski

Ben shared a recent article in The Seattle Times regarding record breaking levels of carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere – 400 ppm.

Matthew commented on the fact that we are engaging with each other and having these critical conversations is awesome.

Review of comments received from iWG and others.

1. Overall, the key concern from F&S is the relationship between the reality of the campus budget situation and the iCAP goals/objectives.
    a. We believe that the iCAP document should include a disclaimer talking about the State funding issues and the approach the campus will take toward implementing the iCAP objectives, as it relates to the campus budget situation. **Following discussion of this item, the group decided some mention of the current budget situation should be included in the cover letter from the Chancellor, the first page of the final iCAP.**
    b. Additionally, it would be beneficial to include a first step toward reflecting the anticipated costs for the potential strategies, perhaps with a symbol code by the names such as $= up to $250K, $$=$250K-750K, $$$=$1M to $5M, and $$$$= more than $5M. **This item of concern was withdrawn by F&S representative.**
    c. The potential scenario in the conclusion should specifically state that it is based on a fiscally unconstrained solution. **Following discussion of this item, Morgan made a motion to include some language regarding funding availability. Lowa seconded the motion. Vote: 4 in favor, 2 oppose.**

2. F&S is still a little concerned about the clarity for a casual reader or a future campus administrator about the differences between an aspirational goal, a campus commitment, an objective, and a potential strategy. One suggestion was for the yet-to-be-written executive summary to (re)introduce the Climate Commitment; state the main goal of emissions reductions and related goals of environmental sustainability, education, outreach, and research; and then list the objectives (Appendix A). **The iWG liked this suggestion. Morgan will draft the executive summary and share with the group in time for discussion at our next meeting.**

3. Regarding the climate commitment date and proposed study of moving the date to FY35, F&S leadership identified a number of issues with the idea of a study.
    a. There is no way to know what technology will be available in the future, or what it will cost.
    b. There is no way to accurately estimate the cost of carbon offsets or RECs in the future.
    c. Undertaking a "detailed study… to determine what steps our campus would need to take to accelerate our efforts…" would take up valuable and limited staff time, with no hope of gaining more information about the costs and benefits than we already have now.
    d. We recommend removing the study from the introduction chapter, by deleting the last four sentences of the final paragraph in chapter 1. **After considerable discussion of**

each of these points, Morgan made a motion to strike the final paragraph in chapter 1. There was no second of the motion.

4. Due to the anticipated budget reductions and associated reduction in staff availability, we need to change the timeline for the fleet study (transportation objective #3) to the end of FY19, rather than the end of FY17. **This comment/concern withdrawn by F&S representative.**

5. The energy conservation chapter includes the objective "Improve standards for new buildings and major renovations and incorporate "net zero energy" requirements by the end of FY16." Our leadership team was very concerned about this objective.
    a. The first attempt for a net-zero energy building (ECE) is lacking about $10M in funding for the associated solar PVs.
    b. Net-zero buildings are currently cost-prohibitive.
    c. The aim of updating building standards is important towards reaching the energy conservation objective of 30% conservation by FY20, so we recommend moving the discussion paragraph (currently on page 19) to a potential strategy under the strengthen centralized conservation objective. With that, the end of the paragraph would stop after "renovations" rather than listing a deadline, i.e., delete "by the end of FY16." **Following discussion of these comments/concerns, Morgan agreed to get more information from Facilities & Services. We will leave this in for Public Comment period, and revisit the topic at our next meeting.**

6. The renewable energy objectives in chapter 3, page 23, need some modification. We want to be clear that the renewable energy goals from the 2010 iCAP were lofty to begin with.
    a. The currently proposed goals are approximately 65% more than the renewable goals from the 2010 iCAP. Our recommendation is to reduce the on-campus solar objective, and modify the text in the PPA objective.
    b. We would like to change the on-campus solar installation objective for FY20 to be 10,000 MWh/year. This is the amount currently in planning, but in need of an additional $10M to implement.
    c. The FY25 on-campus solar objective could be removed from the document, or it could be listed as 15,000 MWh/year. **The group discussed these three comments at length and recognize reaching these renewable energy goals may be difficult to reach, but we need stretch goals. Ben made a motion to leave the goals the way they are, Lowa seconded. Votes: 4 in favor, 2 oppose.**
    d. The objective #3 should be changed from "zero-carbon sources" to "low-carbon sources." This reflects the discussion related to low-carbon energy options, such as nuclear. **The group agreed on the use of 'low-carbon sources' rather than zero-carbon sources.**

7. A number of the F&S leadership team objected to the financing objective #4, feasibility of a carbon-tax. **Following discussion of the item, Ben made a motion to leave this objective in, Nancy seconded. Vote: 3 in favor, 2 oppose, 1 abstain.**

8. Lowa had received and shared some comments from Auxiliary units. The first was in regard to maintaining or reducing gross square footage. New building standards and codes require more space than when most of the campus buildings were built. Should this be reflected in iCAP? To meet a zero gross square footage requirement, Nugent Hall would have had to eliminate 222

beds. In addition, some energy upgrades take up more square footage that would otherwise have been used for programming. **After discussion of these concerns, Morgan made a motion to revise the verbiage, Lowa seconded. All in favor.**

9. Auxiliary units are not in support of a surcharge or ban on the sale of bottled water. The focus should be on education and recycling rates across campus. **Following discussion, Lowa made a motion to remove the sentence regarding bottled water, Morgan seconded. Motion passed.**

10. Matthew shared a concern from the Provost's Office in regard to the financing chapter. The objective relating to sustainability projects without a financial payback stated an increase in those funds 15% per year. They are not comfortable with this level of increase each year. **The group discussed this concern and proposed new language.**

SWATeam recommendations will be reviewed at our next meeting.

Adjournment 3:17 pm.