

PWR

Attendees: Joy Scrogum (Sustainability Specialist for Illinois Sustainable Technology Center), Robert McKim (Dept. of Religion & Philosophy), Tim Stark (Dept of Civil and Environmental Engineering), Morgan White (F&S Associate Director), Julija Sakutyte (SWATeam clerk)

Date: 3 December 2018

Time: 4-5PM

1. M. White, evaluation of indoor recycling collection system
 - a. Clarification: is the collection system for specific buildings?
 - i. A: Not for specific buildings
 - ii. Additional note: Evaluation is not only on which bins the campus is using, but also what infrastructure is in place (i.e. BSW training and protocol)
 - iii. Recycling program hasn't been updated in at least a decade.
 1. Manual needed to describe the protocol.
 - iv. M. White talked to BSW at F&S events. The consensus is that some BSW's will collect everything properly, but at the end of the day everything will be tossed with the rest of the garbage.
 - v. T. Stark—There used to be a separate paper bin but is now inaccessible in T. Stark's building... What to do?
 1. There is a bin on the other side, however for everyone, there is an option to contact the recycling department in order to receive a private tote, which can be used to discard sensitive documents (ex: documents, old exams, etc.)
 - a. Email: recycling@illinois.edu
 - b. New bins have been ordered (14 paper as well as 14 cans and aluminum bins)
2. Paper Policy
 - a. Purchasing reports to campus now, so policy can be shifted
 - i. Policy change is the starting point for altering paper use habits
 - ii. Troubleshooting: There are 12k+ employees and no consensus on how many are from Purchasing
 1. J. Scrogum will inform BMG and BAC of F&S recycled paper truckload; letter drafted but not completed.
 - iii. **Possible recommendation: high-level employees (ex: chancellor, provost, etc) should be informed of necessary action in terms of paper usage and policy**
 1. Educating BMG of paper, implementing policy which is already in place
 2. Should inform the key people in purchasing which we want to implement the paper purchasing policies.
 3. Troubleshooting: How does F&S paper cost compare to 50% from Office Depot? If Office Depot offers 50% recycled for more expensive than the F&S 30% recycled paper, then this is

technically a set-back because PWR wants people to use the highest recycled content available.

3. J. Scrogum—iBuy Difficulties

- a. Consensus is that iBuy is NOT user friendly
- b. Icons system which supposedly designates eco products functions mediocre at best.
 - i. **Possible recommendation: suggest website improvement**
 1. *Question: Is it possible for iStores to be included as a supplier? Only Office Depot shows up.*
- c. *Question: Where do we go from the truckload?*
 - i. It would be best to edit iBuy site to filter products for what PWR wants to see.
 - ii. *Question: How long would it last?*
 - iii. J. Scrogum—The ISTC has at least 50% recycled content paper.
 - iv. Note: PWR needs to phrase steps carefully.
 1. *Question: Is it fair to say that “campus is exploring Office Depot only providing recycled paper, which would allow you to test quality?”*
 - v. *Question: Why is buying a truckload of paper from Office Depot on the side cheaper than getting the price of that same paper adjusted in the Office Depot punchout?*
 - vi. Question: Can Brad just automatically fill paper orders with only 30% recycled content and see if there is dissent among departments?
 1. A: Not feasible. Business managers would never take time to look through requests and make management call. Too much possibility for error.
 - a. Shows need for policy, so that the onus is upon the professor to follow policy.
 - b. Different departments function differently, so there is added confusion as to if certain paper is necessary for some projects.
- d. *Question: Who is in charge of website?*
- e. **Next meeting: Need to recruit Brad Henson! He can answer way more questions on this topic.**
- f. The SSC will not fund battery reform, so the issues are complex enough so that it would be best to move on to other topics, allowing the situation to shift so that the feasibility of battery collection systemic reform increases
- g. PWR wants to provide public locations for battery drop-off
 - i. Free battery drop-off desired, but in this case, where will the funding be drawn from?
 1. Few committees will really want to pay for battery retrieval, and alkaline battery disposal is legally unregulated, so there is an issue with incentive.
 - ii. Note: Some residence halls have funded battery retrieval

1. R. McKim will look into process of battery retrieval in residence halls.
 - iii. J. Scrogum— Employee input needed to make sure that batteries in the boxes are properly submitted (ex: ITSC staff)
 4. Follow-up: R. McKim is beginning to work with Ethics Office to introduce sustainability into training.
 - a. **Donna McNeeley** was asked if there was a way to implement this thought
 - i. Ethics training is universal across all public universities in the state.
 1. Note: terminology and structure of each of the 8 public universities will differ.
 - a. J. Scrogum—This would make implementation of broad policy difficult.
 - ii. Question: Is a focus on recycling the right thing to use the platform for, or are there other iSEE projects which should take precedence?
 1. Familiarize certain employees with their campus' policy, so that individuals can make accurate decisions based on their university policy.
 - a. Note: The law on eco-friendly purchasing is written so that paper is purchased only in the case that it is not fiscally irresponsible/impossible.
 - i. Many loopholes are present.
 2. Everyone should be responsible, but PWR is unsure as to who should be contacted.
 3. Ethics training already has a video on recycling posted on their website, which shows receptivity to environmental ethics
 4. Note: There's a need to inspire people to actually show interest in the environmental ethicality, not just skim it during training.
 - a. PWR is used in order to change the *people* on campus rather than a concrete physical change.
 - b. *Question: How do you create something that would be the agent of change?*
 - b. Note: There should be an emphasis on showing good behavior and negating bad behavior.
5. **Possible recommendation: Motion sensor lights in some rooms, which would decrease the individual responsibility**
 - a. Troubleshooting:
 - i. Automatic lights will shut off at inopportune times, which makes the definition for practical locations for motion light implementation hazy.
 - ii. No department will do it of their own accord; CAM policy **required**.
 - iii. Note: If university wants to meet iCAP goals, wiggle room must be reduced.
 - iv. *Question: Who will fund retrofitting for lights?*
 1. *Question: Are there funds in place for retrofitting?*
 - a. There may be, but last instance showed that there was a long process for it, and it is more complex than expected.

- v. *Question: Which areas will be targeted first?*
 - vi. *Question: Who can be contacted to consult for this goal?*
 - vii. *Question: Is there a possibility of teaming up with the energy SWAT?*
 - b. All newer buildings LEEDS qualified (which includes motion sensor lights); instead, a possible avenue is to recommend existing buildings be retrofitted.
 - c. **Note: Discuss with M. White the feasibility of such a program on a broad scale.**
- 6. R. McKim—*Question: should a message be sent now to Donna McNeeley of PWR's goals, or does the idea need to be more fleshed out?*
- 7. **Policy level recommendations!**
- 8. Future agenda:
 - a. **Recommendations: Motion Sensor lights, Ethics training (including campus ethics).**
 - i. Discuss feasibility of motion lights sensors.
 - ii. Continue work with Ethics Office to introduce Sustainability ethics within ethics training.
 - iii. J. Sakutyte—Will source recommendations material and forms.
 - b. Next meeting: **January 2019**
 - i. Meeting with both Morgan White and Brad Henson.