

iCAP Working Group Meeting

September 25, 2015

9:30 am, room 358 NSRC

Rob Fritz, Morgan Johnston, Ben McCall, Nancy O'Brien, Jess Tang, Matthew Tomaszewski

iCAP Status - The language regarding objectives continues to be discussed in upper administration. It seemed that 'commits' was viewed favorably, but new interim leaders not comfortable with that term. It was suggested that we make the objectives 'declarative'. Remove the first sentence? We would rather have the word 'supports' included, than nothing. What is it they can't commit to? How hard do we push? We need to pick our battles.

Review of PWR006 – Recycle all plastics 1-7. This will require a new bailer that costs about \$300,000. However, financial gain is expected to be about \$100,000 per year. This would also require some training of staff at the Waste Transfer Station and Building Service Workers. New signage will need to be done as well. All were in favor of this recommendation. This recommendation will be forwarded to Facilities & Services.

Response to PWR004 – Hire a sustainability purchasing coordinator. Given the current budget constraints and hiring freeze at UA, this cannot be done. However, they are hiring an Associate Director for Compliance and Policy. This person can work with the zero waste coordinator on issues in the purchasing, waste, and recycling arena. The iWG liked this response and thought it was a good proposal. Thank them, and suggest the new person work with the PWR SWATeam. Invite Duane Elmore to iCAP Forum.

Response to TRANS001 – Modify TEM to capture actual distances traveled. It is very expensive to make changes to the TEM system. However, they can provide city pairs. For classifying purpose of travel, how many choices do we want to provide? Sometimes travel includes more than one purpose, maybe provide check boxes to allow more than one choice. Thank them for response, and ask them to work with the Transportation SWATeam.

The Utilities Master Plan was reviewed at the Chancellor's Capital Review Meeting. VCR Schiffer did raise concerns about the plan. Al pointed out that the document is a guide, not locking us in. We appreciate the good dialogue and want to keep the communication lines open. Al did not endorse option 1.1, even though it is the most economically feasible. There are other things at stake and we will continue to pursue renewables. The document was approved.

Campus Master Plan update. They have obtained a new AE, and the planning process will be about two years. They encourage stakeholder engagement and will hold town hall type events. We hope that it will align with the iCAP. Net zero growth will allow for some predictability in energy demand.

Draft Criteria for Feasibility Studies. Morgan shared with us a set of criteria to consider regarding prioritizing funding for feasibility studies. They include:

- Emissions reduction – using the iCAP’s emissions numbers
- Financial cost reduction – per the formal campus budget impact
- Educational factor – related to students learning more
- Promotional factor – related to UIUC reputation
- Ease of implementation – related to the number of hurdles for getting this done, or using the results of the study to implement a change on campus
- Political factor – similar to promotional, but related more to our responsiveness to community concerns and requests
- Resource conservation – including energy, water, and materials
- Connection to iCAP Objectives

The iWG thought this was a great list, but let’s also add:

- Behavior change – support a sustainable culture
- Cost Benefit Analysis – will the cost align with perceived benefit

How will we rank the criteria? High, Medium, Low? Let’s get public input. Put a survey online and ask people to divide up 100 points among the choices. Are there other items we would want to include in a survey? Have it ready by Sustainability Week.

Ben relayed information and NREL and their software that is designed to optimize renewable energy strategies. He has a call with them next week to learn more.

11:00 adjournment.