

Minutes for iWG meeting, September 18, 2017

Members present: Rob Fritz, Julia Chang, Sean Reeder, Larry Uphoff, Morgan White, Matthew Tomaszewski, Ximing Cai, *Micah Kenfield (ex officio)*

Guests present: Andrea Martinez, Karl Helmink, Paul Foote

1. Welcome to New Members

- a. Ximing Cai welcomed Julia Chang, from the Student Sustainability Committee, as a new member of the iCAP Working Group

2. SWATeam Updates

- a. There are now three paid student clerks working with the six SWATeams
- b. Six student representatives are returning, and six students are new this year.
- c. Nine faculty representatives are returning, and three faculty are new.
- d. Nine staff representatives are returning, and three staff are new.

3. Green Labs Program Update

(brief notes from presentation are noted below – the full presentation is also available)

a. Overview of Green Labs Concept

- i. Ximing provided a brief overview of the program as it stands now
- ii. Labs for research and education are an important part of campus
- iii. Current university administration of labs focuses on safety (Division of Research Safety, DRS in Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research)
- iv. More is needed to do beyond safety, including but not limited to energy and material saving, waste recycling, and space management
- v. Need to start from inventory development and move to the development of policies and guidelines and eventually the full implementation of a green labs program
- vi. A coordinator has been recommended and discussed; he/she is expected to provide investigation, communication over all levels, collaboration with lab managers and F&S, and monitoring, awareness spreading, policy and guideline development, etc.
- vii. Many peers have already started a green labs program coordinator

b. History of SWATeam Recommendation and Assessment

- i. 2010 iCAP suggested repeating the Shut the Sash campaign
- ii. 2015 iCAP suggested “a Campus Fume Hood Efficiency Program”
- iii. Spring 2016 the ECBS SWATeam and Dr. Frances Kuo researched various programs--including another successful Shut the Sash trial--and F&S funded Paul Foote (as an Academic Hourly position) to start inventory process
- iv. Nov. 2016 ECBS submitted recommendation to iCAP Working Group iWG)
- v. Dec. 2016 iWG approved recommendation and sent to the Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR)

- vi. May 2017 VCR agreed to discuss program
 - vii. Aug. 2017 iSEE, ECBS, and VCR reps met to discuss the program – Melanie Loots and Jan Novakofski met with Ximing, Micah, Morgan, Karl, and Paul, with Marian on the phone. VCR reps suggested people to talk with (eg. Associate Deans for Research), explained how Division of Research Safety works with labs now, considered potential reporting lines and scope, and needed personality/skills
- c. Green Labs Best Practices From Peer Institutions
- i. Paul Foote, Micah Kenfield, and Karl Helmink reviewed a number of peer institutions.
 - ii. Universities with well-established Green Labs Programs implementing multiple initiatives, campaigns & competitions which deliver measurable results, greater impact, savings and behavioral change by focusing on these key areas:
 1. Save Energy
 2. Reduce Waste
 3. Manage equipment program to maximize efficiency
 4. Conserve Resources
 5. Purchase Sustainably
 6. Create a Sustainable Lab Culture for a healthier campus
- d. Open Issues for Discussion
- i. Sean – was there any discussion to the volume of greywater reused from Harvard? Paul – no on volume, but it was used significantly to water plants.
 - ii. Ximing - we have time to answer additional questions as needed.
 - iii. Morgan – we still need to figure out where it's going to be housed, what kind of funding it needs, and so on.
 - iv. Matthew – spoke to Melanie Loots, and is passing along that we need to consider the differentiation of the labs. Some will be very much on board, others may be concerned that it disrupts their research. We need to be keeping an eye out for that.
 1. Morgan – in order for the PIs to be comfortable with the idea, we need someone with an understanding of the research process. This will be mandatory for whoever takes the role.
 2. Ximing – they also need to have excellent communication skills with an ability to relate back to all people
 3. Matthew – I agree, we just need to make sure researchers know we're not going to interfere with their problems.
 - v. Location of position organizationally:
 1. F&S Safety and Compliance as well as the Division of Research Safety are very big on drop-ins and checking on compliance with things like chemical storage and chemical waste disposal.
 2. Morgan – this is very much checking to make sure people are following 'established rules.' We need to develop policies and guidelines along the way so everything leads to a positive situation

3. We don't just decide to fund something long-term. In this case, we'll need to have a pilot program for two to three years. This group will help decide what to do and then we'll hire someone capable of it.
 4. With multiple years of data in hand, this will give us an argument to fund the position on an ongoing basis.
 5. This also works well with our general image of "Safe and Sustainable." This program needs to be one supported by the VCR to work toward making campus safer.
 6. Sean – I'm not sure this has the same level of voice if it's not in the VCR's office.
 7. Ximing – Melanie suggested this be situated in iSEE. In the past, VCR had an issue with a person that was a 'department of one,' and without a team/group it was a real area of concern.
- vi. Morgan – another issue is funding. One major question is "does this position pay for itself?"
1. When you decommission a fume hood or shut the sash, you're saving energy which saves money.
 2. Not sure whether or not we can use the 'savings' from doing the project to pay for this position. When we mothball a fume hood, can we use some of the funding to pay for Paul's time? As it stands, no.
 3. One option would be to split the position between a coordinator (who works on behavioral change) and an engineer. There are other options too though and we don't have it worked out quite yet.
 4. One inherent aspect of the program is we'll never have a clear visible payback from this program. Other options we could consider using something like the Carbon Credit Sales Funding. Both the head of F&S and the head of iSEE would need to sign off on it, but if we agreed it would be a good use of funds, we'd be allowed to use it.
 5. Sean – could we see if VCR is willing to match funds along the way? If we choose the buildings smartly, we can have strong data coming out of it to support a longer-term position.
- vii. Next steps – draft a full description, put it in a draft proposal, share it with the VCR's office, and move it along from there. It's now in iSEE's hands to put together.