

iCAP Working Group, January 29, 2015

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

1:36

Given that we just received the draft, Morgan thinks there is a need for a more careful review, and would like to modify the timeline. For example, give two weeks to obtain the stakeholder comments, then have the public comment period.

It was a struggle to get through the document in a short time. Lowa's group spent 2 hours and did not get through it all. There is a concern from F&S that all of their comments have not been reviewed. It's critical that before this goes public, everyone that has a part in it needs to be on board, or the road show will be bumpy.

Send out now to stakeholders. Everyone gets a chance to spell out major issues from their view point.

Perhaps, we should set two deadlines, one for this working group, and one for stakeholders. How do you want to receive comments?

Nancy, specifically representing Senate committee on Campus Operations. Members of the committee might have a different perspective than hers.

If we have many, many comments, and they are in random order. Then we may have a very inefficient meeting. Need time to connect all the comments.

An hour and a half is not nearly enough time.

We set a deadline now, and between now and then, we will work on finding times for multiple meetings to get through all the comments, with as many people in attendance as possible.

We will have to wait on setting further deadlines. Cancel road show until we get comments addressed.

So what is final deadline for comments? Two weeks from now, February 13.

Send this draft to all your stakeholders. Please note that it is not for dissemination, but for their perspectives, and that this is a working document, a draft.

Overall, it is a nice clean document. Swat teams did a fantastic job of making changes and clarifications.

The document is clearly a product of the process.

Let's begin a discussion on the comments we do have.

Drew – first two sections, back and forth between units of energy (chapters 3 and 4) Measurements should all be in MWh per year. Maybe a pop-out box, helping to explain units of measure.

Nancy – page 16, second item, improve standards – recommendations – campus facility standard updated by FY 16, really by July 1? Change that to FY 17?

Rob – page 18, referring to light bulbs – they should be called lamps, it is a more general term. Question on heat pumps, the whole potential strategies, district level geothermal. Air source heat pumps, mini split. Maintenance of those items. Maintenance of individual heat pumps, higher maintenance cost and timing should be taken into consideration. Campus is trying to catch up on deferred maintenance as it is. These strategies and impact on maintenance need to be studied, explicitly considered.

Studies on impact of deep bore holes, is there any environmental impacts – putting something down that far into the ground.

Iowa, what was cost of Ball State project? To better inform stakeholders. Can cost estimates be provided in a separate document? Ball State geothermal project was something like \$85M.

The AEI report does include cost information for geothermal.

Matthew – chapter 9 financing, in general, nothing outrageous. However, given the state of the state, about budgets... On page 46, in FY 15, new fund with contribution from campus? Need more information from the state before commenting on this. Make it even more vague? A lot depends on what comes out of Springfield.

Morgan -- Fleet conversion – the issue is that none of the existing cars in the fleet can run on 100% biodiesel. Electric only cars – we need the infrastructure, electric cars can't go all the way to Chicago, or all the way there and back. On page 30, right now technology isn't there to do it. Pete is going to provide more info.

Nancy – Page 11, converting the fleet, will there be reliable fuel available? Can you get to your destination? What is the resource availability to actually implement this? Housing has 67 vehicles.

Drew – education, page 57. Students in SSC and or SWAT team will be given class credit. Would like to see that expanded on, not just SSC or SWATeam.

Page 20, general and specific. Consider decentralized billing? Responsibility centered management. Billing back to individual units. Something for consideration, not new. Faulkner tried earlier.

This will not be the only issue. Things that we are listing as explored or considered as possibility, with language that says this is a possibility, not necessarily a recommendation. How do we treat those?

Drew – document is advising out to 2050, having the ideas in there is good, it puts it on the collective mind.

Consider the ways that ideas are phrased. For example, if it is a new policy, or other recommendations, we need to acknowledge impacts, and those departments need to be approached.

Aspirations are a good thing to have, in the general sense setting parameters is good. If you don't put them out there, they may not be considered.

Rob, when F&S strongly opposes, can we learn why, where are comments coming from. When comments are submitted, can we know who sent them.

The decentralized billing, at least resulted in lots of metering, that most campuses don't have.

Include [controversial] items in potential strategies, not objectives.

Stakeholder groups – who should we be sharing this with? We need the perspectives of the group or organization that you represent.

Each of you should use your own judgment in soliciting comments.

Lowa suggested that we explain what exactly 'net zero energy' means and what defines a 'major renovation'.

The document should explain why we want net zero space growth if people can build net zero energy buildings.

Adjournment 3:00 pm.