Minutes from March 4 meeting approved.

Presentation:
- The letter for Jim Dehlsen regarding the Tehachapi project was postponed because Mel thinks we can wait to write the letter after some anemometer data is released in the near future.

Discussion:
- Mo created a second draft budget including all funding requests to show the difference between bare minimum ($270K) and fully functioning ($1.3M) - (see white board). Joel said we should prioritize the staff positions – probably do not need a Director, but the two coordinator positions should stay. Joel asked if we needed 100% time CNT as webmaster. Mo stated that we are so far behind on the web work, plus FM has real-time energy data that needs to be posted for campus buildings, so it is definitely full time work. Bruce T asked about the procurement coordinator. Mo said we are not currently staying on top of regulations and we need someone to work with vendors on increasing sustainability in the contracts. Joel said that, since the contracts are on a system-wide level, this should be partially paid by UCOP, or UCOP should hire someone to be doing this. Mo asked if a letter should be drafted to Nathan Brostrom (acting EVP of business operations, UCOP). Joel said it should come from Gene Lucas’ group (Committee on the Future). Bruce T suggested we separate out the Change Agents’ on-going costs from the one-time project costs. Joel suggested we pick one figure for Change Agents and dole the money out later. Britt suggested we include a column with previous successes.

- David McHale was asked to attend today’s meeting to discuss the FM perspective on the Student Affairs’ Zero Net Energy project. David stated that 60-83% of our utility costs are for reserve stand-by charges (based on other utility company’s rates, currently researching what SCE’s are) for when we need a large amount of power on a moment’s notice, so even if we are generating our own electricity, the campus still has to pay these charges for back-up. Off-site generation of electricity is less than what we pay on campus, so there is not a 1:1 rate. In addition, there are performance clauses written into utility contracts that state we have to generate a certain amount per year. If we start “owning” our power, the campus will have to register as a utility with the State which will lead to a whole new crop of regulations. The SRB will still need lines running into the building. If the power goes off, the campus will still be able to supply them electricity. There is approximately a 4.5% energy loss (line loss and heat loss) during distribution, and the entire campus needs to take responsibility for these costs. Joel asked if, when we recharge Housing for electricity, are they paying for these losses? David said yes, but it gets complicated. Lighting for walkways, etc. are paid for by FM for the greater good of campus. Marc stated that a surcharge on electricity should apply...
to everyone on campus to create a reserve account to be used for emergency repairs. David added that this surcharge can be capped when we reach a certain amount in the reserve account. Ron noted that, similar to the TAP program, as you decrease demand for electricity, the price increases for those that remain. Prof Kohn asked if any other large universities have addressed the financial aspects of generating their own power. David stated that, due to regional differences, there isn’t anything to compare with UCSB at this time. David is feels that the idea the NZE project won’t have a cost impact is concerning. Bruce T felt it is more than an energy discussion, though – it’s a longer, more philosophical question about doing the right thing for future generations. Ron suggested that we write a letter of support, but require that there be full discussion about all costs involved in the project. Joel thinks the committee could support it in principle, but we need to be careful whole-heartedly endorsing it. Bruce added that SA needs to sit down with David to figure out how costs are parsed out and find the most efficient way of doing it. Prof Kohn added that it is important we avoid false advertisement. Bruce said that he and Ron would draft a letter to student affairs, suggesting they meet with David and BAP to determine all the costs. Bruce asked what we should do about the student fee, knowing it is not in the best interest of the students. Prof Kohn said we need to redirect the students without discouraging them. Steffen asked if going forward with this project would impact the reputation of campus, and how far it would benefit the campus. Marc said we should endorse the project to send a political message, but the caveat being a more thorough business model with any energy savings going back to Todd Lee to fund campus infrastructure. Britt asked if students should be paying for campus infrastructure. Mo said the money should go back to campus to offset the project’s costs to the campus. Bruce added that this idea is so new, it’s close to the bleeding edge – we need to approach it carefully.

• Meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Actions/Tasks:
• Draft and send a letter to Student Affairs (Bruce and Ron).
• Approach Gene Lucas about drafting a letter to UCOP about a sustainable purchasing coordinator (?).
• Make suggested changes to budget (Mo).

Next Meeting:
• Friday, April 2 @ 1:30 in Cheadle 5123
• Discuss Smart Building Policy
• Vote on budget
• Suggestions?