CSC meeting minutes

Tuesday, December 2nd. 1:00 0 2:30 PM

Attendance:

Voting Members: Britt Ortiz, Bruce Tiffney, Jennifer Suh, Eric Matthys

Other Attendees: Mo Lovegreen, Jewel Snavely, Bob Wilkinson, Jordan Sager, Katie Maynard, Andrew Riley, Bob Wilkinson, Amorette Getty, Sarah Siedschlag, Ben Warner, Bill Shelor, Eric Sutherland, Shivira Tomar, Noelle Steele, Cassidy Green, Matt O’Carroll, John Foran, George Foulsham

**Announcements**

Katie --- Save the date for CHESC at San Diego State University June 16th to 20th 2014. In mid-January we will be sending out a call for speakers.

We didn’t hear John Foran’s announcements because he was not yet present at the beginning of the meeting

**Minutes Approval**: Review meeting min. from November

Britt motioned to approve minutes, Bruce Seconded

Minutes were approved with no additions or edits

**Presentations/Discussion**:

1. **Sustainable Procurement Initiative** – Eric Sutherlin with industrial Ecology Research Services gave a presentation for the committee presenting the companies proposal.
	* Proposal—Sustainable procurement initiative for the whole campus.
		+ Outcomes: Feasibility assessment
			1. Project proposal if feasible, if not feasible will provide the campus with an indication of the steps they need to take before this project will be feasible
			2. Action plan development
			3. Annual footprint

**Questions/Discussion**

* + Mo: would this be pro bono?
		- Eric: They would like it to be a paid service
	+ Bruce: is the feasibility study related to us being able to afford this?
		- Eric: No it would rely on the amount of data we could get and the granularity of that data. If the project isn’t feasible, we will provide the campus with the steps that need to be taken in order to get feasible data.
	+ Bruce: Once you determine the feasibility would you be will to come back and share that information with the committee at a later meeting?
		- Eric: Yes
1. **Sustainable Living Research Ordinance – Ben Werner/Bruce Tiffney**

Ben Werner gave a presentation on his proposed Sustainable Living Research Ordinance.

* The goal being to procure a letter of interest in support of Goleta adopting this ordinance.
	+ If adopted by a city or county, it would create a process to permit some urban design/planning projects as pilot projects based on performance based rather than prescriptive metrics.

**Dsicussion/questions**

* Senate working group’s response--- As Bruce relayed --- the concern is that the involvement in research is an individual choice and we cannot promise faculty participation. It is a great idea but the concern is that we as a campus may not be able to make a commitment; maybe this should be on an individual faculty level.
* Katie: The SWG felt like this was something they think is important for the community however as Bruce said, they cannot make a commitment for the faculty. However the SWG hoped to communicate in the letter that they thought individual faculty are likely to be interested in participating in some aspects of the project.

There is a lot of opportunity to use this campus as a living laboratory and this ordinance would offer more opportunities.

* Ben Werner: When and if the chancellor puts a signature on this how much PR can we squeeze out of them?
* Bruce: This is a question for public relations. Note: George Foulsham had not yet arrived at the meeting
* Ben Werner was asked to leave so that the group could discuss the ordinance further.
* The question was asked if we wanted to move forward and send the letter to the chancellor, or give more time for questions and comments.
* Matt: is there a group working on this with Ben Werner?
	+ Katie: There isn’t an official group supporting him, but he does have informal partnerships. He is in the process of seeking more formal support from other groups as well.
* George Foulsham arrived and Mo asked him if he sees any problems with us supporting this.
	+ George: I don’t see any problems with this but you might let Michael Witherell as Vice Chancellor of research know. You may also want to consult with Kirsten Deshler
* Bruce: suggested that before making a decision on this we check in with Michael Witherell, Kirsten, Cal Poly, and SBCC, and come back at the next meeting with this information.
1. **Annual Energy & Utility Report-Jordan Sager/David McHale**

Jordan gave an overview of our historical and current energy use and costs. There were no questions

1. **Operational Effectiveness Energy Initiative**
	* **Jordan Sager gave an overview of the workshop**
		+ Half-day workshop on OE initiative: energy incentives for state funded buildings.
		+ The question was how we incentives behavioral changes?
		+ The proposed Pilot program: Pilot would focus on two buildings: Graduate school of education and PSB North and would run from 2014 -2016. A two year average would be taken to an energy budget. This would be entirely a savings program and 50% of the savings would go back to the department. A component would also be a green revolving fund. Sub-committee of the CSC would provide governance and overview.

**Discussion/Questions within**

* Eric Matthys: because it is a research-building aren’t they already paying for their energy?
	+ Jordan: Yes and No, We receive money to cover building energy use on a per square foot basis. This is also only a carrot program, building users aren’t getting penalized.
* Bruce: I think the collective of faculty within the building would see this as a way to work towards a common good.
* Bill Shelor: This will help management engage people to reduce energy if they could offer some benefits.
* Jordan (project timeline)
	+ 12.13.13 mark will talk with budget office
	+ By the end of year we will have the baseline data
	+ 1/24/14 we will submit Bren master project proposal for support in developing building allocation models.
	+ 7/1/14: pilot phase begins

Eric Matthys brought up the concern about the cost of this program in terms of having to designate staff time. Jordan said that in utility services we already keep track of the energy us.

**Action Items**:

**a) GM Carbon Reduction Initiative MOU**

* Bruce along with Mo and Katie gave an overview of the Academic Senate Sustainability Work Group’s Position: SWG discussed this yesterday and thinks that the financial benefits are appealing and this is a project worth pursuing but need to see an MOU before a final decision is made. SWG supports the recommendation of CPB to create a conflict of interest committee to look into net impact, ethical considerations, association risks, and use of the UC name. An MOU should be drafted in parallel. SWG suggests that CSC should establish the committee quickly and move forward as quickly as possible, but not so quickly that we don't fully resolve these issues. SWG also feels that the funds should be earmarked to create new intellectual advances in research and education, and not be used to address existing infrastructure. Please note that SWG is an unofficial Senate Working Group and does not represent the Academic Senate.
* Jennifer Suh ---students position --- EAB though it seemed harmless and would be in favor however they heard that Associated Students Legislative Council may be against it.
* Sarah Siedschlag --- Associated Students Staff--- stated that the AS president released a statement with three main concerns:
1. When asked where Chevy is getting the money from for this program they stated, "Chevy is accounting the cost of the carbon reduction initiative as a marketing expense." I don't know if we want to be a part of a "marketing expense" for a large car company (even if they are trying to be more environmentally friendly).
2. Chevy appears to be the first group that has offered to buy our carbon credits and retire them. Should we sell them to the first group that has offered to buy them? I think we should maximize the amount of money we are getting for our credits in order to best fund campus sustainability projects.
3. We would be the first UC campus to accept this deal. I think we should consult with other campuses before possibly setting a precedent for the UC.
* Bruce: The deal they are offering is above market value.
* Mo asked Bob what his thoughts were on the timeline?
	+ Bob: I couldn’t speak to that.

There were general concerns amongst the committee that this may disappear because we aren’t taking any steps.

* Bob: There isn’t any other markets. There is either money on the table or not.
* Jordan: There is no other market for this and we can’t get a better value.
* It was suggested that we have a group meeting with all the interested parties and try to answer all of their questions at once.
* Bruce: It sounds like our position is that we recognize the potential of this proposal and we recommend expeditious review.
* Bill Shelor: We should talk with Ball State.
	+ Mo: we are currently in the process of contacting Ball State

CSC recommendation: Move forward with drafting a MOU with all do haste and recommend expeditious review. It was decided that an information session would be scheduled with all the important stakeholders to answer their questions and address their concerns.

It was agreed that Pam, Mark, Jordan, and Bob should be apart of the team present at the information session.