**Chancellor’s Sustainability Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Thursday November 10th, 2016 10:00-11:30**

**Library, Room 1312**

**Attendance:** Jewel Snavely (staff), David Austin, Bill Shelor (advisor), Bruce Tiffney (Co-Chair), Renee Bahl (Co-Chair), Natalie Burrous, Denise Stephens, Constance Penley, Mel Manalis, Marc Fisher, Britt Ortiz, Ken Hiltner, David Lea, Shivkumar Chandrasekaran, Nicolás Pascal

**Absent Committee Members:**

Igor Mezic, Alan Heeger (advisor), Rachel Segalman (advisor), Roland Geyer (on Sabbatical), Mark Brzezinski, Daniel Bernal Otero, Alex Regan,

**Other:**

Katie Maynard, Andrew Riley, Matt O’Carroll, Corey Lott, Barbara Quimby, Shelby huffaker

Introductions (10:05-10:10):

Announcements (10:10-10:15):

1. Food security position (2yrs) open for recruitment (funded by OP)
2. CHESC assistant position open
3. TGIF Application Period and workshop – on November 28th from 4 – 6:00 PM in SRB MPR
4. The World in 2050: Creating/Imagining Just Climate Futures" - a nearly carbon-neutral conference -- has opened! ---- Online conference, over 50 participants.
5. Carbon Brief –want to draw your attention towards a website that focuses on carbon neutrality.

Updates (10:15 –10:20):

1. New Membership update and Welcome – Ken Hiltner, David Lea, Shivkumar Chandrasekaran, Nicolás Pascal
2. STARS Submission- Mo Lovegreen – we finally hit the submit button.
3. Annual Report - The committee approved the report through email vote and we sent a copy up to the chancellor.
4. Ecoalition, last night we had our second meeting, heard from student activist network, climate relates, AS recycling, we also discussed the elections.

Minutes (10:20-10:25):

1. Approve meeting min. from May & October – Bruce

Committee approved meeting minutes for May and October.

Presentations and discussion (10:25-11:20):

1. Chancellor’s Graduate Student Researcher Presentation (research on behavior/economics/water) – (15 min) - Corey Lott

This project was funded through the CSCs graduate research fellowship program. The project looked at the effect of price information on consumer behavior under nonlinear tariffs.

Background – California is in the worst drought on record with several environmental and economic impacts. Utilities use price to promote conservation but have limited ability because they are regulated. Some economic studies have shown that consumers don’t really respond to incentives/price systems that are complex.

Study - Used data from water utility merger in Reno, NV. Before merger, one utility didn’t provide information on how there charges were calculated and the other did. Main finding was that providing price information led to a 4% decrease in water consumption. Also found that price information motivates low-income people more.

Discussion - Could we share this with local agencies? Also I read something that says people are also sensitive to social norms. Does benefit carry over paper billing? Wasn’t able to look at paperless billing.

1. Chancellor’s Graduate Student Researcher Presentation (research on Fisheries) - Barbara Quimby (15 min)

This project was funded through the CSCs graduate research fellowship program. We looked at Pier fishing in Santa Barbara County. Pier fishing doesn’t require a license like other fishing in California. Very attractive for low income and immigrant communities to supplement there diet. Our group wanted to answer the following questions:

* 1. Is pier fishing related to food insecurity
  2. Who is fishing and are there vulnerable communities
  3. Are there any health risks.

Two sites here in Santa Barbra that allow fishing without a license, but are different in terms of parking and tourisms. Goleta parking is free and it is less crowded. They found that people are fishing a lot more in Goleta because they can park for free and stay as long is they like, it is also more peaceful. Over the summer we trained undergraduate interns to go out to both locations and conduct interviews. Basic demographic information was collected along with information about what they fish, and the quality of the environmental and the fish.

Preliminary findings –

* Who’s fishing - higher rate of minority, particular Asian Pacific Islander and African Americans, mostly males between 30 and 45 years old, saw a lot of females but they said they weren’t really fishing.
* What were they fishing - Mostly catching mackerel, sardines, and anchovy?
* From where and how often - Most people go a couple times a week. Most people are coming from IV or Downtown, and some outliers from central valley and Los Angeles. Most were low income for Santa Barbara county and about 1/3 had children in the household. Most people reported that they ate there fish and that they didn’t find out about health risks from the sign, rather from friends and family members.

Discussion - Interested in woman standing with a pole and say that they are not fishing. I have seen woman with tents and children and snacks. Could be some kind of cultural divide would be nice to do interviews.

How much pounds do they usually catch? –2 – 3 lbs., and above 5 lbs. of fish.

Are you going to be collecting at other times? No, but we are missing some of the peaks time for bass.

1. Climate Action Plan (20 min)

Discussion and comments:

* Only three of the UC campuses are in a good place to achieve carbon neutrality by 2025 and UCSB is one of them. This is primarily due to UCSB not having a central plant.
* Freshman outreach should be a bigger part of the plan and Gaucho FYI should include climate literacy (Sustainability staff updated that this is in the Campus Sustainability Plan, but it will face challenges in implementation.)
* Parking - concern was raised that tiered parking rates would most negatively impact the lowest paid workers and give an advantage to faculty that only come to campus certain days. A concern was raised that existing programs to support alternative transportation do not fully address needs of families.
* Offsets - Concerns were raised about whether support could be garnered for offsets. Concerns were expected to be especially strong amongst students as well as staff/administration overseeing budgets. Group had a strong preference to reduce emissions through direct investment on campus rather than through offsets. It would be good if CSC were given a presentation on the potential costs and timeline effects of not including offsets in the strategy.
* Point was raised that new technologies may make the goal easier as we get closer to 2025. We might need to wait to see what the technology is in a few years before we can finish planning.
* Group was ok leaving offset language in as long as it is caveated that all other possible efforts would be pursued first. More language regarding the priority towards re-investment before offsets needed to be added.

Next Steps:

* CSC needs to meet with the Chancellor to discuss the plan before December. CSC should meet on their own at least one more time before meeting with the Chancellor

Committee Reports (11:15 -11:30) – didn’t have time for committee reports