

## Chancellor's Sustainability Committee Meeting Notes

Monday, April 8<sup>th</sup> 1:00 - 2:30

Ellison 5824

**Attendance:** Renee Bahl (Co-Chair), Derek Musashe, Jewel Persad (staff), David Lea (Co-Chair), Henning Bohn, Janet Walker, Jem Unger, Eric McFarland, Jacob Godfrey (advisor), Garry Mac Pherson, Mo Lovegreen (advisor), Dennis Whelan, Britt Ortiz, Mark Brzezinski, Hunter Lenihan

**Absent Committee Members:** Igor Mezic (advisor), Alan Heeger (advisor), Kristin Antelman, Ken Hiltner, Quinn Lyon, Sangwon Suh, Bill Shelor (Advisor), Roland Geyer

**Other Attendance:** Jordan Sager, Katie Maynard, Heather Perry, Sarah Siedschlag, Nick Balistreri, Barbara Haya, Elizabeth Szulc, Matthew O'Carroll, Jessie Schmitt

### Announcements (1:00 – 1:05):

- a) Cool Campus Challenge & Residential Hall Energy Competition – Competition started on April 1<sup>st</sup>, I encourage all of you to participate.
- b) RFI Workshop - April 8th 3:00 - 5:00 PM
- c) CHESC - Katie Maynard – Proposal extension until Friday, April 12<sup>th</sup>.
- d) Sugar Challenge and Forums
- e) #MovewithHeart
  - a. UC Walks (May 8th)
  - b. CycleMAYnia (all of May)

### Update: (1:05 – 1:14):

- a) [Campus Sustainability Plan](#) feedback from the CPB/Academic Senate

We received the following feedback from the Academic Senate:

“CPB expressed its appreciation of your committee’s responses to its earlier comments and was pleased to see the detailed matrix that lays out the top goals under each area of the plan and its current funding sources.

CPB believes that campus sustainability efforts should include the development of a strategic plan that provides an analysis of costs and benefits as well as a plan outlining funding sources and overall financial responsibility. The Council is eager to participate in future discussions about campus priorities once a detailed budget and cost-benefit analysis are available.

CRIR’s two standing committees considered the most recent revisions, but both groups declined to comment.”

We will vote on the approval of the plan at our May meeting, please review before then and send any comments or edits to Jewel Persad.

- b) Matt St.Clair, Director of Sustainability, UCOP Visit on May 15th

Brainstorm of items we would like Matt to present on at the May 15th CSC meeting:

- a. What kind of activities they are engaging in to get funding from the CA legislature?
- b. The future of CNI funding
- c. P3 development projects and the application to sustainability projects
- d. General questions on how offsets are viewed
- e. Potential for campuses not on direct access to partner with UCOP on solar projects

**Minutes (1:14-1:15):**

- a) Approve Meeting Min. from March (attached) – Approved

**Presentation and Discussion (1:15 – 2:10):**

- a) Request for Ideas: UC Carbon Offset Projects - Barbara Haya (45 min)

UC brought Barbara Haya on as a researcher, she is an expert in offsets, to lead a two year project figuring out what UCOP's offset strategy should be.

Scope of work:

#### **Voluntary market offsets**

- research outcomes of several project types
- create methods for due diligence assessment of individual offset projects
- compile set of well-vetted projects and project types

#### **UC-initiated offset projects**

- release RFI (request for ideas) UC-wide
- build portfolio of potential UC-initiated offset projects
- awards up to \$70,000 to several projects

#### **We are developing a menu of options to campus decision-makers**

Quality challenges – Barbara looked at the outcome of Kyoto for her PhD dissertation and found that offsets weren't actually generated.

Each project had to prove additionally when applying through UN, main way they showed this was by putting together a spreadsheet showing that the project wasn't cost effective.

California offset are structured in a much better way but still have flaws. They approve project types, where offsets could really make a difference. The California livestock protocol allows any new livestock digester to be an offset project. Instead of projecting out a business as usual scenario for these projects (some would be built anyway), California assumes every project is additional which causes over crediting.

The motivation for this project is to create a third generation of offset projects that meet a stronger standard for additionality and to push the volunteer market to have stronger standards.

People are really excited about the request of ideas. This gives us the flexibility to

think more creatively about how we can invest in research and education with more benefit while generating offsets.

Each offset is 3<sup>rd</sup> party verified and equals 1 ton, however there is a high level of uncertainty in how much is actually additional.

### **Discussion:**

Question: given the fact that UC wants to say we are at zero emissions, how can we use offsets to say we met that goal? There is a tension between certainty and the relaxed standard expressed by the market.

Question: Should we focus less on the absolute number and more of the benefits? I would slightly rephrase, going to measure emissions reductions conservatively, but given uncertainty on open market, how much are willing to accept. It is really easy to say I bought these off the market and they are third party certified so I am comfortable even though there might be better projects that we don't have methodology for.

Question: Why is the timeframe 40 years for projects that sequester carbon? It wasn't chosen out of a hat by us, but by others. Some bodies have chosen 40 years and some have chosen 100 years. We didn't think it was reasonable to ask anyone to assure for 100 years.

Question: What is the target price range? Offsets on the market range from \$1 to \$15. For projects we will take into account the co-benefits. The social cost of carbon is \$40 to \$200.

Timeline: RFI do at end of May.

Question: A number of us have an idea, should we submit them all? Yes, we will work with campuses before awarding projects to make sure it doesn't interfere with campus functions.

Talk about costs of third party certification – could UC spin off its own third party?

This is already happening, Second Nature is working with the Offset to create a peer review process between universities.

How important is it that a project is reproducible? We do give preference to reproducibility among other things. We anticipate that these would also come down to campus decisions, flavor of money, etc. We are trying to get a range of options for decision makers on each campus.

Do you think offsets should be a part of this program? This is a big experiment and we will see what we will get.

- b) UC Santa Barbara Energy Dashboard – Jordan Sager (10 min)  
We used to have an annual energy competition in the Residential halls but haven't done one since 2015. Since we have all this smart metering we decided to relaunch the competition.

The Energy Dashboard is a simplified version of what we use to track energy use on campus. We have most of our buildings set up here.

The dashboard provides a good public display of how all buildings are doing in the

competition and we are also able to show building level dashboards.

Some buildings have more than electricity, are you monitoring all fuel sources? We are monitoring but not displaying all. In a situation like this, users have the most control over electricity use.

Arizona has a similar display that shows day to day energy consumption and provides a snag shot. Is this something we will show? UCD has built out this display. We can take their code and display it, we are the first campus to take them up on the offer to use their code developed.

### **Other Updates (2:10 – 2:30):**

- a) Student discussion of campus sponsorship - Jem Unger Hicks & Kathryn Foster

UCSB is listed on Aera Energy website under charitable giving. We did some digging and realized an employee of theirs gave \$350, which the company matched. We wanted to bring this issue to everyone's attention and see what feedback you have? Preserving our reputation is important.

#### **Discussion:**

Is it a bad thing?

EAB thinks it is a bad thing. Don't want to be associated with publicly taking money from them. 45 students have signed a letter saying that we do not want them to list our name on their website.

Responding could be a slippery slope. What's the appropriate action?

When we think about major corporate donations, we are worried about company influencing, this isn't the case.

Janet thinks this is very problematic. They are trying to be a part of the community by listing all of the local communities.

It is free speech so we probably couldn't prohibit it.

The committee recommended that EAB reach out to Jennifer Lofthus, Policy Coordinator, and the development office