Chancellor's Sustainability Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, December 4th, 2018 2:00 - 3:30

Attendance: Renee Bahl (Co-Chair), Derek Musashe, Dennis Whelan, Jewel Persad (staff), David Lea (Co-Chair), Shivkumar Chandrasekaran, Janet Walker, Sangwon Suh, Jem Unger Hicks, Britt Ortiz, Kristin Antelman, Ken Hiltner, Mark Brzezinski, Hunter Lenihan, Quinn lyon, Mo Lovegreen (advisor)

Absent Committee Members: Roland Geyer, Igor Mezic (advisor), Alan Heeger (advisor), Bill Shelor (Advisor), Henning Bohn, Garry Mac Pherson, Nicolas Pascal, Eric McFarland, Ken Hiltner, Mark Brzezinski, Jacob Godfrey (advisor)

Other Attendance: Jordan Sager, Katie Maynard, Amorette Getty, Sarah Siedschlag, Jessie Schmitt, Rachel Huang

Presentation and Discussion (2:05 – 3:15):

a) **China, the global economy, and its impact on Santa Barbara County's Recycling** – Carlyle Johnston, Project Leader, Santa Barbara County Public Works, Resource Recovery & Waste Management Division

There is a lot of miss information about what is happening with recycling. First I will talk about how recycling works in Santa Barbara and then I will talk about how we are affected by the changes China is making.

Recycling is consolidated and put into large orange trucks and taken to Ventura for recycling. It is sorted and compressed into bales and then shipped off to China. Recycling has been subsidized by trade deficit because we had empty crates going back, so sending stuff to China has been really cheap. Carlyle showed some pictures of the pollution and health risks associated with the recycling industry in China. A lot of the excess recycling is often burned or thrown into the streets.

The linear system we have is destructive. All industrial activity has a cost including recycling.

- Aluminum is the best to recycle, it is easier to recycle then to make, and it also doesn't down cycle like paper. Aluminum is also recycled here in California, this means recyclers are forced to follow our local laws.
- Paper and Cardboard are also fairly easy to recycle.

The point is that there is a hierarchy to recycling and not all things are easily recycled.

China passed new laws requiring materials to be cleaner and by doing that it became an effective ban. China did this partly because of the environmental impacts. They targeted recycling because:

- already breaking law

- Smaller companies
- Other main polluters are bigger companies.

So what does that mean for us? Until we get better at processing our own recycling, we won't be able to recycle a lot of things.

1 and 2 plastics are still recyclable because we have CRV, CALrecycle pays businesses to process 1 and 2 and they audit these facilities. CRV payments make recycling these plastics more financially rewarding and they require that the bales be really clean.

All plastic #1 in SB are recycled in California and turned into clam shells, but we don't have a way to recycle clam shells.

How is info getting out? Slowly, once you get out the message it is hard to change so it is all about waiting and getting all haulers to agree that our information is correct.

Short term is that all recycling will have to be cleaner and people won't take dirty products. This is good in the long run.

It is going to cost more now because we aren't going to get the subsidies, also getting recycling cleaner will come at a cost (tech and labor).

What most people through in blue bin is paper, less is mixed rigid plastics, so it won't make a huge impact on diversion.

Do ferrous metals get pulled out of trash? No, nothing really gets pulled out of the trash.

Given what you just outlined, is the implication that what we have got used to recycling is better off going in the landfill? Yes, especially film plastics (#4). You have to use a lot of water and chemicals to clean them. There are a lot of things we shouldn't have been recycling. Even recycling plastics #1 is a linear process. It is always better to reduce.

b) The Impact on UCSB's Waste Diversion Efforts – Jessie Schmitt (5 min)

Here is the waste data from last year, we are still far away from a 90% diversion rate. The County is using different educational guidelines then what we are telling people on campus. We have to follow Marborg guidelines. Several Items will no longer be recyclable, including:

- Chipboard & Boxboard (cereal boxes, pasta boxes, show boxes, etc.)
- Cartons (milk, juice boxes, coconut water, etc.)
- Aseptic Packaging
- Plastics #3 - #7 (Food packaging, yogurt cups, solo cups, butter tubs fruit

or veggie packages)

Discussion
We will need to shift our focus to reducing waste generated, and increasing composting. We are partnering with facilities to see how to expand composting.

Broader implications before we move on? A little depressing, recycling just seems like a bandage. We don't have a lot of models for how this would work. What other models are there/alternatives for these products, this is something that the waste subcommittee should look at.

UCEN catering containers are compostable. Restaurants on campus are required to use compostable.

c) Draft Green Labs Action Plan – Amorette Getty (30 min)

8 to 10% of the campus population interacts with lab spaces.
17 to 19 of the largest lab buildings use between 50% and 60% of the electricity and 30% of gas consumed on campus. Lab buildings also use more waste on average. The majority of energy use is for ventilation. Cold storage and large equipment also use a lot of energy.

UCSB's Green Labs History
2005-2006 School Year
UCSB launched the first comprehensive green laboratory assessment program in the country. Now UC policy requires that all UC campuses have a green lab assessment program

2010
UC Davis and UCSB LabRATS co-founded the Green Labs Planning community, which supports collaboration among 321 members and more than 60 Universities, National Labs, and other locations.

2016- Current
UCSB LabRATS Co-Chairs the Green Labs Working Group at the UC Systemwide level.

Fall 2018
19.7% of Campus Laboratories Assessed to date
Received a green lab purchasing award at the International Institute for Sustainable Laboratories (I2SL) Conference.

Green Lab Action Plan Purpose

- Reduce the environmental impact of research laboratories while improving safety.

- Set short, mid, and long-term, and visionary goals
- Document the work that has already been done.
- Engage the campus community in setting the direction for our sustainable laboratory operations.

Please note that there are no goals or policy recommendations within this plan that require any faculty or researchers to do/not do anything that is not already required by UC Policy.

Timeline
Jan 17 policy was adopted
Fall – completed first draft
Winter – vetting plan
March – finalized.

Key stakeholders we are hoping to engage in feedback on the plan include: academic departments, faculty and researchers, administrative and operational departments and Leads, committees, and student organizations.

Plan is divided up by the nine sections both for best practices and areas of improvement.

Discussion:
In the waste section, I wonder why composting and solvent recycling on campus are so far out in the plan horizon? We did some work with labs and found that the waste streams were incredible inconsistent and small, so we had a hard time getting a good ROI on the project. We have been successful in the animal research area, particularly the bedding, but bioengineering was able to integrate this into their building. To speak to solvent recycling, there is an opportunity. We would need to identify the labs that use a lot and create a system for sharing them. But often times finding enough faculty that have similar needs and setting up EH&S requirements is hard.

Do most of procurement through gateway, maybe it is a source to use to steer folks towards sustainable products? Procurement is working to integrate with the ACT label but unfortunately there aren't a lot of manufactures using the label yet as it is fairly new.

How do we integrate surplus sales and procurement?

We had a website to share equipment but it wasn't really used. Labs don't want to hold equipment for more than a day or two so it will need to go back to surplus sales.

Some of the action items aren't necessarily lab specific, could there be better bang

for buck focusing on lab specific issues like lab ventilation?

Biggest issue is lab energy, and we have some specific goals to address this. We have been working over the last few years to define our approach to lab ventilation projects.

We just did a project at PSB north that had a 30% reduction in electricity, and 45% reduction in natural gas do to night time heating setbacks. The temperature was set back from 75 to 55 degrees. We exempted two of floors do to research. We got very little negative feedback.

There are a lot of recommendations here, my feedback would be prioritize goals in terms of impact and feasibility.

Done some of this through the development of short, mid, and long goals. Would it be better if we moved away from time frames and did a prioritized list?

We will be continuing to get feedback through winter quarter.

Updates (3:15 – 3:18):

a) Major Milestones and Deadlines – Mo Lovegreen

List of Major Milestones and Deadlines can be found here

Minutes (3:18-3:20):

a) Approve Meeting Min. from October (attached) – Approved

Committee Updates (3:20 – 3:30)

a) Proposal of a new format for committee updates – Renee and David

We propose that each committee be assigned a month to have a more in depth presentation and or conversation (15 min total). There will always be time at the end for other updates.

a. Energy & Climate – David Lea & Derek Musashe - Jan
b. Waste – Kristin Antelman - Feb
c. Transportation, Ken Hiltner, Roland Geyer, Mark Brzezinski - March
d. Procurement – Sangwon Suh - April
e. Food – Hunter Lenihan – June
f. Other Updates

Edible campus student farm got selected for the senior class gift and got a 20k grant from the Santa Barbara Foundation.

Hunter went to Oakland for a GFI meeting. There is a request for proposals out and they are planning to award 10k grants. GFI as a whole will wrap up in June.