Chancellor's Sustainability Committee Meeting Agenda  
Wednesday, May 23rd 10:00 - 11:30  
5123 Cheadle  

**Attendance:** Bruce Tiffney (Co-Chair), Renee Bahl (Co-Chair), Janet Walker, Hunter Lenihan, Derek Musashe, Dennis Whelan, Jewel Snavely (staff), Jacob Godfrey (advisor), Nicolas Pascal, David Lea, Henning Bohn,  

**Absent Committee Members:** Roland Geyer, Igor Mezic (advisor), Alan Heeger (advisor), Mel Manalis, Rachel Segalman, Ken Hiltner, Rena Lahn, Mark Brzezinski, Matias Eusterbrock, Alan Grosenheider, Sangwon Suh, Britt Ortiz, Bill Shelor (Advisor),  

**Other Attendance:** Katie Maynard, Heather Perry, Naomi Carrillo, Cesar Tran, Demetrious Fishell, Hailey Colin, Amorette Getty, Andrew Riley  

Announcements (10:05-10:15):  
a) Lab Equipment – TGIF is offering a new rebate program for energy efficient equipment.  
b) CHESC- Registration is now open and we have some funding that can help cover costs for departments that cannot provide support.  
c) CycleMAYnia end of month BBQ - BBQ to celebrate CycleMAYnia on 31st, McConnell’s is donating ice cream. SB is 3rd in nation for love to ride, the competition ends June 1st.  
d) CNI and GFI Fellows, call for applications – Accepting applications through June 1st  
e) Training Opportunity - UC Irvine is running an institute for climate resiliency, they are offering a trainers’ training. The announcement for this was shared with the committee via our list serve.  
f) TGIF Reaffirmed - 83.4% voted to Reaffirm TGIF  

Updates (10:15 – 10:28):  
b) Draft Green Labs Action Plan – Amorette Getty  
   UC Sustainable Practices Policy requirea each campus to develop a Green Labs Action Plan. We have had a green labs program on campus for a long time so our plan will include over 40 best practices. Our campus is in good shape and we will be ready to start the vetting process for the plan in fall. How far are we ahead then other campuses? Really far, only UCSD has a greater number of total lab assessments. Our percent of lab certifications for campus is at 20%.  

Minutes (10:28-10:30):  
a) Approve Meeting Min. from April – Bruce Tiffney – Hunter motioned, David
second, all in favor.

Presentations and Discussion (10:30-11:10):
   a) STARS pathway to platinum part 2 – STARS Team: Naomi, Cesar, Hailey is, and Demetrius

AC 1: Courses (5.7 out of 14) and AC 9: Research (9.77 of 12)
Value: Integration of sustainability across majors and fields.
Problem: We need a broad scale solutions, our New Leaf grant only allocates $3,000 a year to incuse sustainability into curriculum. For full credit, STARS requires that 20% of classes have some relationship to sustainability, we are currently at 5.8%. For AC 9, 90% of departments have to be conducting research related to sustainability for full point, we are currently at 50% =. Potential Solution: We have talked about a grand challenge in previous years. Another model is the University of Oregon’s sustainable city model. – They rotate between cities in the region. We think we could do a Sustainable cities year for IV at relatively low costs.
Questions: How do we define sustainable courses? Academic senate developed their definition of what counts as a sustainable course.

EN 10: Community Partnerships (2 out of 3 points)
Community Partnerships – missing inclusive and participatory partnerships. Underrepresented populations need to be engaged as equal partners in strategic planning, decision-making, implementation and review. The proposed Sustainable cities solution for the last credit could work for this if students participate in community development and the local community decides what the project chosen are.

IN 13: Spend Analysis (0 out of 0.5 points)
Other campuses received credit for this by having an intern do a spend analysis or having office depot do a spend analysis. Data accessibility could be an issue. TGIF just awarded a grant to have a masters student complete a spend analysis for food purchases in the dinning commons, this could help us get the credit.
Question about scope and scale of spend analysis. Do you need total spend or spend in specific areas? Could be for a specific area.

OP 1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (6.47 out of 10 points)
Based on three parts
Part 1: Earn up to 2 points for reporting and verifying emissions.
Part 2: Earn up to 4 points for reducing our adjusted net Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions per weighted campus user compared to a baseline (2000).
Part 3: Earn up to 4 points if annual adjusted net Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions are less than the minimum performance threshold (0.215 MtCO2e per gross square metre).
For our score to increase we would need to fund energy efficiency projects on campus. Graphs displayed during the presenting used projects outlined in
the draft climate action plan to show how much reductions we could get with different levels of funding.

**OP 5: Building Energy Consumption (3.93 out of 6 points)**
Identify sources of funding for projects outlined in the CAP. Same model as OP 1. $8 million would result in over 7 million KWH of electricity savings.

**OP 3: Building Operations and Maintenance (2.1 out of 5 points)**
Earn up to 5 points for having all eligible buildings certified at the highest level, LEED platinum. Only a small amount of buildings on our campus are certified. We are currently only certifying buildings through the LEED labs class.
Three options for increasing points: 1 - reinvest and continue to certify under LEED, 2 - look at different certifications. 3 - Establish an internal certification process like Stanford does. With options 1 and 2 we can get full credit, we only get partial points for option 3.
TGIF paid for portion of LEED certification for next year but for future years we need to find an alternative option. Most LEED labs certification are in housing or student affairs because they have funding.

Question, does anything actually change about the building during the process? With the first couple buildings we see a large positive impact, but after several building, the returns do diminish. Still through the certification process several changes are usually made to improve the building before the final documents are submitted for review.
Andrew Riley is going through the LEED process right now for the SRB and remarked that the occupant and transportation survey done as part of the process give staff and students a significant amount of helpful data that can be used to take action.
We have a few million dollars of deferred maintenance, what should we prioritize? Sometime LEED projects can help with deferred maintenance.

**OP 4: Building Design and Construction (2.68 out of 3 points)**
Can earn full points by having all new buildings certified at the LEED platinum level.
Solution: We could consider a policy for LEED platinum with an exception process if it is deemed to cost prohibitive. Getting a certification for LEED platinum isn’t inherently more expensive then gold.

**OP 6: Clean and Renewable Energy (earned 0.02 out of 4 points)**
Only earn full points if all energy comes from renewable sources.
Is Nuclear included? Nuclear isn’t included but Hydro is?
All direct access Universities will be renewable by 2020.
Recommendations: New buildings should be solar capable.

**PA 9: Sustainable Investment (2.13 out of 4 points)**
Issues: STARS asks us to use 30-60% of our investment pool, while we use 1.9%
Our Solution: Coordinate with other UCs and push Regents for Green Revolving Fund

PA 10: Investment Disclosure (0.75 out of 1 points)
Missing: Proxy voting records are not included in the snapshot of investment holdings
Solution: Urge Board of Regents to include this snapshot

OP 12: Electronics Purchasing (0.55 out of 1 point)
45% of Electronic purchasing are non EPEAT. EPEAT is important because it looks at toxicity, and end of life. Student affairs switched to MAC (all Apple computers are EPEAT gold) which boosted numbers.
Solutions:
- Training program for campus purchasing staff
- Outreach campaign to raise attention of the impact of electronic waste and EPEAT certification
- Better ways in Gateway to restrict views of non-EPEAT products
- Add a check-box on purchasing forms or require departments to include a verification sheet when purchasing that confirms a product is EPEAT (or an explanation of why an alternative product was purchased)

OP 17: Employee Commute Modal Split (0.78/2.00)
We need a higher level of employees using alternative transportation.
Recommendations:
- Better enforce bike infrastructure policy (requirements for employee showers and bike racks)
- Continue supporting CycleMAYnia especially for engaging staff and faculty in bike commuting
- Monitor the use of the commuter train and support efforts to help staff get to campus from the train station.
- Rebalance parking pass prices to incentivize alternative transit every day

OP 9: Landscape Management (1.0/2.0 points)
Maximum of 2 points earned when 100% of campus grounds is managed in accordance to an organic program. Incremental points are awarded for percentage of grounds managed in accordance with an IPM (we currently get 1 point for our IPM program) and/or an organic program. UCSB generally operates with very little inorganic fertilizers and chemical pesticides, fungicides, and herbicides.
UCSB however needs to eliminate the use of inorganic fertilizers and chemical pesticides, fungicides, and herbicides. This can be done for a
portion of square footage rather than all of UCSB.

**EN 2: Student Orientation (1.71 out of 2.0 points)**
Sustainability only reaches undergraduates, transfer students, and graduate students in Bren and Geography. We could improve our reach to graduate students and international students by getting onto the agenda for international and graduate student orientation.

**OP 20: Construction and Demolition Waste Diversion (0.81/1 pt)**
UCSB documents all construction and demolition waste that is generated by subcontractors. Contractors and subcontractors are required to report their waste generation at the end of each project. We receive incremental points for the percentage of construction and demolition waste that is recovered.

**Recommendation:** Increase accountability of contractors to divert waste and report data. Require project managers to track compliance with guidelines for diverting and reporting on waste.

**AC-10: Support for Research**
We currently don’t give incentives in tenure review process.

**Next steps:**
Will send out full packet by Tuesday along with a survey asking each member to prioritize which credits we should focus on. Will review survey results during June meeting.

Committee Check-Ins (11:10 - 11:30)

a) Academic Senate Sustainability Work Group* – Katie Maynard
   Selecting CNI and GFI fellows in early June. New Leaf grant application deadline have been extended to mid-July.

b) ECOalition* – Gabriel Etatt

c) Energy & Climate – David Lea and Nicolas Pascal
   No updated as the committee is meeting tomorrow

d) Food* - Katie Maynard – Meeting with IV community services district to talk about a joint project to start a garden in IV. Funding - trying to secure $500K from Sacramento to support food security across the UC system. We are also working on GFI funding proposals.

e) Landscape – Bruce Tiffney --- the group is discussing becoming a Bee friendly certified campus. One of the issues we face is the use of pesticides inside, not outside.

f) Procurement* – Sangwon Suh & Heather Perry
   Meeting next week to review sustainable purchasing criteria.
   Attended the SPLC last week. The SPLC is the leading national forum on sustainable spending. The conference was a great opportunity to see where we are compared to other institutions. During the conference Heather presented on the process for updating our UC system wide sustainable
procurement policy. Our campus was also awarded two star EPEAT award.
g) Transportation – Mark, Ken, or Roland and Sean Burns
h) Waste – Rena Lahn ---
   Katie – received a My Last Trash grant from UCOP for a graphic design intern
to update signage.
i) Water – Britt Ortiz