

iCAP Working Group

April 9, 2015

1:30 pm

Kevin Duff, Rob Fritz, Morgan Johnston, Ben McCall, Nancy O'Brien, Drew O'Bryan

Guests: Mike Larson, Kent Reifsteck, Scott Willenbrock

Updates:

Assessments from SWATeam recommendations will be sent out soon for your comments.

Mike, Kent and Scott will be joining us at 2:00 pm to discuss a more forward looking clean energy plan. The goal is to get Kent's perspective and Scott's perspective and try to come to an agreement. This was one of the major items of concern in the current draft of the 2015 iCAP.

The current timeline for the iCAP is to finish all homework by April 16, and meet on April 23 to review. We hope to have a public comment period before graduation. Ultimately, our deadline is by May 29 when the Sustainability Council meets.

Mike Larson, Kent Reifsteck, and Scott Willenbrock joined the meeting for a discussion of a clean energy plan.

Kent asked if the SWATeams were continuing, and stated that "we don't need a separate/third plan, we have the AEI Report and the iCAP. Do we need another?"

Ben: We don't intend for another group to be formed, but the top level goal is carbon neutrality. The AEI report doesn't help meet our climate goals.

Kent: The AEI report allows us to build scenarios with many different toggles to change variables for energy supply. Much of the technology is still developing and will require a huge capital investment. There is not a silver bullet to get us to carbon neutrality.

The last utilities master plan was done in the late 90's. It was a total review heating, cooling, electrical; led to a new distribution system which allowed us to buy from MISO. The AEI report will feed into decision making; want it to be interactive, want input from iSEE regarding renewables, net zero growth. We need to control space growth and continue the conservation work to reduce energy consumption. We continually upgrade and test new technologies, but need input from campus on load and funding.

Ben: Is the Utilities Master Plan finalized? What does that mean? What if there is an error in the AEI report, what if geothermal turns out to be cheaper? Who decides to move forward?

Kent: F&S has a process for evaluation; then many questions will need answered in regard to permitting, funding, infrastructure.

Ben: there is also a campus sustainability process. SWATeams make a recommendation that is evaluated by the iWG, and when it is a big issue, then it gets taken to the Sustainability Council.

Communication needs to be consistent.

Scott: The AEI report does a good job on fossil fuel energy, but concerned that they haven't taken geothermal serious enough, that perhaps the consultants are not experienced in geothermal. Perhaps we can build a geothermal system that we can grow into, do it in phases.

The AEI Report doesn't show any savings relative to geothermal.

Mike: We do need to prove the numbers for geothermal; many question the accuracy of the numbers.

Kent: We will continue to evaluate renewable options as projects arise. The iCAP doesn't supply any cost estimates, some things can be difficult to implement without funding.

Ben: The AEI Report shows greenhouse gas emissions up at 600,000-700,000 metric tons all the way out to the year 2050. The iCAP projects reducing greenhouse gas emissions down consistently to zero by 2050. What are we going to do to bridge that gap?

Scott: Can we get a second opinion? From someone who specializes in geothermal? (MEP?) We are requesting due diligence in the geothermal topic.

Ben: We need to reconcile the section in the iCAP about a clean energy plan. Is it a plan or a roadmap? Need to get AI's approval on language and wording.

Adjournment 3:15 pm.