**Energy Conservation and Building Standards – 4th Meeting Minutes**

*In attendance: Marian Huhman, Dave Boehm, Karl Helmink, Andrea Martinez Gonzalez, Paul Foote, Swarnali Sanyal, Carol Lin (clerk), Morgan White, Ximing Cai, Doris Reeser, Brad Klein; Absent: Yun Kyi Ki*

1. Introductions were conducted for the guest visitors and new student representative, Swarnali Sanyal, to become acquainted with the SWATeam.
2. Approval of October 18th minutes
	1. They have been adjusted with Karl’s, Paul’s, and Marian’s edits. After some refining, they will be ready to be posted to the iCap portal.
3. Deferred Maintenance Program and AFMFA representatives, Doris Reeser and Brad Klein, present a mini-lecture on maintenance.
	1. Doris was on SSC for its first 3-4 years, was involved in revolving loan program, and attended UIUC for 7 years.
	2. Differentiating between the kinds of maintenance:
		1. Deferred = maintenance for something that didn’t get accomplished in the time it was supposed to; funding-wise, cannot take care of the issue anymore and must be put off for a later time
		2. Preventative = any of the actions planned to keep equipment in best possible shape, such as extending the service life and preventing breakdowns and failures
			1. Ex: changing old, dirty filters to new, clean ones
		3. Backlog is $720 million.
	3. Presentation itself:
		1. AFMFA’s philosophy is to address highest needs and DM backlog. They fix not patch; In other words, they search for long-term solutions, not short-term.
		2. Capital project is $250,000+ . Wants a single campus project list for all funding, which could then be used for state capital budget requests, deferred maintenance, and special funding opportunities. That way, one can efficiently draw from the same list instead of multiple lists.
		3. The AFMFA student fee is a board authorized facility condition assessment. For example, mechanical and electrical plumbing’s partial assessment was in 2013. AFMFA student fee generates about $20 million per year (depends on fee waivers and number of students).
			1. AFMFA, COPS, and UA Reserve all borrow from this.
		4. All projects go through AFMFA committee and must satisfy three general objectives: They must address deferred maintenance, have an impact on teaching and learning, and benefit a large number of students.
		5. The committee has a 100 point judging system and pick which project is the winner based on 8 judging criteria, such as deferred maintenance, life safety, building utilization/number of students served, etc.
		6. Some of the buildings from the list of 20 highest used student facilities are: Lincoln Hall, ECEB, Gregory Hall, Loomis Lab, BIF, Noyes Lab, David Kinley, Armory, Altgeld, Siebel, Woehlers, Foellinger, FLB, DCL
		7. There are 6 different focus groups to help decide what gets funded (electrical, plumbing, elevators, etc.)
			1. Each one has experts correlated to each topic. They are a combination of people who are designers, engineers, and architects, who provide expertise on these fields.
			2. As we look at needs across campus, we know which systems are on verge of failing and which one had numerous repair calls. Each focus group has a priority list, and it’s passed up the chain to see if it makes the capital budget list.
		8. Dave says 99% of deferred maintenance projects on campus are handled by capital renewal process, and 1% is handled by maintenance.
		9. Doris suggests partnerships to meet iCap objectives. Use quick payback fund. Karl says it’s hard to do anything significant with that though. Revolving loan fund is coming up and there’s a couple hundred thousand there.
		10. The team is interested in setting up a quarterly time with Doris and Brad to touch base. Facilities on campus have a direct tie to energy savings. They are thinking of meeting them once a semester to share updates of the group.
	4. Karl pulled up a chart of the energy usage trend to show Doris and Brad. We’re 33% down since 2008. He also showed how it’s accessible from the utilities and energy services website.
4. Funding for energy conservation.  Discussion on possible recommendation
	1. Marian and Karl met with Kent last Monday. Funding is limited, especially after losing DCEO grant funding. If we can continue to reduce energy, it helps free up dollars for other things on campus. Projects and ESCO and retro-commissioning and recommissioning need money.
	2. PM (preventive maintenance) teams rely on Dave’s (Boehm) shop to carry out his responsibilities in order to carry out theirs. Dave says there are great things happening. He wants another team going through the buildings in consideration of the goals. Working group says they want a rec that’s focused on one thing; For example, one rec on building and one rec on energy conservation). Dave says they’re so interconnected though.
	3. Morgan strongly recommends having one request in the recommendation. Make it simplistic instead of dense. Then explain rationale behind it.
	4. Ximing suggests making a new recommendation but to use some of the old priorities that didn’t get discussed from the last recommendation. Priority #3 has been discussed by the IWG since 2015. Karl says a new rec won’t be put out until after the year. Marian says it’s possible to simplify old priorities. Karl says to do a quick update.
		1. This is all to meet a deadline since it has to go through IWG before it gets passed to the council meeting happening in December. For example, the team could change working group “3 and 4” to now “5 and 6”. Focus on priority #2 to get it to working group (The working group might be meeting the week after Thanksgiving, but it has not been officially planned yet).
		2. Brad says make it a simple two-sentence statement and move some bullets to rationale, so it’s a lot simpler and more impactful. Morgan says keep all of it but keep the rec succinct. Ximing’s suggestion might have moved the group along 6 months early.
5. Green Labs Coordinator position.  Report from Paul on meeting with Ximing.
	1. Many meetings happened with different groups. Paul searched around other universities and researched what they did. iSEE coordinator Micah contacted people. They applied to get people together.
	2. There is concern over how the GLC program will affect safety. Safety department and GLC should coordinate. GLC needs to complete the inventory of labs across campus and identify some possibilities for policy development. Safety department has established institutions with their office. Division of Safety has established guidelines and policies, but there aren’t any for the program yet. Coordinator will have to help us explore some. Ximing will meet with Jan N. and write a proposal. They have pieces to put it together. They will then distribute the proposal to different groups after it’s been written, as well as tell the council. Overall, GLC is moving along.
6. Background on building maintenance projects and funding
	1. Campus has 13 mil square feet of buildings to maintain. People contact F&S with what needs to be fixed and it gets fixed. Dave says they fix what they can. There is $1.4 million for Repair and Restoration funds, ~$3.5 million for preventative maintenance, and $1 million for overhead for administration and management. Rest of the budget goes to items of utmost urgency.
	2. In FY15, the overall building maintenance budget was $20 million, and in FY18, the overall budget was $13.9 million.
	3. Two goals expressed from campus, even with the massive budget reductions Building Maintenance has experienced, are to build better relationships and still get the work done.
	4. For repair and replacement projects every year, they carry over projects that have not been addressed.
	5. Many of these fixes are energy conservation related.
7. ILO on Nov 10
	1. Andrea will attend this one and might bring her parents along too.
8. Imagery design idea
	1. Marian has contacted the student group of American Advertising Federation, but they have yet to respond.
9. Next meeting:
	1. Nov. 14 from 3:30-5 pm Tuesday 4th floor Lincoln Hall.