**Energy Conservation & Building Standards Meeting**

*In attendance: Alex Dzurick, Ben McCall, Claudia Szczepaniak, Dhara Patel, Fred Hahn, Jessica Tran, Karl Helmink, Marian Huhman, Morgan Johnston*

1. ECBS Objective 2 discussion. Ben begins with some perspective.
	1. An earlier draft of iCAP 2015 stated all new renovations should be net-zero.
		1. If you make it too expensive, units might as well keep old buildings, which use a lot of energy. Instead, agreed net-zero is too ambitious and is something to aspire to. Compromised that the highest level of energy performance standards that would be achievable for all campus buildings would be the goal.
	2. BM and MJ came up with the idea of creating a consultation group to figure out the options, costs, etc. ECBS SWATeam could then use this information to come up with a formal recommendation.
	3. FH: Is Ben ok with our SWATeam looking at the big picture by looking at other issues that can be addressed by building standards besides energy conservation?
		1. BM: Building standards does encompass these other issues and it’s good to consider these other issues in the context of building standards.
	4. Fred lists some concerns regarding building standards:
		1. Reliability of utility and energy services
		2. Maintenance capabilities
			1. The structure of high energy saving equipment includes fragile heat exchangers, making their life cycle shorter. Need more durable equipment.
		3. Adoption of new technology
		4. Research
			1. We are a research university with high demands for optimal performance.
		5. Space limitation
			1. We are behind on this objective.
		6. Budget
		7. Flexibility
			1. Sometimes there is no optimization available.
		8. Overall point: there is no “one size fits all” standard for campus buildings.
			1. Law, sustainability, etc. could be used to prioritize certain concerns.
	5. LEED is a design-based standard not a performance-based standard, so decided LEED was a bad deal in regards to energy performance standards valued by the iCAP.
		1. LEED Silver is a requirement of the state of Illinois. Not a high bar, so we’re pushing for better.
			1. ASHRAE 90.1 2013
				1. Every 3 years ASHRAE revisits their standards and makes them more rigorous.
		2. MJ: Could we have a baseline of standards to guide us? Ben is thinking maybe a minimum standard that is higher than required by the state and also an aspirational standard to shoot for.
			1. Consultation group will work on this and pass along a recommendation to iWG. Hopefully come up with something by the end of the semester.
		3. Variance committee has the authority to make changes to the standards.
			1. MJ would like to see some options offered on the recommendation. Will most likely be different options that work best for different issues, such as budget issues versus maintenance capabilities issues.
		4. FH: Have to look into the campus master plan if we’re going to be looking at making goals. If we can get the input of stakeholders, we have a better chance of succeeding.
	6. Who is going to be a part of this consultation group?
		1. Potential consultation group members: Fred Hahn, Morgan Johnston, Kent Reifsteck. Morgan was suggested as the convener.
		2. MJ could recruit people. How else to recruit?
		3. Would be good to have 1-2 students, 1-2 faculty members, a SEDAC person, 1-2 from F&S.
		4. Everyone will send MJ suggestions of people who could be on this consultation group.
			1. E.g., Richard Strand in Engineering.
2. MH: Regarding Objectives 1 and 3, there are many suggested strategies that are in the iCAP for these two objectives. Should we pick a couple of things to focus on and create recommendations for?
	* 1. BM: If we are getting things done toward meeting the objectives without a formal recommendation, great. There could be many things that this campus could be doing but up to ECBS SWATeam to decide which to pursue. Some can be done without a recommendation.
	1. BM is on the campus master plan committee, which hasn’t met yet.
		1. Karl says they are supposed to address space issues around campus, so we should understand what they’re doing and avoid duplicating their work.
			1. Matt Tomaszewski said that AE would go through all campus spaces, so comprehensive space utilization audits are on their radar.
			2. Kent has mentioned space incentives as well, such as getting some sort of payback for cutting back on space usage.
3. Karl gave updates on NSRC. 6-10 fume hoods are being shut down. However, still having ongoing discussions with professors about potential uses for these fume hoods in the future.
4. Recommendation for doing energy audits was discussed.
	1. MJ: We can do 2 recommendations, one for the pilot event on April 15 and one for the continued program.
	2. JT will rework the recommendation to focus on the pilot on April 15.
5. Objective 3
	1. The amount of energy going to campus buildings divided by square footage is the number that is supposed to go down by 30%, according to our objective.
	2. MJ: Can ask Mike Marquissee to provide this number every month so we can watch it. That way we can establish a feedback loop.
		1. Could have a student take a GIS class so that we could have this information mapped out for us.
		2. If a building goes up 10% and then drops 5% from there, do they still get rewarded?
		3. KH: Could make a webpage.
6. Revolving Loan Fund
	1. RLF for our SWATeam purposes would have to be for projects that affect energy usage directly. Paying for real time meters in the fume hood labs would not work.
	2. MJ has encouraged parking to use funding to install LED lights in parking lots and streetlights on campus. This is a strategy in the iCAP.
		1. LEDs are inconsistent year to year so not the greatest option for indoor lighting yet.
7. Next meeting will be Tuesday, March 15 from 3:30-5pm.
	1. Will have an update on fumehood efficiency at that time from the Green Labs Initiative project.