

iWG Meeting Minutes – September 17th 2018

Attendees: Ximing Cai, Morgan White, Dhvani Jain (proxy for Adrian Chendra/SSC), Alma Sealine (Skype), Sean Reeder (Skype), Renee Wiley, Joey Kreiling, Jonah Messinger, Josh Whitson and Kent Reifsteck (from Utilities & Energy Services at F&S)

Could not attend: John Dallesasse, Scott Willenbrock, Matthew Tomaszewski

1. Introductions

2. Review of iWG Charge Letter

- a. Showed [Campus Sustainability Procedures](#) document
- b. Ximing explained how SWATeam Recommendations are handled (page 3)
- c. Morgan mentioned that iWG will do a lot of work on the next iCAP during the upcoming academic year.
- d. Evan DeLucia will send charge letter to everyone.

3. Updates

a. Student Efforts

- i. SSLC: Not many updates, they have yet to meet for the first time this year. Joey & Jonah are planning what to do this year, hope to expand the council to include more RSOs and to plan a lecture series with SSC micro grant funds, and communicate how to be involved with iCAP to students.
- ii. SSC: First application deadline is on Monday 9/24. Fall Retreat took place for committee and faculty members. SSC was part of Quad Day recycling drive, and promoted & participated in Illini Lights Out on 9/14.

b. PWR012 – Purchasing Representation

- i. Morgan: This did not need discussion in committee, so it went straight to unit. Director of Purchasing agrees he needs to attend SWAT meetings or send proxy when he can't (but was able to attend first meeting this year)

4. iWG Assessments for SWATeam Recommendations

a. ECONS007 – Energy Conservation Funding

- i. Morgan explained this is a large recommendation and asks Josh Whitson explain energy performance contracts (EPC) further. Josh explained that EPC is a method focused towards utility reduction, and that energy savings expected under such a contract are guaranteed by the contractor (ESCO), who must reimburse the university if the savings come up short. EPC benefits both utility conservation and deferred maintenance needs, which are closely linked. There are several other EPC contracts that have already been completed or are underway, and adding the proposed

contract for six laboratory facilities would push the university's total EPC contract value over \$100 million.

- ii. Ximing asked for an explanation of deferred maintenance (DM). It is essentially the backlog of incomplete maintenance on campus due to the funds not being available. These things are dealt with only when they fail. \$750 million backlog.
 - iii. Kent highlights that when contracting with ESCO, and they guarantee savings, we also have responsibility to maintain and operate equipment. The best thing to do is get buildings up to current standards and maintain these conditions, not maintain old equipment.
 - iv. Jonah asked about the bidding process, which Josh explained further.
 - v. Ximing asked how would this contribution pair with other DM projects. Josh gave a specific example from Roger Adams Lab where they were able to fit an existing DM need into an EPC (turning two projects into one).
 - vi. Alma: where does the \$10 million the recommendations ask for come from? Only from academic funds, or also auxiliary? Kent explained this hasn't been determined yet, and this is one of the reasons why this is scalable. It does depend on getting additional funding
 - vii. Morgan would like to submit the recommendation needs more information gathered, and more dialogue is needed between iWG and Josh/Kent's group. Basically, this should be discussed more in later meetings. Ximing agreed that we need to understand more about the proposal.
 - viii. Sean pointed out it's not clear what we're really asking for, and who's coming up with the money. Is this in addition to the ESCO/EPC project on its own?
 - ix. Kent said it is for additional items to add for the scope, and it would all fall in 20 year payback. They continued to discuss the payback process and pros/cons of payback possibilities.
 - x. Sean thinks this is a hollow recommendation because we don't have the money for it; since overall on campus there is more than \$1 billion in DM needs.
 - xi. Jonah suggested that without a funding source it seems hollow, but bringing it up may lead to a funding stream if it helps it become a priority.
 - xii. Morgan suggested again to send it back to the SWATeam for more info, so it becomes more specific and actionable. This is agreed upon.
- b. EGEN008 – Pursue Solar PPA (Review and Reconsideration)**
- i. Morgan explained there was disagreement in iWG over this the first time around, and after collecting comments over the summer, there was a clear need for more discussion.
 - ii. Sean says there is an item going to the Board of Trustees in September to allow contracts of this type to go out to 20 years. If the BOT approves, an

RFP would proceed to look at adding on campus solar as the first area of focus.

- iii. Jonah asked why on campus and not off. Kent explained this is due to the interconnect and associated costs – ultimately, this is most cost effective.
- iv. Morgan mentioned that the Sustainability Council has approved an RFP for proposing 50-60 more acres of solar farm.
- v. Morgan explained how F&S wants to finish Solar Farm 2.0 (SF2) before getting into this RFP.
- vi. Kent mentioned that the iCAP has a stronger goal for onsite solar rather than offsite, which Morgan supported with the numbers for solar megawatt goals in iCAP. The idea of the PPA is getting more megawatts to reach these goals.
- vii. Morgan suggested updating the recommendation to essentially say no, we're not ready and want to focus on SF2.
- viii. Sean agreed that we should reject it now to focus on SF2. He thinks bandwidth to handle all of this at once is an issue because a lot of unknowns are involved. Kent agreed, especially because this is a 20 year commitment – over-purchasing means we'd have to sell back.
- ix. Dhvani said that Adrian fully supports the recommendation.
- x. Morgan said if we want to buy more clean energy, we shouldn't limit it to Illinois sources- instead wherever is cheapest. Jonah agreed to focus on current PPA.
- xi. Ultimately, this recommendation is going to be denied at this time. May be revisited after SF2 is completed.

c. PWR013 – Zero Waste Coordinator

- i. Morgan explained the history of Zero Waste Coordinator recommendations, and that this is a new recommendation in support of hiring fulltime Zero Waste Coordinator. It would create a new position, and this person would explain and promote recycling, look at opportunities for new collection technology, etc. Morgan is very supportive.
- ii. Ximing said it looks like the major thing is that F&S may now have financial support for this now. Morgan said this is because of the transfer of leadership at Waste Transfer to Pete Varney, but just because it's now possible in the budget doesn't mean it will happen without pressure.
- iii. Jonah asked if there is pushback, could it be done as a pilot position? Morgan said it still needs permission to hire an employee, which is still tough for budget reasons. They probably wouldn't be able to get someone until next year, no matter what.
- iv. Renee: what is the benefit of this position? Morgan explained that there are so many students who want to see better recycling systems, and we have inconsistent methodology and limited items that we recycle. This person would communicate with users. Ximing said that we need to

improve recycling inside and outside buildings, because visitors perceive that we don't have bins though we are a gold sustainability campus.

- v. Renee: does this also increase funds for transporting the waste? (answer unclear)
- vi. Morgan: this person can explain to the campus to use the recycling bin! Because of the campus myth that all recycling in trash cans will get taken out. She estimated that the cost of this position at most would be their salary and perhaps \$5,000 in office expenses.
- vii. Ximing mentioned that SSC is very interested in waste & recycling, so this person can work with SSC. Dhwani said Adrian very much supports the recommendation, and talked more about SSC's dedication to recycling.
- viii. Jonah firmly believes this position has to include more than just educational efforts, such as insuring dual recycling all around campus. Morgan talked about current efforts toward dual recycling.
- ix. Jonah, with support from the group, dictated the working iWG Recommendation statement:
 - 1. *The iWG supports moving forward with hiring a Zero Waste Coordinator, and we would stress that their responsibilities are twofold: educate the campus on recycling, and to push for system changes to improve campus recycling.*

5. SWATeam Status Updates

- a. **ECBS:** Bill Rose is now chair, first meeting is upcoming.
- b. **EGEN:** First meeting upcoming.
- c. **PWR:** Several recommendations are in the drafting process, including Marching Illini lunch waste, dual recycling, and battery recycling.
- d. **TRAN:** Reviewing recommendations about vanpooling and the PAC.
- e. **Water:** Meeting with Arthur Binder 9/19 to hear about "possible ways to use a certain water-saving product in the university," and want to apply to SSC for the Parking Department.
- f. **ALUFS:** Working on SSC application for nitrogen monitoring station.

6. Goal Setting and Vision for FY18

- a. Ran out of time- Saving this until next meeting

- 7. Ximing: remember SWATeam/iWG Kickoff will be on September 25th from 2-4pm, in Illini Union Room 314a.