

Cal Climate Action Partnership (CalCAP)
Steering Committee Meeting #2
November 17, 2006
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm, Chancellor’s Conference Room, California Hall

Minutes

I. Introduction & Purpose (Cathy Koshland)

CalCAP milestones and timeline, since Steering Committee Meeting #1...

- Many recommendations approved and implemented
- Chancellor announced target of at least state targets
- UCB joined California Climate Action Registry 10.17.06
- Hired PM Fahmida Ahmed, 3 hired students
- Feasibility study started

II. CalCAP Project Approach (Fahmida Ahmed)

UC Santa Barbara Campus Climate Neutral case study – PPT

- Universities can be leaders, California is the 12th largest source of climate change emissions in the world
- Project approach: inventory, targets, project options, feasibility
- Growth projections vs. GHG emissions targets
- Emissions reductions projects—electricity and natural gas, transportation, purchasing offsets/ Evaluation criteria for projects
- Cash flow analysis—upfront costs, savings, cash flow evens out
- Green Initiative Fund—funding from students
- Comments? State vs. campus-specific emissions factors

Emissions Reduction project examples for UC Berkeley

- Many opportunities in each emissions category, we are soliciting for mitigation project ideas
- Comments?
 - Cathy Koshland: distinguish between projects that are already incorporated in existing buildings and in plans for new buildings vs. completely new projects
 - Judy Chess: project list is not inclusive—can be adapted as ideas present themselves and as technology changes
 - Scott Zimmerman: list as it stands today will influence targets
 - Harrison Fraker: Center for the Built Environment—list of buildings, which are the best opportunities for retrofitting.
Go for more ambitious numbers/targets
 - Ron Coley: Have we considered a generic list of project ideas? Fahmida Ahmed: we are considering generic lists and whether the projects on these lists have been in successful at other institutions

III. CalCAP Recommendations & Committee Decisions (Fahmida Ahmed)

A. Emissions Inventory: sources and priorities – discussion

CCAR Optional sources discussion:

- Water consumption: requires energy to get it here
 - Lisa Bauer: water and solid waste have multiple solution benefits (health, etc. as well as GHG reduction)
- Commute: Samer Madanat- Commute is important
- Waste:
 - Cymie Payne: Municipal Solid Waste seems easy and important
 - Lisa Bauer: waste goes to landfill

General comments:

- Tom Kelly agrees that inventory should be as extensive as possible
- Cathy Koshland: there are some things that we have a lot of control over, but we have already done a lot about some things, so our baseline will be low—making change more difficult
- Cymie Payne: we can tell others how we made changes in these areas
- Sam Arons: are we committing to reducing optional sources also? Fahmida Ahmed: we can inventory and record optional sources without committing to reductions in these areas

Consensus: Chris Rosen: we should be as ambitious as we can with inventory sources and let the campus know

B. What emissions factor should we use?

Discussion:

- State: 3.14 vs. an emissions factor specific to UCB, Depends on energy mix, UCB will probably be higher than state because of extent of
- Paul Black: does PGE have a universal power mix?

Consensus: Decision postponed. We should look into both options. (Chris Rosen & Cathy Koshland)

C. Emissions Reduction Project Evaluation Criteria - Which criteria should be used?

- Cathy Koshland: why did UCSB not use annual operating cost? Fahmida Ahmed: because they vary and because student interns might help implement projects
- Samer Madanat: Criteria #3 is inclusive
- Arpad Horvath: All matter, we need to include hidden costs
- Chris Rosen: look for hidden costs so that we can find hidden savings
- Nathan Brostrom: Operating cost should be a part of project cost
- Arpad Horvath: Project cost should be lifetime cost
- Fahmida Ahmed: How do we assign price tags to qualitative criteria? How do we use qualitative criteria in assessing projects? Qualitative criteria as a tiebreaker?
 - Chris Rosen: Use surveys

- We should get credit for these things because they are also important (as well as savings)
- Sasha Gennet: If measuring qualitative criteria requires too much time and money, these criteria could be secondary—however, interns could be hired to conduct surveys
- Nathan Brostrom: Social environmental cost should be considered—additional savings
 - Fahmida Ahmed: as long as we are okay with the fact that this requires assumptions
 - Harrison Fraker: worker productivity in relation to environmental quality—changes in efficiency and satisfaction—lower absentee and sickness rates—pays itself off—worth it to try to measure environmental quality

Consensus: all of them matter

Additional comments:

- Sam Arons: tool for evaluating projects
 - Includes timeline, quantitative and qualitative criteria
 - Tool can tell us which projects to implement
- Scott Zimmerman: project evaluation - looking for students who are already researching these topics

Scope discussions:

- Cathy Koshland: there are only so many working hours—this needs to be manageable to be successful—it needs to be achievable
- Ed Denton: agrees that qualitative criteria could be used as a tiebreaker
- Ed Denton: after beginning the assessment, we should reaffirm targets—maybe we can be more ambitious
- Several people would prefer to have more sources researched than to have fewer, more specific sources
- Ron Coley: perception is important—good perception can lead to more funding—political component is a big deal

Project Timeline:

- Cathy Koshland - we should have a milestone in the timeline for reaffirming the targets—this should be in the timeline so that it can be discussed and announced at the Sustainability Summit
- Judy Chess: This could be discussed between Steering Committee meetings 2 and 3
 - Fahmida and Judy will revise timeline and send a draft report to the Chancellor for cabinet discussion and feedback
- Cathy Koshland: How ambitious can we be, what is the target, how much risk should we take? What risks are affordable? We have to move forward, so we have to live with a certain amount of ambiguity and risk
- Harrison Fraker: how do we know if we have succeeded?

Other:

- Harrison Fraker: replacement of computer monitors
- Chris Rosen: one of the first projects should be infrastructure changes

D. Should we join ACUPCC? (Sam Arons)

- Advantages - We are already doing a lot of what is required (forming CalCAP, establishing targets), High visibility
- Comments:
 - Cathy Koshland: what would we be committing ourselves to?
 - Ed Denton: we are pretty close to meeting these requirements—but we don't know the cost of some of these requirements
 - Nathan Brostrom: How much would it cost to achieve climate neutrality? Sam Arons: there is no deadline to achieving this
- Cathy Koshland: Table until February meeting (when inventory is complete)?
- Matt St. Clair: ACUPCC wants a leadership circle formed by January
- Ed Denton: after resolving some questions, we could join even before the inventory is complete
- Lisa Bauer: are we comfortable agreeing now? Ed Denton: Nathan, Cathy, and Ed will discuss

Consensus/Decision:

Ed Denton: *Can Fabmida send out interim updates to the Steering Committee?*

Cathy Koshland: Email updates in December and mid-January