

Campus Sustainability Committee Meeting
February 14, 2020 SF-329
Meeting Minutes

Attendance:

Members:

Jillian Buckholz, Julie Mielke, Omer Shakoor, Erik Pearson, Winnie Kwofie, Ed Inch, Debbie Chaw, Karina Gerbesi, Martin Castillo

Guests:

Carol Trost, Jack Steinwann, Kim Napoli, Michael Lee, Bob Andrews, Chandeeep Singn

1. Introductions
2. [2019 United in Science Report](#).
 - a. Report compiled and came out in November reiterates most of what we've read before in the IPCC's findings that as early as 2030 1.5 degrees celsius temperature rise. This 1.5 raise is the threshold for the runaway feedback event. We are finally turning the corner and a stampede to take action.
 - b. This report describes the constant warming and the emissions gap. By 2030 we need to be getting very close to zero to meet our 2040 goal of zero.
 - c. Information for reference and is linked in the agenda. This is for reference for the committee.
 - d. Our current track will not get us to the zero goal by 2040. Heroic efforts need to be taken.
3. CAP-IT Update.
 - a. Has been continuing work on all of the areas of work on today's agenda. Pleased that there is progress on the RFP and the printer and air travel offset policy.
 - b. Parking budgets for alternative transportations? We have been getting more information as we move forward.
 - c. We found out that there are no system wide restraints on the parking funds. It is encouraged that those funds be used to fund alternatives transit. It is basically the president's decision for how these funds are being used.
 - i. Debbie. Her team is working on a report for the senate.
 1. Also putting together a report for the shuttle service and the decision away from AC transit. The AC transit plan there was no formal proposal or any negotiations. Everything was based on matriculated students. It did not cover all of the university's needs.
 - a. Michael. Debbie's office was very quick to respond to request.
4. Zero Waste Update.
 - a. Facilities has organized a waste discussion group focused on a zero waste plan for CSUEB, group is acting zero waste task force unofficial from the CSC.
 - b. In the SFBuilding Sustainability has been working closely with facilities to reduce waste contamination and educate occupants. Every person in this building has

been trained on zero waste. The custodians are getting the correct infrastructure. Trying to move to other buildings on campus.

c. UCLA shared their resources, which were used to create a poster for all custodial closets.

i. Debbie, Starbucks cup included on those posters for custodial? The custodian on the 4th floor in SA has since been informed that the cup has changed to landfill.

1. Waste management is no longer accepting the cup as compost. They only take 100% paper items as compost now.

2. Debbie, how do we get to zero waste if the hauler changes the items.

a. The 5 R's. If we can encourage people to bring their own cup and reuse it and get rid of disposables.

b. Also Vessel might be an option. This is a reusable program where you pay a deposit that you get back once you return your cup. If you do not return the cup they keep the deposit.

c. Debbie, might be something that we can advertise in Starbucks.

i. Chartwells will be in charge of signage in all franchises. We can have these conversations now.

3. Karina in response to Debbie, It is very frustrating to get all of the waste sorted as all municipalities are different. The change happens when people bring their own cups.

a. The City of Hayward might partner with CSUEB and align the contracts with the same hauler to keep everything the same.

b. Erik, how defining zero waste? Is that 100%.

i. JB- 95%.

c. Karina, my classes do some waste audits and learned a couple of years ago that the way diversions were quantified is through the dumpster if they were labeled recycling or other. There was no inspection on the contamination. It was only counted as the item and the capacity of the bin collected. If you want to have an honest diversion, we need to analyze and count correctly.

i. WM is supposed to actually be weighing the waste. It is in the contract and WM has been having some issues.

ii. Karina, Is there any monitoring?

1. Winnie, Yes it's part of their contract but they need the scale

- a. Carastar gives contamination on recycling.
 - b. There was more contamination in A&E than in housing.
 - d. New waste signage going up around campus. The exterior bins are also being updated with alumigraphics that are meant to be more durable.
 - e. Kudos to facilities because we are going to have compost bins in all restrooms. Signage was created by a student. CSUEB StopWaste and Chartwells conducted a food waste survey in housing and have also created signage for the Pioneer Kitchen. StopWaste will be interacting on campus.
 - i. StopWaste also paying for LeanPath which tracks the weight of the food waste and educates about food waste to users
 - ii. "Waste not" is Chartwells proprietary back of house pre-consumer compost tracking and hopefully this partnership with LeanPath will give us time to create a mechanism for front of house.
 - iii. Michael, there is a baseline and all of these items are being put into the carbon reduction data.
 - 1. We use SIMAP based on the data they are collecting. We have a baseline with all of our waste data paper towels should be easy.
 - a. This is for the concord campus as well? Can we also include Oakland. ADA is a concern.
 - b. We don't run the Oakland campus and while we don't run it we should be consistent. We would have to work with the property management compatriot.
 - c. Michael, will there be side by side landfill and compost bins?
 - i. Compost and small landfill
 - ii. There will be some restrooms on campus where ASI is placing toiletries. This might create contamination and needs to be noted and ensure that all of the proper infrastructure is there.
5. First item of business: Vote.
 - a. The structure for parking and transportation has changed and now they no longer are one person removed from being represented on campus. We thought it would be helpful to have a rep on this committee.
 - i. 1st Karina. 2nd Martin.
 - ii. Unanimously passed.
6. Printer policy.
 - a. Initially, I thought we could vote on these but in the last week the language has been changed and just want to make sure we are all on. The same page as where this policy is going. Accounting and Fiscal Services has proposed different languages in the background. As well as some clarifications for the type of

printer. The idea is to get people away from personal desktop printers and using the network printers.

- b. Are there any questions or discussion?
 - i. Karina, everyone on CAHS was happy to move it forward but understand the clarifications from Procurement.
 - ii. This draft has been reviewed with the senate and is going forward through the senate.
 - iii. Kim, Jon Medwin noted that we need to standardize the type of exceptions.
 - 1. They realized that everyone had different printers and we should unify those purchases to be the same model to make toner purchases more efficient.
- c. With the 3 additions and edits. Should we move to vote and recommend this for presidential signature?
 - i. In person vote or email vote?
 - 1. Changes need to be incorporated into the document then if the group approves an electronic vote then it can be voted on.
 - 2. This comes to the senate as an information item. They can accept information or deny it.
 - a. If the edits are clear without being incorporated we can have an in person vote without the changes being updated.
 - 3. As co-chairs should we move forward,
 - a. Provost, the dean had questions about the timeline of implementation and the efficiency of network printers. In two weeks we will review at the academic advisory council.
 - b. If this is something that the president can decide without the senate then it goes to the senate as an information item. Or it can be an action item for the senate without the president beforehand.
 - c. Provost concern is to eliminate the shock factor.
 - d. Karina, in response to what was raised by procurement. Yesterday Jon Medwin raised the issue that it might be more costly to bring in networked printers and instead it might be more cost effective to have desktop printers for some groups on campus.
 - e. Debbie, somehow the faculty should know. The colleges are the last of the groups to make this change.
 - f. What data is there to justify this change. Is it actually cheaper to have networked printers? There are very small departments on campus who are only one person they might deserve an exception. Some of the deans and departments have very specific budgeting parameters. It might not always be broken down within certain groups

and how you can actually breakdown the cost per group.
Need to prove that this is going to be more cost effective.

- g. Michael, it's based on the netID and then on a code and then on a budget. This is based on carbon not primarily cost. This needs to be carbon focused. We understand that there is a cost but the carbon needs to be the focus.
- h. We do have faculty serving so many positions and it all rolls up into payroll as a catch all. It is applicable to other places on campus.
 - i. Pharos can handle different roles.
- i. Winnie, the part that is still important is that cost shouldn't be the first factor. We need to look at the people who use it and see if they are inconvenienced to use the network printer. When you send your print and not actually print you get charged.
 - i. Print job gets cancelled after 3 hours. If you send a print job document print there might be some issues with the printers.
 - ii. Education is with the Pharos not the policy.

7. Update on Solar and the CORE building.

a. CORE building.

- i. Update- we are doing site work and so far everything has been great. No one has jumped over the fence. There is a lot of site work. Some challenges have been utility lines.
- ii. Hoping to get approval from the state fire marshal; needs to stamp the final drawings.
- iii. We do have a storm water prevention plan. Anything that is on site filters before it gets to groundwater. There is a lot of recovery to reduce contamination.
- iv. Reviewing everything to reduce dust and contamination and noise. And mitigate all of those as best as possible.
- v. Safety is number one. Please come to committee meetings to raise concerns.
- vi. Questions.
 - 1. Michael, budget to install solar?
 - a. This is one of the assets to list in the Solar IV RFP. The folks who bid will tell us what our best options are. This building is like a year behind schedule. You do not want to make changes. Building will be available in 2022 for solar if the solar company recommends the installation from them.
 - b. Omer, Solar panels on the PE building. Where did they go?

- i. Unfortunately, the way they were installed and they were old. They caused major leaking in the building. The gym part of the roof has been replaced but the two sides are in the works. We will identify PE as a building available in the RFP. Hopefully there will be lighter solar panels and won't cause the same problems. The tiles in the roof are asbestos and need to be remediated whenever one falls. This has caused a headache the past couple of years. It is now fixed.
 - ii. If it is included in the RFP as a feasible option then it will be put into that Solar IV project.
 - iii. The panels themselves are being recycled.
 - iv. They were integrated panels so when one died a few went bad. About ¼ of the panels were bad.
- b. In the last 4 years we have done a lot in terms of utilities. We are doing a lot better job in terms of controlling consumption.
 - i. Data presented in kwh?
 - 1. Data is on the website.
 - ii. The percentage increase means what?
 - 1. We expected the increase to be more than it is.
- c. Better documentation for retrofits.
 - i. We are tracking baselines and doing a better job on taking the improvements. We have installed LED bulbs throughout campus.
 - ii. HVAC retrofits and retrofitted boilers.
 - iii. Improvements in-house.
 - 1. Low flow
 - 2. Water dispensing stations.
 - 3. New meters.
 - iv. The cleaning products are green.
- d. We have implemented new things at not an extreme cost.
- e. Current usage, and looking ahead.
 - i. Looking at de-carbonization for gas powered equipment.
 - ii. Native plants.
 - iii. Solar IV
 - iv. Water
 - v. Real time dashboards.
 - vi. We want the campus to be a living lab.
- f. Deliverables.
 - i. To the end of the fiscal year.
 - 1. Starttic utilizes plan outline. June 30, 2020
 - 2. Rr compost paper towels Martha 30, 2020
 - 3. Solar RFP- march 30 2020

- a. Want to ensure that the service and the maintenance is covered by the vendor. O&M. Operations and maintenance.
 - 4. Micro grid assessment - June 30, 2020
 - a. Due to PG&E issues. This is for business continuity. A system to support the campus when the utility company fails.
 - b. As separate from the RFP it might be worth including this into the Solar IV proposal
 - c. Chabot is working on this now.
 - d. The CSU has identified 5 campuses (Sonoma Chico, maritime, East Bay, and, Humboldt) to implement the micro grid. Prop 13 to fund this. We don't know if this will pass but it is still something we should be doing to plan for this.
 - 5. Metering upgrade/replacement- Sept 30, 2020.
 - a. Currently reading meters is manual want to move more towards digital.
- 8. Air Travel Offset policy.
 - a. We have a goal in CAP to offset travel by 100% by 2022.
 - b. Additions.
 - i. If a donor gives money but doesn't want to cover the fee. VP of University Advancement has elected to cover the fee.
 - ii. Is donor funding eligible for this charge? This is ORSP or W funds? This really only applies to faculty. Donner funds as D funds are the true donor funds that are not eligible for the fee.
 - iii. All personnel needs to be defined?
 - iv. Kim and Jillian to meet and clarify the policy details. It has to be clear.
 - v. Policy presented to the senate was all personnel and state funded. If this changes the senate needs to be informed of the changes.
 - vi. ASI? Students who travel to conferences?
 - vii. Clarification needs to be made for all the funds that are eligible.
 - viii. This policy is aligned to the policy of climate neutrality. It should involve everybody. Students staff faculty. How it is achieved is mechanical. All flights need to be offset.
 - ix. ASI should be informed ahead of time. So they can start budgeting and have a say.
 - x. The policy is coming from the commitment from the president. There isn't much of a say people can have. This policy will happen. It's more what the implications are. There isn't much they can say.
 - 1. Martin, They should have a say. It might not change it but they should have a say.
 - xi. Ultimately it is the president's decision.
- 9. Adjournment.

