

Minutes

Wed. May 12, 3:00 – 4:30 PM
Administrative Building III, Room 110

Attendance

Bill Davis, Bill Winner, John Carter, Lindsay Batchelor, Erin Champion, Blain Woods, Sarah Ketchem, David Dean, Mahomet Accilien, Alan Daeke, Paul McConocha, Tracy Dixon, Lisa Johnson, Carole Acquesta, Rob McKenna (phone), Darren Fallis, Jeff Hightower, Jack Colby, Brian O’Sullivan, Mike Harwood

Welcome – Jack

Introduction of Darren Fallis, new Staff Senate representative. Darren works in OIT security and compliance.

Energy charge (see complimentary document)

Jack - Availability and rising costs of energy driving interest in focusing on energy to a greater extent
VC Leffler interest in establishing CEST as focal point for sustainability and energy and cultural change across campus

Call for a more focused energy management strategic plan

Move this energy plan through the administration with the sustainability strategic and climate action plans

VC Leffler is in Washington at an unexpected meeting so will try to get him at the next CEST meeting

Due to urgency of getting started on this charge, wanted to go ahead and present and get to work

Need to make the business case for sustainability and climate action

Spending approximately \$32 million/year on utilities – reduce this as part of the business case

More challenging issues of budgetary system, use of space, culture change

Walked through parts of the charge

Discuss today how we use CEST structure to develop this charge

Need to maintain sustainability umbrella with energy concepts imbedded in the sustainability strategic planning document

Bill – Opportunity to advance sustainability across campus

This energy management strategic plan isn’t far off from what is happening in the energy and water working group and climate action work

Point about utility bill might not get any smaller because adding new equipment and buildings

Caution plan driven by cost savings alone because there might be other larger investments needed to make the biggest difference/impact

Look at cost savings, cost reductions, incentives, outside grants, and more as ways to move forward and advance sustainability

Suggestion of including transportation and other areas of energy focus

Jack – if given a charge to only reduce energy costs we could arrive at less desirable projects not inline with climate action and sustainability. This charge states alignment with these initiatives and using the triple bottom line.

Jeff – isn't this also looking at growth of the university so we can do more with what we have?

Jack – with budget flexibility can use utility surpluses for campus projects. If have utility deficit it comes from campus funds, funds that would have come from core mission. Growth is inevitable and need to accommodate and counter with more aggressive standards.

Jack – the charge also asks for costs associated with these projects. Recognition that capital investment is needed is a real opportunity (instead of unfunded mandates).

John – many of these issues are being covered into the climate action plan

Lisa – we would need to come up with costs to implement ways to better manage space? Mike and Lisa – difficulty about tagging people to space. Issue of research space.

Jack - yes, need to identify what is needed, management systems or other to optimize efficiency. Simple metric of \$ per square foot that doesn't have to be built due to improved space utilization. Opportunity for NC State to be a leader in the UNC System.

Jack – possible structure of addressing this memo that develops certain points further

1. Space, utilization, and operating hours (seasonal closings, standards) – cross working group
2. Outreach plan – cross working group
3. Enterprise (company that buys some energy, produces some energy, and customer is the campus) – internal group
4. Business plan, incentives (for conservation, how make everyone personally interested) -
5. Buildings, total cost of ownership, life cycle cost analysis
6. Service learning, living labs
7. Transportation

Incentives and personal interest tie to outreach plan

Enterprise system wants to sell energy – how balance with conservation?

Bill – should we add transportation?

Jack – ask VC Leffler to add or tie it into the sustainability plan enough?

Brian – would be interested in could create some points into the charge

Lisa – land use group interested in transportation and was at times hard to move on to other topics.

Need for walkability, routes between Centennial Campus and Main Campus

Jack – this might not be one plan but the plans must be complimentary. For example if not fully covered in the sustainability plan it would be covered in a broad statement in the sustainability plan. Attempt to somewhat separate plans for reporting needs.

David – suggest devote entire session to outreach

Jack – we'll work internally to move this process forward

Long-term climate action planning (see complimentary presentation)

John - Looking at many issues in the charge

A lot of concepts in CEST were short term, what actionable steps can be taken now. This was CEST's charge and these will have a large impact and be financially viable.

Looking further out things get more nebulous. Even if existing buildings are energy efficiency as possible, Progress reduces their greenhouse gas (GHG), etc, there will still be GHG emissions. To get to climate neutrality would have to get away from fossil fuels.

From subgroup looked at fuel options and energy supply. Posed question about what level of detail want to share on long term options in climate action plan.

3 examples in presentation that impact fuel mix:

- 1) Cornell got very specific in analysis (deep geothermal research)
- 2) UNC Chapel Hill near term strategies projected to stabilize future emissions. Looked at 4 paths for long term, not banking on any one in particular knowing information will change as time grows closer. Two paths for coal substitute, one large scale biomass, one plasma arc gasification of municipal solid waste (MSW). UNC-CH committed to be off coal by 2020 as of last week.
- 3) Duke – AEI’s work for Duke was a lot less detailed overall. No financials behind this graph.

How does NC State want to handle the long-term?

Paul – how do we look with out the long-term?

John – we are not complete with the GHG portion but expect a stabilization effect like UNC

David – is that offsets?

John – yes, typically

Bill – like to understand and represent the difference between our plan and where emerging technologies are available. However, not comfortable specifying what those emerging technologies are.

John – has gotten similar feedback, can quantify what removal from fossil fuels would be but couldn’t put costs to what it would take to get there.

Paul – the conversations need to happen but not be a part of this level of analysis. This needs to be in the narrative, not the analysis.

Jack – lets not present level of knowledge that we don’t have about technologies that aren’t commercially available. We can describe technologies we know but not commit to specifics.

Lindsay – this plan will be modified as we go so we can include information as it is available and commercially viable

Bill – good product of this would be aggressive versus business as usual investments and in options in between.

Jack – whatever the energy source it doesn’t mean we have to do it ourselves. We can partner with Progress Energy.

Final comments - Jack

Darren to Bill – possibility of some other metric besides the dollar to go back to the caution of focusing the energy charge on cost savings

Paul – will follow up

440 adjourn