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Joanna Calabrese, Undergraduate Student, Environmental Science and Policy
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Presenters/Invited Guests
Mark Stewart, Campus Sustainability Coordinator, Office of Sustainability
Dylan Rebois, Sarah Eisenstein, and Nehama Rogozen, Student Advisory Subcommittee members
Michael Popkin, newly elected chair of the Student Government Association Student Sustainability Committee

Meeting Overview
The meeting focused on campus sustainability metrics and also included review of a student fee funding proposal from the Student Advisory Subcommittee, a report from the Building Schedules Sub-group, and concluding remarks from student members cycling off the Council.

Meeting Highlights

Council Updates
Dr. Wylie made one announcement at the start of the meeting regarding the State of Maryland stimulus award to the campus to install solar panels on the Comcast Center. The 630 kilowatt array will provide approximately 15 percent of the energy used by the Comcast Center and be a visible statement of the University’s commitment to renewable energy and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Energy Manager Joan Kowal noted that the Council’s endorsement of the project would be helpful to the process. Dr. Wylie noted that the project is a great example of Joan’s leadership on energy and climate issues.

**ACTION:** The Chair will write a letter of support on behalf of the Council.

The April 1 Meeting Summary was approved.
Campus Sustainability Metrics Report

Scott Lupin and Mark Stewart of the Office of Sustainability presented an overview of 27 draft campus sustainability metrics and their trends from Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 to FY 2009. They noted that the metrics have been vetted with diverse campus stakeholders and were developed based on best practices in corporate and campus sustainability reporting. At the conclusion of the presentation, members had a number of questions and comments about the report for the Office of Sustainability to consider:

- **Should solid waste be considered on a per capita basis?** This would take campus growth into account and provide an understanding of how solid waste is changing based on population.
- **How would biodiversity be tracked?** It was noted that this could be tricky to manage on an urban campus. Members had suggestions of species surveys and indexes that would track the diversity of the campus’ urban ecology and noted that it would provide a learning opportunity for students to participate in field surveys.
- **Should green space be tracked? Would this be a measure of biodiversity?** Members discussed a number of metrics such as percent “pervious” versus “impervious”, “managed for stormwater” versus “non-managed”, and the use of harvested water, among other metrics.
- **Are the energy metrics controlled for temperature?** They currently are not and it was noted that normalizing for temperature is challenging as there are many variables, including conservation, that affect building energy use. As more historical data is collected, it will be possible to compare “hot” or “cold” years against one another. It might also be possible to track heating degree and cooling degree days for each year and report that data separately so that the reader has a temperature metric to compare against the energy usage data. It was also noted that the campus is doing more work on demand response – essentially reducing load to neutralize the impacts of weather so this will also contribute to lower energy usage and emissions over time.
- **Metrics such as crime and student retention are not related to the Council’s charge.** Further, one member noted that crime is only one means of measuring community well being. He also suggested that student retention is a complex issue based on who is admitted, how they are advised and taught and whether they are assisted academically. Retention is one measure of the University’s success but there are many others. To selectively choose a few “social” sustainability metrics struck several members as well outside the scope of the Council’s domain.
- **What is the ultimate goal of the curriculum metrics? 100% of majors and courses related to sustainability?** Members discussed how tracking the number of sustainability-related courses and majors is just an interim step; having a sustainability literacy metric that assesses what students know about sustainability is the ultimate goal. It was suggested that the Campus Assessment Working Group (CAWG) surveys might be a means of assessing environmental literacy. It was noted that the Office of Sustainability has worked with the CAWG “Beginnings” survey but found that literacy is difficult to measure in a few short questions. This issue requires additional work to determine the best means of assessing sustainability literacy going forward.

A member suggested that the Council might form sub-groups to consider appropriate goals for the specific metrics that Council members are interested in discussing. The Chair reminded the group that the Council is advisory to the President and needs to work on issues that the administration can put in place. She asked members to think about how work on the metrics would lead to concrete recommendations to the administration.
ACTION: The Office of Sustainability will make the suggested changes and remove metrics 21 (Crime Incidents on Campus), 22 (Student Retention), 23 (Environmental Academic Programs), and 27 (Environmental Research Centers). Members are asked to provide additional feedback and comments by June 15 so that the report can be finalized for distribution. Members are also asked to provide a list of 3 priority metrics for which they would like to see the Council develop specific goals. The Office will compile this list and share it with the Council in advance of the September Council meeting.

Student Sustainability Fund
Student Advisory Subcommittee Chair Joanna Calabrese explained that the Subcommittee members had voted to spend the first year of the student fee ($98,000) on Renewable Energy Certificates or RECs. Council member Joan Kowal provided a brief overview of RECs and explained that the University System of Maryland renewable energy procurement will be a “bundled” purchase – meaning that institutions will be purchasing both the energy and the renewable energy attribute. Until the USM projects go online, the student purchase of RECs will reduce the University’s carbon footprint. The student members of the Subcommittee spoke in favor of the purchase outlined in the table below, noting that it was the easiest, most responsible, and most transparent use of the funds until the on-campus sustainability project selection process is implemented in Fall 2010. They also stated that the proposed expenditure was consistent with the student sustainability fee language that existed when the current fee was collected. The fee language has been revised to allow for a broader array of sustainability projects that could be funded in the future with the student fee. However, the students felt the current fee should be spent on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REC Name</th>
<th>REC Source</th>
<th>REC Cost (per REC and per MWh offset)</th>
<th>Approx. total # of RECS that can be purchased with FY2010 revenue</th>
<th>Approx. % of total campus Purchased electric use</th>
<th>Estimated ranking in EPA’s Green Power Challenge 2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Wind</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One member asked if the Subcommittee had considered deferring the purchase to allow all funds to be invested on-campus. Subcommittee members responded that they wanted the fee to be implemented immediately and there was concern that deferring could set a precedent for inaction.

The Chair asked for a vote on the Subcommittee recommendation and it was unanimously approved. The Chair thanked the Subcommittee for their careful consideration.

1 A REC represents the property rights to the environmental, social, and other non-power qualities of renewable electricity generation. A REC, and its associated attributes and benefits, can be sold separately from the underlying physical electricity associated with a renewable-based generation source. RECs provide buyers flexibility when green power is not locally available. Source: U.S. EPA, [http://www.epa.gov/greenpower/gpmarket/rec.htm](http://www.epa.gov/greenpower/gpmarket/rec.htm).
Building Schedules Sub-group Report
Maryann Ottinger of the Building Schedules Sub-group offered a short update on the group’s progress, noting that the group looked at building data for a number of non-laboratory buildings and saw that there were some opportunities for energy saving schedule adjustments but that the real opportunity for the Council is to consider policies that would have broader energy saving implications. Ideas that the group discussed include set schedules for administrative buildings (e.g., 6 am to 6 pm, Monday through Friday), exploring opportunities to consolidate summer or evening classes so that unused areas could be “set-back” (reduced lighting and HVAC service), and investigating laboratory energy use to get a better understanding of how and when energy is used. The group indicated that it would focus this summer on understanding summer scheduling and potential energy saving opportunities.

Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction at the University of Maryland
Council member Allen Davis shared a proposal that he is working on for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Chesapeake Bay Stewardship Fund. It is an opportunity to obtain federal funding for non-point source projects that will benefit the Chesapeake Bay through innovative nutrient and sediment reduction strategies. To strengthen his proposal, he asked for a letter of support from the University Sustainability Council.

ACTION: The Chair will draft a letter on behalf of the Council, noting that the Council has reviewed the project and supports its effort on campus. Allen Davis will seek letters from the Office of Sustainability and Facilities Management for in-kind support of the project.

Concluding Remarks by Student Members Cycling Off the Council
Graduate student member Ramy Serour gave a brief update on campus greenhouse gas emissions based on his recent work compiling the Calendar Year 2009 Inventory Update. While the initial results are promising with an 11 percent reduction over Fiscal Year 2008, he noted that there is a need to remain aggressive in seeking emission reduction opportunities. He highlighted the areas of Information Technology (virtual servers), behavior change (expanding Energywi$e) and transportation (improved data collection/management, mitigation strategies, and transportation demand management) as places where the campus should put particular emphasis. He concluded by thanking the Council for the opportunity to serve and noting that the campus has a great start on these efforts but constant vigilance is needed to ensure that it remains a leader in climate action.

Undergraduate student member Joanna Calabrese began her remarks by noting that she has worked on campus sustainability issues for four years and thinks that the campus has made tremendous strides during that time. However, there is still much more to be done and she highlighted a number of gaps and opportunities. She suggested that to address the important issue of sustainability literacy that a sustainability lesson be a mandatory part of UNIV100 and the Chesapeake project be expanded for faculty. She suggested greater administrative oversight of sustainability via the creation of a Vice President for Sustainability and sustained funding for the Office of Sustainability. She also suggested greater alumni involvement, in part through a dedicated green fund to support campus sustainability projects. And finally, she suggested that the campus carefully consider its messaging about sustainability and refrain from making exaggerated claims about its progress. While the campus won the 2009 on-line registration challenge called “America’s Greenest Campus,” it has the potential to actually embody that title only through concerted action and determination. At the conclusion of their remarks, the Chair thanked the students for their service.
**Next Steps**
The next Council meeting will take place in September 2010, and will focus on goal setting for certain campus sustainability metrics, sub-group progress reports, and selecting a topic of focus for the 2010-2011 Academic Year. Other topics may be considered as time permits.