

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

February 19, 2008

EMU Century F

Attendees: Chuck Kalnbach, Jesse Hough, Lynn Giordano, Steve Mital, Tim King
Deb Merskin, Jim Blick, Art Farley, Leslie Hinkle, Paula Staight, Christine Thompson,
Bill Cresko

January minutes were approved.

Steve presented information that the committee asked him to assemble:

UO Emissions Spreadsheet) Five major areas listed: Buildings, Transportation, Purchases, Water, and Solid Waste. This can be used to help determine what types of emissions should to be included in the scope of UO's responsibilities and those that are beyond scope. Data was provided where possible in the following categories: Estimated eCO₂ in MT; Monitoring Data Availability; Opportunities for Significant Additional GHG Reductions; % of Core Emissions; and % of Total Emissions.

Recommendations: It would be more accurate to change the category labeled buildings as physical infrastructure, move water under infrastructure and solid waste to purchases. Add a category for IT after transportation. The committee questioned how much data Purchasing, Banner, and departments will be able to provide, and what improvements in tracking may be required.

Good Company) A section of the report makes a case for institutions of higher education, when possible, to achieve more expansive emission reduction than are expected of other types of organizations.

Emissions Classifications) Organized into four levels: Core emissions; Direct transportation activities; Indirect transportation activities; and Goods and services. Under each area Steve listed definitions, sources, monitoring, actions, goals, and measurements. The bulk of emissions and those that UO has more direct control over are found in level one.

Steve asked for feedback on the classification framework for the different types of emissions. He would like the committee to consider the monitoring plans for each emissions class and begin to discuss reduction goals and measurement options.

Recommendations: Suggested that data from past years be included in the reporting process in order to have comparisons on how much GHG has been reduced, as well as to publicize how much has been accomplished. There was discussion about the pros and cons of measuring methods, such square foot, or a per student basis, or other ways to calculate GHG reduction. The goal of carbon neutrality was discussed. Cost savings is factor that should be taken into account.

Steve shared that the buildings working group has met and is in process of drafting a list of actions. The group has considered breaking down cost savings incrementally, for example in 7 years, then 15 years payback, etc. Another approach to measurement that is being contemplated suggests break out certain types of spaces because more energy would be used in science buildings, for example, compared to classroom spaces.

Next Meeting: Thursday, March 20th, from 2:00 – 3:00 p.m. in the EMU Alsea Room