

**January 14, 2009**

**Environmental Issues Committee Meeting**

**Attendees:**

Art Farley, Michael Latteri, Terrie Scharfer, Steve Mital, William Cresko, Christine Thompson, BJ Sorensen, Alden Gray, Jose Bustillos, Lynn Giordano, Fred Tepfer

**Agenda Review**

1. Introductions
2. Meeting Minutes Approval for November and December
3. Approval of Carbon Offset Policy
4. Bus Stop

**Meeting Minutes from November and December -**

November 18<sup>th</sup> – Typo – B in front of “Look into BPA”

Missing word “off” in November 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, check language of Classes v. Scopes

Review document from last year and clarify “scope” v “class”?

Meeting minutes are approved with the recommended changes.

**Review Carbon Offset Policy**

In November ACUPCC finished their draft of the Carbon Protocol – our statement builds off of that. The ACUPCC deals with all the things we were concerned about for protocol, we agreed to follow and abide by it to handle basic issues regarding offsets.

The review focused on the UO document which reflects additional guidelines for our institution: Please see the attached draft policy for details.

**On Introduction and Number I:**

- What does “public” mean? All things equal, the UO should support public versus private projects
- Meet as many of the guidelines as possible, flexibility and discretion are key
- Regional discussion –In the policy we are the University of “Oregon” and therefore we should keep “Oregon” as the geographic scope
- There are three parameters or guidelines, as many as possible should be met to purchase offsets.
- ACUPCC guidelines must be followed first.
- Costs – it does not address costs, but by meeting all those criteria and guidelines we are entering into higher quality of offsets which cost more – cheapest in the higher level of quality
- The first three (under number I) guidelines should be met “prior to the consideration of cost” – Agreed upon

- “The latest or current version of the Voluntary Carbon Offset Protocol from ACUPCC” will be referenced instead of “November 2007”
- Take the word advantageous replace with necessary in our policy.
- “University may find it necessary to purchase credits”

**On Number II:**

- It is actually more expensive to be lazy and wait because the penalty is built in and the funds spent will not pay off year after year.
- If we wait till 2020 we have to buy offsets until we catch up with our campus goal

**On Number II-iii:**

- It is important to make sure we are not just getting offsets because they are easy.
- The trigger point of cost differentials is nebulous, we could not necessarily figure it out in a timely manner. Reducing emissions on campus is always arbitrary. This is meant to require decision maker to think twice
- Buying offsets is the last resort not the first attempt and is not advantageous for the university – says so in ACUPCC policy

**More on Number II iv:**

- Somewhere in the ACUPCC agreement there is a list of how to prioritize emission reductions, first reduce on campus then use offsets.
- Number iv is a really strong criteria, it should be first. Committee decided to move it to the first spot and leave the rest in the same order after that.

**Number II – v:**

- ACUPCC allows the purchasing of offsets in current year for future year
- Buy a bundle in year 1 and distribute in multiple years
- Reduces transactions and costs, and gets out of atmosphere sooner
- Does not change impact on campus, just anticipate what you will need in the future
- If this is a part of your strategy, this might trigger buying 500 in one year and distribute them out in the future years
- Does this build in a loop hole? What if people become lazy and already have the offsets?
- Change the last to say “when one of the above four situations occur/exist.” because they are “or” statements you can read them as if only the first four don’t apply, does not offset the “penalty” only be credited when one of four situations exist

**Guidelines were adopted by the committee with the edits made at the meeting.**

**Bus Stop Issues**

Should the committee make some recommendations as to a preferred Carbon Calculator or a set of criteria for choosing a carbon calculator?

**In February...**

Review the document from last year emissions for which we are responsible – 2008 EIC report. Take a look through it and make some recommended additions and changes, and recommend to adopt.