Attendees: Jordan Lutz, George McConnel, Dan Allosso, Alyssa Hauser, Tori Warne, Anna Knowles, Anna Carlson, Allan Bedford, Brian Brown, Pat Welle, Thomas Dirth, Erika Baily-Johnson

Tentative:

Regrets:

4:05 Introductions

4:07 Jordan introduces conversation about EAC roots.

Allan recalls conversations with Jordan and Erika

BSU has been committed to Sustainability for a long time.

Recalls EAC has been a part of this.

Recalls that our current president is fully committed to continuing this heritage.

Recognizes that who is the driving body for this is unclear.

Recalls his directive: What is the operating body, review and qualify bylaws, etc.

Identify process and accountability.

Hoping there is a single body, this would simplify things.

And will seek appropriate authorizations.

Also hopes the selected body is integrated into the university.

President will support the body and direct the university to do so also.

The selected body should keep campus accountable, tally up carbon emissions, etc.

The president id fully committed to supporting all commitments of the university and former presidents, and to continue in our national leadership role.

Jordan introduces narrative document.

What is the process moving forward?

Jordan proposes a work session to identify main points of prospective strategy.

Offers alternative: review progress and build from there.

Dan states this line woild depend on assuming we are far enough along.

Anna recalls progress is important but authority is a priority.

Allan points out his priority is agency, inventorying commitments, identifying who these commitments are tied to, even if unclear.

Recalls he is aware that some feel EAC is not given access to decision making.

Pat recalls his participation in past EAC progress.

Identifies EAC formation and Sustainability policy statement didn’t articulate agency/process.

Assumes EAC is the conscience of the university and that it makes sense to figure out how to get it involved.

Allan recognizes personal experience will lend to clarity about original intent.

Pat recalls EAC has been blown off even in the beginning.

Allan reiterates president’s commitment.

4:27 Jordan introduces a question: what is our primary goal/guide?

Reads from ()

Refers to carbon neutrality commitment.

Shows how BSU tracks progress.

Suggests defining new 30 year goals.

Suggests they depend on neutrality commitment.

Dan asks if the question is should resiliency part be a priority over reduction part?

Jordan states resiliency is perhaps a position we are being backed into but reduction should still be the priority.

Thomas points to the need for collaboration and that EAC should be the facilitator/conscience.

Dan confers and adds the process could influence the results.

Discussion: Carbon goal should stand on its own.

Anna suggests utilizing classes to perform analysis on an annual basis, outcomes used to support University level review.

Discussion: using models and existing guidance to define agency and should also include value of social capitol.

Allan revisits the relationship of resilience and carbon neutrality.

Proposes including increased costs and or decreased productivity as a part of resilience.

Would EAC explain/articulate the strategy for covering costs/inefficiencies?

Anna asks who would present scenarios? Whose responsibility is it to pose and review?

Allan suggest EAC is in conversation form the beginning.

DAN identifies the need for a larger guiding document like an Env impact statement.

Recalls a large part of our progress is from Ottertail adopting wind, not our doing.

Identifies marginal return on efforts moving forwards, even 5% will be difficult.

Allan suggests analyzing data and highlighting strategic benefits.

Alyssa recalls the availability and abundance of data.

Anna recalls the benefits of acting as a large institution.

Dan asks why cant we put solar on roofs?

Pat points to full cost pricing. Some of these investments will be economically viable.

Discussion: need to consider local rules.

Pat recalls it was always part of the plan for things to be very different.

Anna Knowles recalls doing something is better than nothing.

George recalls Ottertail interest in energy audit and what if we don’t participate.

We should be considering options.

Asks do we know how to do a resiliency assessment?

Erika recalls the need for defined agency. Two ideas. Vagueness offers adaptability but clarity offers effectiveness.

Pat recalls not having buy in, and that vagueness was built in to mission because of the disadvantage of not having buy in.

Allan recalls the ground source heat pump. Who is and who should be involved? Who has the final authority to decide on options?

Pat recalls stadium and white pines. Decision was made without EAC and other university interests.

Jordan suggests drafting versions of a statement/proposal.

Suggests a future meeting in about two weeks.

George asks should we be asking the president for direction?

Allan replies that EAC should propose a strategy including the role of the committee.

Includes an inventory of promises and commitments.

Thomas refers to the strategic plan as a base document.

Pat refers to the E policy statement, including designation EAC.

5:08 Meeting adjourns.

1. Hybrid Fleet Vehicle Memo

**Ask:** feedback?

1. EV Charging Station Memo

Feedback?

* 1. Do we need to define in campus policy what owning an EV charging permit means?

*(reach out to Marilyn Yoder to ask of her experience thus far)*

**Ask:** Is the EAC comfortable asking that additional spots (up to 3) be designated as EV-only via signage and paint?

* 1. Warnings for first offenses of permit infringement.  An EV owner who occasionally drives a non-EV (also on the permit registration) when in need of greater range accidentally put their new permit behind last year’s permit and was ticketed accordingly.  To support adoption of EV’s, can we not exercise greater leniency for first offenses, particularly when a permit card is being switched between two vehicles (EV and non-EV)? Both vehicles are entered into the permitting system with Public Safety, but drivers are issued only one hanger card…

1. Renewing our Climate Action Plan
   1. We need to identify new interim goals within the next 30 years: 2020-2050. (2% by 2015, 10% by 2020)
   2. We are preparing a grant application for McKnight Foundation to fund this process
   3. We are in communication with Elizabeth Turner about the possibility of facilitating our process

**Ask:**

1. Initiating our Resilience Planning Process

*(Show commitment language and timeline)*

* 1. EAC is commissioned with overseeing the resilience planning process, which fits within our overall Climate Action Planning
  2. Erika and Jordan in conversation with Elizabeth Turner (Precipitate: Architecture, Planning, & Research), who is working on a proposal for facilitating this process.
  3. Possible tool Anna Carlson and I are exploring in collaboration with City representatives:

*City Resilience Index*

1. EAC Involvement in Campus Planning

Our initial commission given by President Leslie Duly (10-22-1992) was to “make recommendations to the University Cabinet on pertinent environmental issues.”

a. How can we best uphold this commission?  What do we need from administrators to do so?

* + 1. Example – tree removal along Lakeside Lawn for Hagg-Sauer construction. When can we expect to voice our collective input?

*(share Carl’s letter to VP of Finance Snorek)*

* 1. Geothermal Feasibility Study
     1. Otter Tail Energy offers a funding program for geothermal feasibility studies
     2. Travis Barnes does not currently see geothermal playing a role in our next campus master facility plan, which will have a 5-7 year outlook and is due for completion in 2022.

**Ask:**