

Campus Sustainability Subcommittee (CSS)
MEETING MINUTES
October 14, 2022

Present: Apple Alvarez '24, Beth Brucker-Kane, Megan Buchanan, Darren Drabek, Grace Geurin '24, Jen Natyzak, Tarah Rowse, Chair, Rik Scarce, Mark Youndt

Absent: Dan Rodecker, Carol Schnitzer

The meeting was held in-person and called to order at 3:07 pm.

1. Committee Function, Membership, and Organization

- a. The “function” statement of the CSS, as developed by the IPPC, was reviewed. Note focus on policy, planning and reporting to IPPC.
- b. The membership was reviewed with brief introductions.
- c. The committee was reminded of the College Diversity and Inclusion statement, with an emphasis on open listening and participation.

2. Review of Draft Combined Two-Year Annual Report for Fiscal Years 2021 and 2022

- a. The current report is for both FY21 and FY22, distinctive from the others in that it focuses more-so on goals, metrics, and reporting methodologies.
- b. Campus energy consumption primary sources includes 2M kWh increase in electricity use from FY21 to 22.
- c. Electricity from renewables is at 31% due to change in how we define what renewable attributes are Skidmore’s. Previous metric was 43%. This drop is because data cannot include renewables from the grid, because we do not have legal claim to them (that is we do not own the Renewable Energy Credits/“RECs”).
 - i. Rik suggests adding a bar to the graph to address the renewables in the electricity mix we purchase, perhaps with hatching to create an educational moment. The NYS grid is indeed improving, and arguments are to be had around the greening of the grid.
- d. 37% of our building square footage is heated and cooled from renewable sources (goal is 60%). Report will reframe this statement about square footage heated and cooled by geo to be accurate.
- e. Currently 52% reduction (2019 GHG inventory) in our scope 1 and 2 emissions (goal is 75%) i.e. this is what we have control over on campus such as natural gas, fleet vehicles, and purchased electricity
 - i. Scope 3 emissions are not included in the goal. These are usually the most, at around 50% of the total carbon footprint, including food, air travel, waste. It’s easiest to manage scope 1 and 2.
 - ii. Much of the emissions savings occurred between 2000 to 2015, with the solar, hydro, geothermal, and efficiency projects.
- f. Currently a 47% reduction in natural gas use per student and a 56% reduction in natural gas use per square foot (goal 60% reduction in comparison to year 2000 baseline).

- g. Currently +9% increase in electricity use per student (goal maintain, 0%); currently - 10% decrease in electricity use per square foot (goal maintain, 0% is year 2000 baseline).
- h. Water consumption is not in the current plan, but will be reported. There's currently a positive trendline, but with a data gap for 6 of the 14 years, it's not certain that there's indeed a trend.
- i. Current 36% diversion rate in routine operations (waste goal is 60%).
- j. Current 35% special project diversion for CIS (waste goal is 50%). This includes items like renovation and carpets, tiles, brick, etc.
 - i. Note that last year was 50% diversion thanks to early CIS work, later in the project is more challenging.
 - ii. For the new sports center, it will follow the building policy, with geothermal to heat and cool.
 - iii. Committee questions 2020 and 2021 data with pandemic and total waste/recycling generated.
 - 1. 2019 recycling was very high.
- k. Food data will be completed in the coming weeks. The results are significantly lower than past years, maybe due to new methodology including all food purchasing. This does still exclude vending.
- l. For Engagement goal there are many initiatives, program changes, and projects in motion. It would be valuable to consider how CSS can support the Sustainability Office in advancing this goal.

3. Campus Sustainability Plan Recommendations

- a. Improved data and methodologies.
- b. Expanded tracking for water, waste, ESG and sustainable investing.
- c. Benchmarks, to compare ourselves to developed standards, and best practices would be useful.
- d. Engagement metrics.
- e. How can we make progress?
 - i. Working Groups- these were used to form the goals and could be revisited to form action plans for the remaining 2 years.
 - ii. Action Plans – we have goals but very few developed pathways and tasks. Action plans would help organize the sustainability goals work.
- f. Priority actions on sustainability goals
 - i. Individual conversations with internal key players and stakeholders and external experts are occurring to research and explore options that advance Skidmore in the five focus areas of the CSP.
 - ii. Tarah is meeting with Joshua Woodfork, Michael Orr, and President Connor to address some of the key strategic sustainability opportunities.

4. City of Saratoga Springs Transportation Projects (Glen Mitchell and Clinton Road)

- a. Project came about from Saratoga Springs Mayor's Infrastructure Committee and focus groups, campus tour with College safety committee and faculty-parents in spring, and memo was presented in the spring.
- b. Rik notes that there's a typo with 2 words combined. This will be corrected.

- c. Motion passed unanimously to re-approve the Transportation Memo and advance it to leadership.

5. Sustainable Landscape Management Plan

- a. This combines both the ambitions on stormwater and landscaping from the Campus Master Planning Process with the Campus Sustainability Goal on land management planning.
- b. Potential cost is 40-50K or higher if the scopes is expanded to include other elements of the CMP.
- c. Megan notes that the zones around Sports Center by the pond are indeed used for parking for any and all big events. Clinton Rd is a dense site too for road-side parking. Landscaping will need to consider this parking issue.
- d. Mark asks who is pushing forth the Campus Master Plan. The process is still being worked out with individual projects being distributed as appropriate.
- e. Beth notes that this may be a project to seek funding from the Presidents' Discretionary Fund.
- f. Motion set by Darren, seconded by Beth. A vote of support for the idea of an expert-developed Sustainable Landscape Management Plan was unanimously passed.

6. A Climate Commitment

- a. Second Nature developed this Climate Leadership Network with three options for commitments: 1) carbon (focused on climate neutrality), 2) resilience (focused on adaptation and risk), and 3) climate (neutrality and resilience). Tarah recommends the Carbon commitment, using this as a lever for college action, structural and operational accountability, and engagement and education potential.
- b. Tarah notes it often does not go to the board of trustees, says Second Nature.
- c. Beth suggests it would be interesting to include endowments in the peer-aspirant presentation. Mark suggests endowment per student as a unit to include.
- d. Mark asks if Bates, Colby, and Bowdoin worked together to attain the carbon goals.
- e. Darren notes that few are committed to climate/resilience.
- f. Apple notes that the Break Free from Plastic folks are also presenting a commitment to President Conner and we may want to think about the various asks being made of leadership.

7. Other Business

- a. None.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 pm.

Meeting Action

1. Unanimous support to re-endorse the Transportation Memo
2. Unanimous vote in support of the idea of advancing an expert-developed Sustainable Landscape Management Plan

Campus Sustainability Subcommittee (CSS)
MEETING MINUTES
November 18, 2022

Present: Apple Alvarez '24, Beth Brucker-Kane, Megan Buchanan, Darren Drabek, Grace Geurin '24, Tarah Rowse, Chair, Rik Scarce, Mark Youndt, Dan Rodecker, Carol Schnitzer

Absent: Jen Natyzak

The meeting was held in-person in North Hall (133/Advancement Conference Room) and called to order at 3:11pm.

1. Approval of Minutes - October 14, 2022

No objections and minutes passed.

2. CSP Reporting: Food and the Conclusion Graphic

a. CSS Approval of the Combined Annual Report)

The sustainable food inventory methodology was reviewed. This is a manual entry process with over 6,000 entries in the 2022 inventory. The process is assisted by interns and very time intensive. All invoices are individual, except for Sysco which is an excel report. All food is labeled and categorized.

Challenging “local” category; currently within 250-mile radius of origin; hard to clearly identify foods; explained examples of what qualifies and what disqualifies and nuances of categories.

Calendar year (2015-2019) vs. fiscal year (2021-2022)

Dining Hall only vs. all Dining Services: shifted in 2022 to include all dining service sites

Food Goal: 25% sustainable food in dining services (actual is 8%)
2016 and 2022 are very close, similar.

Rik asked about STARS inclusion of plant-based food. Will there be a conversation about the metric of STARS; is STARS democratic?

Dollars/expenditures is the only metric we have and use for inventories, Rik asked; Tarah confirmed.

Food expenditures by category was presented.

Sustainable Food Share by Vendor was presented.

Apple asked about alternatives or vendors to reach out to. Tarah mentioned some use of local vendors and can open those conversations. Where do we want to take it and opportunity to adjust?

Rik asked what Dining Services could do to share orders with RPI or Union? Might help boost ability to buy minimums. Even other institutions with food services to share sources.

Energy Goal 1: 60% of our electricity from renewable sources (actual 31%)

Water Consumption (not in current plan). Rik asked if we know where water is used on campus. Dan reminded us we have few isolated meters for water and gas. Only one water meter but several gas meters. Tarah recently visited meters with a contractor to see how we could make submeters for natural gas. Trying to estimate the costs of adding more submeters.

Goals (Progress). Tarah created a new graphic to illustrate progress and our status for each goal. A summary snapshot of what and how we are doing.

Mark asked about Harder demolition and how 50% waste was diverted. Mark thought we had done better than that. Dan cited that CIS was our first project under this policy.

Motion for CSS to endorse the combined report. Rik moves, Mark seconds. No discussion. Motion carries.

3. Sustainable Construction and Renovation Policy

March 2021 adopted by IPPC. Key concept is the need for an integrated process.

Darren asked if existing buildings can be brought up to LEED certification. Yes, and Old Dana is a recent campus example.

LEED v4- New Construction. Tarah and Dan and Dean Phillips met with 11 members of design and build team to discuss the project.

Would be good for committee to read up on LEED before we meet with design team on December 9. What is important to you as individual and to the institution and what should be take into consideration on the project.

4. Health and Wellness, Fitness and Athletics Project Update

Dan presented an overview of the project. Design team has our construction policy. Next step is for us to meet with and engage the team.

Greenberg is set to move December 17th with inspection of site December 21. The old Greenberg building to undergo demolition during winter break.

New lighting on 8 new tennis courts will be LED.

Rik asked if new wells need to be drilled for geothermal. Dan says it is under review if the same bores can be used. Hopefully they can.

Space on campus that will open up as a result, primarily in residential spaces.

Beth asked if there is room for a campus hockey rink. Dan replied, yes. Technically there is room but it is tight. Dan also said that the Campus Master Plan explores other potential sites on campus that could be used for a rink.

5. Institutional Sustainability Policies - Current and Potential

Policies, Plans/Guidelines were delivered and discussed.

Purchasing policy is one to potentially look at this year. Existing policy has categories – paper, IT/electronics, fleet, and cleaning products. Carol is key part of discussion. Discussion of WB Mason and other vendors in relation to supply chain issues, availability, substitutions.

Mark suggested that there should be set timelines when policies are reviewed, for instance every couple of years.

Other plans/guidelines to consider:

City idling policy, maybe we should have a campus policy.

It has been observed that many people picking up and dropping off children at the ECC in Palamountain lot let cars idle, sometimes excessively.

Building temp guidelines. Don't really have much teeth in the policy.

Tree Care Plan: Jen is taking the lead on some of this. Focus on native plants/trees.

Cold water clothes washing? Dan said res halls are supposed be only piped for cold water washing.

Travel policies.

Apple reported a meeting with SGA Committee on Life; discussed student voices and desire for help getting students around campus and around area with vehicles. Accessibility and access to external locations. Dan reported that a meeting with SGA the other day many comments came up about accessibility around the new location of health and wellness.

Dan also said there is a new committee for fleet management. Mark asked if the utilization of the fleet is tracked. Yes, Dan said.

Mark asked if there is a pesticide policy. Dan didn't think there was a set policy, but definite practice that engages the campus.

6. CSS Work This Year

Transportation memo (Glen Mitchell and Clinton), moving forward. Presented to IPPC today, by Tarah.

7. Other Business

EV Stations: 9 new EV charging stations will be added, by ChargeSmart; at no cost to the college. Fee based for the user. 3 by the greenhouses; 3 at North Hall; 3 at Jonsson Tower lot. 18 new plugs. We currently have just 10.

Some of the ChargePoint stations are having inconsistent availability problems. Skidmore is working with the tech support team to try and address the problems.

CSS is looking to have a participant from Finance and Administration leadership position.

Sustainable Landscape Management Plan would be submitted for capital request to move forward. Jen and Tarah will meet with landscaping colleagues in Facilities. Could put out an RFP in April before formal approval of capital in May.

Tarah will reach out to schedule 3-4 meetings in the spring.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40.

Meeting Action

1. Combined Annual Report approved by CSS.

Campus Sustainability Subcommittee (CSS)
MEETING MINUTES
December 9, 2022

Present: Apple Alvarez '24, Beth Brucker-Kane, Megan Buchanan, Darren Drabek, Grace Geurin '24, Jen Natyzak, Dan Rodecker, Tarah Rowse, Chair, Rik Scarce, Carol Schnitzer, Mark Youndt

Absent: None

The meeting was held in the North Hall Facilities Conference Room in hybrid format (in-person and Zoom) and was called to order at 2:04 PM.

1. Health & Wellness Building Consultants' Presentation

- a. College Construction and Renovation Policy requirements
 - i. Siting- protect habitat, rainwater management
 - ii. Water- indoor water use, indoor water use reduction
 - iii. Energy
 - iv. Materials and resources- storage and collection of recyclables, construction and demo waste, construction and demo waste management
 - v. Innovation- purchasing lamps all LEDS
 - vi. Indoor EQ- environmental tobacco smoke control, low emitting materials
- b. Policy discretionary status
 - i. Transportation- Bicycle Facilities
 - ii. Siting- Heat Island Reduction
 - iii. Water- building level water metering
 - iv. Energy- fundamental commissioning and verification, building level metering, enhanced commissioning, optimize energy performance, advanced energy metering, grid harmonization, renewable energy production, enhanced refrigerant management
 - v. Materials and resources
 - vi. Indoor EQ- daylight
 - vii. Innovation- green building education
- c. Other project notes
 - i. Consultants are following tree care plan
 - ii. Only 1 point in indoor AQ not pursued (thermal comfort). 7 points are stretch. 8 points are yes.
 1. Consultant interest in managing acoustic performance
 - iii. Innovation includes
 1. Staircases that are especially inviting
 2. Biophilic design in the building
 - iv. From regional priorities, USGS notes priorities are stormwater management, high priority site, building life cycle impact reduction indoor water use, and renewable energy production
 1. MAYBE include stormwater management and others
- d. Goal is to get above 50 points to meet the LEED silver policy requirement.

2. Committee Questions and Discussion with Consultants

- a. Mark asks if the current points are too conservative. Consultants note that this is very doable. 50+ points were presented stretch though some are likely to be met.
- b. Geothermal is not included as renewable energy item by USGBC, but may be an innovation point since Skidmore uses district geo.
- c. Rik asks if a green roof is possible. Consultants note solar is more achievable than green roof. The Green Roof may not help on LEED checklist but may be innovation point. Green roofs are relatively expensive- the thicker they are the more expensive. They work well for controlling stormwater. They work on sloped roofs too- just challenging and expensive.
- d. Solar is not currently in the project, but 20% of building's electric could be met by rooftop solar. Inflation Reduction Act offers rebates on rooftop solar.
 - i. Dance building could be an option but needs to be sited. That project there wouldn't apply to this building's LEED rating.
- e. Rik asks about LEED Gold possibility. Consultant says easiest way to achieve gold is to consider solar on the building. Solar is a regional priority. If 10% of building usage is offset, that increases energy and atmosphere credits and impacts carbon offsets and green credits purchasing. Next is to look into lifecycle cost analysis related to embodied carbon from materials- this is a major study. Also consider indoor air quality monitors and display it publicly.
 - i. This may not be attainable with current budget. These stretch points come at a premium. The goal is to be advantageous.
- f. Process ahead- the scorecard and detailed documentation will be submitted to USBGC. This documentation is a preliminary design submittal, which is when 75% Construction Documents are completed. Then drawings will be reviewed with Skidmore, with final designs finalized and submitted again to USGBC before construction begins. At the end of construction, all construction related credits are submitted.
 - i. For a LEED Platinum project in Albany the approval came out 1 calendar year later.
- g. Tarah notes 75-year lifecycle analysis- this is Skidmore's first implementation of the policy. This could include climate, energy, and/or cost.
- h. The consultants need feedback before Dec 19 when they submit for initial design review.

3. Other business:

- a. Additional discussion and review of the Athletics project presentation and Skidmore building policy
 - i. Acknowledgement and reflection of geothermal use not providing direct points in the LEED system. Geothermal uses a lot of electricity.
 - ii. Solar – the committee is interested to have a basic cost and payback estimate for solar for the project. It would be difficult to incorporate solar based on the current project timeline. Solar from another building would not count towards the project. This would not be grid tied- which would save money and time- it's building specific.

- iii. Building permit due in February.
- iv. Dan notes positive feedback from the consultant on Skidmore's building policy. The design team offered to discuss and offer comments as related to Skidmore's building policy.
- v. Group support to focus on updating the building policy for this spring
 - 1. Is there a need to discuss/examine ROI benchmarks? ROI has varied on projects from 3-15 years in the past. Case-by-case.
- b. A carbon neutrality/climate commitment will be a key ongoing institutional focus.
- c. Kelley Patton-Ostrander, Assistant Vice President for Financial Planning & Auxiliary Services, will be joining CSS meetings in the spring via Zoom.
- d. Meetings next semester will be hybrid, with preferred in-person attendance.
- e. Sustainability is working with Facilities on moving forward a Sustainable Landscape Management Plan.
- f. Tarah asks for thoughts and input on CSS projects for the Spring.
 - i. Mark would like to update the Building Policy
 - ii. Megan is interested in supporting her staff on managing waste and purchasing
 - iii. Rik notes about looking intentionally at transportation- the new campus parking policy appears effective. Consider bus routes for campus community. He notes cutting GHG emissions- and that this bus route idea and other relevant projects may have an upfront cost.
 - 1. Carol notes the leased vehicles may be bought out when leases end (approximately 9 months). Fleet cars have 20,000 miles on them.
 - iv. Darren notes having sustainability featured in the All-College Staff meeting.
 - v. Beth notes updating promotional materials for tour guides, advancement. Potentially 10 points for every advancement person to understand and be able to communicate.
 - vi. Darren notes over-enrollment dollars and asks if that money is spoken for. Dan says this money may go ahead to support ADA efforts, renovation.
 - vii. Beth asks about how sustainability funding operates. Tarah notes there is no building project fund, and that this could be an energy or green revolving fund. Beth notes that with the next fundraising campaign, sustainability could be part of the bucket.
 - 1. Tarah wants this to come about from a Carbon Neutrality Commitment and tied to a climate action plan. This can be done with a consulting group with expertise. A carbon commitment would need funding.

Meeting adjourned at 3:26 PM.

Meeting action:

1. Committee members should send Health and Wellness LEED notes and questions to Dan and Tarah by Wednesday December 14.
2. The committee supports work on updating Building and Construction Renovation Policy for Spring '23.

Campus Sustainability Subcommittee (CSS)
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, February 13, 2023, 1:30-3:00 pm

Present: Apple Alvarez '24, Beth Brucker-Kane, Megan Buchanan, Darren Drabek, Grace Geurin '24, Jen Natyzak, Dan Rodecker, Tarah Rowse, Chair, Rik Scarce, Carol Schnitzer, Mark Youndt

Absent: Kelly Patton-Ostrander

This meeting was held hybrid, in-person and Zoom, and called to order at 1:35pm.

Meeting Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes – November 18, 2022 and December 9, 2022
 - a. Approved and to be posted on the CSS website.

2. Renewable Energy Claims and Green Power Reporting Update, Tarah
 - a. Some data adjustments need to be made to the Campus Sustainability Plan Fiscal Year 2021 and Fiscal Year 2022 Combined Annual Report, due to new information on Skidmore's renewables ownership. First, Skidmore has stopped purchasing unbundled Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) for 10% of our electricity. This change occurred in the summer of 2021, so no RECs were purchased for Fiscal Year 2022, thus they need to be removed from our renewables claim for 2022. Second, Skidmore has been tracking solar RECs via the New York Generation Attribute Tracking System (NYGATS). Our solar RECs from calendar year 2016 were retired. However, our solar RECs from calendar year 2017-2021 were not retired. Instead, as the RECs were not retired or banked at the end of the trading period, the active RECs were swept in to the pool of attributes and became residual mix certificates for NY state. Thus, Skidmore cannot claim these solar RECs and the FY 2017 through Fiscal Year 2022 claims need to be adjusted so that only RECs for which we retained ownership (and retired) are counted.
 - b. Group discussed the distinction of accounting versus generation- yes, Skidmore's solar field generated power, but NY state accounted for it, so if Skidmore counts the environmental attribute in our own reporting it would be double-counting.
 - c. Rik asks to consider how to envision the solar project in the report to still record generation year to year. Consider "self-generation" or "renewable attributes that we own" instead of current "renewable sources" text.
 - d. We are a signatory on EPA's Green Power Partnership and report our renewable energy annually. Accurate data has been submitted for fiscal year 2022 (no unbundled RECs and only partial solar for the 2022 solar RECs that will be retired). EPA is deliberating on what to do with the old data that was mistakenly presented inaccurately.
 - e. Dan and Mark agree that this is a moment for the College to continue to explore new projects.
 - f. Next steps- Tarah will update the document, share, and post to the website.

3. Health and Wellness, Fitness and Athletics Project – Sustainability/LEED Update, Dan
 - a. Design development phase is complete and now in construction drawing phase. The team is reviewing comments and LEED points. EV charging stations have been added. The construction team is reviewing the building for solar- it is designed with structural capacity for solar.
 - i. Awaiting cost for conduit for the electrical room. They're evaluating space needs in electrical room to accommodate solar needs.

- ii. Awaiting PPA evaluation with current electric rates, which are good, but they're likely to increase. Dan's in favor of this option for convenience and maintenance. This approach would mean no upfront cost, we would just have an agreement to purchase the electricity over a 20-30-year contract.
 - iii. The benefit of moving solar ahead now is that we get the LEED points, and doing it later would have no LEED impact.
 - 1. Megan asks about timeline of LEED approval.
 - b. Plans for building project are mid-March to enable construction for June. If Skidmore decides to go ahead with solar, it's feasible to return with an amendment to the city to get approval.
 - c. Up next will be value engineering phase. Then the consultant will present again to CSS with updated inventory of LEED points.
- 4. Sustainable Construction and Renovation Policy Next Steps, Mark
 - a. The document is a living document. The focus points for revision is (1) process for decision-making and reporting i.e. to CSS and when (2) energy analysis, specifically renewable and solar (3) 50-75 lifecycle analysis on major systems is unclear
 - b. Next steps for review will be to share revisions electronically, review redlined version at next meeting, and then vote at the CSS April meeting. Before presentation, it'll be reviewed by Dean Orr and VPFA Ingram. Once passed by CSS, it will go to IPPC for approval in one of the final IPPC meetings this spring.
 - c. Jen asks about what projects could fall through the cracks with the policy- Dan confirms \$2M is pretty low and would capture most projects. Only projects on the 18-month horizon are Wellness Center and baseball field.
 - d. Tarah asks about whether or not now is the right time to commit to net-zero. A net-zero approach is the best way to support sustainability goals and be a role-model for sustainable construction. Dan notes that budget impacts are crucial to understand. Mark notes that there should be discussion and details about methodology and that offsets are problematic. Dan notes changes in state codes and natural gas (i.e. some building codes are requiring occupancy sensors per building). Rik is in favor of Skidmore taking responsibility of environmental impacts given the science and impacts of global climate change and other environmental challenges.
- 5. Purchasing Policy
 - a. CSS will return to the purchasing policy at another time.
 - b. Tarah notes that there are other potential policy areas, such as consideration of offsets for study abroad travel. There are some more clear-cut offset projects (like weatherization) that could be considered, though some of them take a lot of development and coordination.
- 6. Other Business
 - a. Next meeting is March 6. We will need an additional March meeting for the Athletics design team to present a LEED credit update.
 - b. Upcoming Sustainability Office efforts: composting in offices, Sustainable Workplace Operations Program lunch workshop on Mar 1, Saratoga Sustainability Fair is Sunday April 16, Give+Go move out is Sunday May 21.

Meeting ended at 2:58 pm.

**Campus Sustainability Subcommittee (CSS)
MEETING MINUTES**

Monday, March 6, 2023, 1:30-3:00 pm

Present: Beth Brucker-Kane, Megan Buchanan, Darren Drabek, Jen Natyzak, Kelly Patton-Ostrander, Dan Rodecker, Tarah Rowse, Chair, Rik Scarce, Carol Schnitzer, Mark Youndt

Absent: Apple Alvarez '24, Grace Geurin '24

This meeting was held hybrid, in-person and Zoom, and called to order at 1:32pm.

Meeting Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes – February 13, 2023
 - a. Approved and to be posted on the CSS website.
2. 2022 GHG Inventory Update
 - a. Making some final adjustments and finalizing. To be presented at the April meeting.
3. Sustainable Construction and Renovation Policy – Redlining Discussion
 - a. High level review from Mark of edits: solar ready added within energy section, process now includes “sustainability leadership” (this is how it was written in an earlier draft), lifecycle analysis standards (TBD, tougher decision here)
 - i. Rik notes we should consider having an operating code if we don’t have one. It is worth noting that the chair of CSS in a future scenario may be able to be privy to new construction projects and not be required to share anything with CSS itself.
 1. Tarah shares the CSS committee has a charge, to address policy and procedure for sustainability at the College
 - b. Introduction
 - i. Discussion on visibility for sustainability with building projects. Dan notes recurring challenge to address sustainability, as geo is all underground. Darren notes idea of small solar panel by the garden to teach campus visitors about off-campus solar project.
 - ii. Ongoing potential project with John Galt in sculpture to build an outdoor geo model for the Wiecking and Sustainability Quad area.
 - iii. Why are updates being considered so soon after the policy was adopted (originally in March 2021)? Updates are needed given questions that have arisen out of the recent application of the policy to the Health and Wellness building project. The last edition was published so quickly that lingering questions are being revisited and certain sections are being clarified.
 - c. Process
 - i. Many colleges have a ton of details to the process. The goal of this new text is to balance burden and clarity. Is this the right participation from College representatives and who is involved in the decision making? The policy should be the process for building construction going ahead.
 - ii. Megan welcomes clear process for various departments that are scoping and budgeting for projects. How do miscellaneous projects, like the baseball field, get direction and pricing per this policy? There are toilets, but the space is likely under 1000 s.f.
 1. LEED projects are minimum 1,000 s.f., but that is not noted in the policy.

2. There's no part of this policy covering lands and grounds currently. Where do projects under 2 million that are outdoors fall? Consider lighting on fields, consider HVAC overhauls, flooring updates, etc.
 - iii. Dan wonders about approval timeline given new CFO to start June 15. Notes that it's worth planning further ahead for all projects. Facilities is aiming for submitting budgets 2 years out to allow renovation projects the planning needed.
 - iv. Rik endorses Dan's note about waiting to bring this policy to the new CFO.
 - v. Rik offers a grammatical comment as related to the use of "ing" (present progressive tense) under the steps for Project Initiation, Programming, etc.
 - vi. Mark notes that most colleges have 3-7 steps for process. There's no right way to do this process and Facilities, Paul and Dan, have input that is crucial to finalizing what is the appropriate process.
 - vii. Rik suggests moving Pre-Construction Documents- with new name- to the second spot in the list.
 - viii. Jen notes whether we should consider specificity of commitments to responsible parties, keeping it highly specific bullet by bullet.
- d. Definitions for new construction and renovations
- i. Beth asks about public reporting- what does that look like? It can be a website, a LEED scorecard. Documentation would be ideal.
 1. Mark notes separate scorecard for internal versus LEED projects where this is all thoroughly documented.
 2. The timing of reporting is with the end of the project
 3. Megan comments for new health and wellness building, signage is coming to the Health and Wellness to share about the sustainability of the new building coming ahead.
 4. Tarah notes that the new Health and Wellness fundraising video did not include sustainability as a theme.
- e. Policy for all projects
- i. Tarah highlights new points on renewable projects, solar ready roofs, and life cycle analysis.
 - ii. Dan questions what life cycle standard is the right one- picking one may be helpful to enable consistency. He expresses interest into looking into this item. Tarah notes asking Cannon or other consultants about best practices. Mark notes at U Minnesota and all state buildings have a high-detail lifecycle policy which seems so complex and burdensome that it may not all be followed. Middlebury and other schools reference this policy. This section needs more work.
 - iii. Rik comments that current language for "design and build new roofs to be solar ready" is too suggestive that this means no solar is going to go on the roofs. Mark suggests switching or combining 4 and 5. Beth suggests "with a preference for panels"
 - iv. Dan asks about item 4 "based on current regulations and incentives" wondering about if the incentives make or break the project.
 - v. Education was moved up with 3 items, which are made mandatory here but can be moved to the below section as a non-mandatory item.
 1. Beth notes the first item- incorporating building design- is potentially the most impactful. Group shares ideas on scale of building design, whether railings on roofs so people can safely tour up there, adding glass panels to see structural elements and insulation materials.
 - a. Mark notes Middlebury has tons of design items, dashboards inside buildings, and that their communication is so thorough around every part of campus.

Campus Sustainability Subcommittee (CSS)
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, April 3, 2023, 1:30-3:00 pm

Present: Apple Alvarez '24, Beth Brucker-Kane, Megan Buchanan, Darren Drabek, Grace Geurin '24, Jen Natyzak, Dan Rodecker, Tarah Rowse, Chair, Rik Scarce, Carol Schnitzer, Mark Youndt

Absent: Kelly Patton-Ostrander

The meeting was held in-person in the North Hall large conference room. Meeting called to order 1:34pm.

1. Minutes for March 6, 2023 approved
2. Sustainable Construction and Renovation Policy Revisions Update
 - a. Tarah, Dan, Mark, Paul to meet with Michael and Charles for feedback and review.
3. SGA Green Grant - Apple Alvarez '24
 - a. Competitive grant program operated by steering committee of Sustainability Commission, Sustainability Office, faculty rep. student rep, facilities, and leadership activities
 - b. This is to create a designated fund for student-led initiatives, and is an opportunity to encourage educational opportunities, promote interdisciplinary and diversity efforts, increase student-led projects on campus, and to build on the Campus Sustainability Plan
 - c. This will start with 10k from SGA.
 - d. Haverford, Oberlin, Vassar, and Middlebury run green grants, many of them thru student fees. Example fund from University of Idaho, funded \$1,600 for pollinator garden revival, \$2,700 drought tolerant grass planting, \$2,200 hydroponics project
 - e. Timeline includes application open August-November, review begins winter break with Committee, project/s chosen and announced in February, and project implemented starting Feb thru approved timeline.
 - f. This presentation was shared with SGA to anticipate \$10k in the budget for next academic year, and it will be voted on with the budget in 2 weeks. Apple is meeting with budget committee to confirm this allocation.
4. 2022 Greenhouse Gas Inventory – Tarah Rowse and Forrest Levey '23
 - a. Inventory takes place every 3 years
 - b. Scope 1 is on-campus generation such as natural gas for heating and fuel for campus vehicles, scope 2 is purchased electricity
 - i. Scope 2 methodology has evolved in recent years and includes changing methods that are location-based and market-based. This change in methodology is the primary reason for Skidmore's drop in Scope 2 emissions from the 2013 to 2016 inventory. There is debate over using RECs for carbon reduction claims. Stockholm Environmental Institute is criticizing EPA for their methods.
 - c. The inventory thru time, after 2010, includes a drop from the elimination of the steam plant on campus. There's plateau between 2016-2022.
 - i. The inventory is every 3 years and there is benefit to doing it annually to understand trends and project impacts.
 - ii. The variability between 2013-present is solar and hydro coming online in 2014 and an increasingly cleaner grid, but there's a big shift from emission factor methodology at play too.
 - d. Scope 3 is variable depending upon what metrics are included. Second Nature's Climate Leadership Network requires only staff/fac/student commuting and air travel.
 - i. If including all inputs, 60% of GHG inventory is scope 3, whereas it drops to 19% if using Second Nature/Climate Leadership Network requirements

- ii. Additional Scope 3 emissions in the 2022 inventory are coming from Fuel and Energy Related Activities (FERA), which was a recent addition to the SIMAP inventory tool
 - iii. Comparing the last 3 inventories, the student commuting to campus information greatly increased, the past 2 methods including a sample survey from 300 students versus a review of all student addresses. Study abroad is also down compared to the previous past 2 years, as there were fewer folks studying abroad then. Staff commuting went down this year compared to past years.
 - 1. For staff commuting- 10% population drop in the last review. In future also consider how many EVs are in the fleet of college commuting.
5. Carbon Offsets Initial Discussion
- a. Four project types include avoided nature loss, nature-based sequestration, additional emissions avoidance/reduction, and tech-based removal. Verifying these projects is necessary to be credible, audited, and measurable.
 - b. Global and community-based projects offer co-benefits and have clear alignment with UN Sustainable Development Goals (often human health and women empowerment and reducing inequality)
 - i. Examples include water wells and sanitation/filtration projects, solar and efficient cookstoves, low-income weatherization, regenerative ag, on-farm manure management, efficient manufacturing/recycled waste materials
 - c. Cost varies \$10-30/ton
 - d. Apple asks about carbon sequestration of on campus trees and tracking cut-down trees. Jen notes data available through Tree Campus USA and GIS projects. Dan notes City policy on tree plantings and more trees being planted than removed. Trees recently removed on N Broadway were considered invasive.
 - e. Tarah notes that Skidmore commuting and business travel (unavoidable Scope 3 emissions) is about 2,000 MTCDE. If we were to offset these the cost estimate would be from \$20,000-\$60,000 annually, depending on project type and quality.
 - f. Rik comments that while previously hesitant with offsets, these metrics and standards are assuring given the potential for tangible, trackable, and transparent projects
 - g. Mark asks if Skidmore can develop our own projects. Yes, though there is much more process work required for validation.
 - h. Beth asks about moving this forward with President and IPPC. Tarah says we need to establish how to budget and manage this. There are a few methods to this- department by department to internalize price or to have it managed with one annual purchase.
 - i. Dan asks about operations for reviewing tree removal. Tarah and Jen agree Tree Campus Committee is best group to discuss/plan this.
6. Campus Sustainability Plan – Next Steps/Wrapping up – discussion postponed to a future date.

Campus Sustainability Subcommittee (CSS)
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, May 1 2023, 1:30-3:00 pm

Present: Beth Brucker-Kane, Megan Buchanan, Darren Drabek, Grace Geurin '24, Jen Natyzak, Tarah Rowse-Chair, Rik Scarce, Mark Youndt

Absent: Apple Alvarez '24, Kelly Patton-Ostrander, Dan Rodecker, Carol Schnitzer

This meeting was held hybrid, in-person and Zoom, and called to order at 1:41pm.

Notes

1. Approval of Minutes – April 3, 2023
2. CSS Year in Review Updates
 - i. Thanks to Rik for his time on the committee. Christine Page will be new faculty from Business and Management
 - ii. Anticipate scheduling the meeting for next Fall same time, likely Mondays at 3pm. Mondays at 1:30pm may not work for Apple who has a class that runs through 2:20pm.
 - iii. Letter from College in support of Clinton bike path and Glen Mitchell path. In February it moved ahead to Paul Tonko's office and more funding may come down the line.
 - iv. Green Grant was approved by SGA and will move ahead this fall. It's \$10k currently, more funding may be available.
 - v. Funding should be available for Sustainable Landscaping project, will move ahead with LA Group with Bruce and Tarah as co-chairs. The project focuses on design guidelines and policy.
 - vi. Sustainable Construction and renovation policy is moving forward with revisions and edits.
 - vii. Carbon offsets update- Tarah and Forrest talked with Bowdoin about their carbon offsets, and they're pivoting money into the College's fossil free fund. Tarah also talked to Cori Filson about study abroad offsets, but it's not a priority at the time. Nothing to move forward at the moment.
 - viii. The tennis and wellness center has no current changes on building design regarding LEED requirements and adaptations.
 - ix. Tarah is managing retirement of RECs for solar and hydro. There are still conversations on adding unbundled RECs through the energy purchasing process. Electricity cost is increasing, which makes renewable projects look more appealing.
2. Sustainability Office Updates
 - i. This is our first year with the CDPHP Cycle! Bikes and compost in academic spaces. Hoop House 1st spring, is going well, plants in the ground, please scare away the rabbits. North Woods boardwalk and bridge are upcoming and ongoing projects for our summer stewards. Give+Go move-out donation collection will take place this May, volunteers needed. This was our 2nd Saratoga Sustainability Fair in partnership with Sustainable Saratoga in April, and brought out 350 attendees with 25+ various organizations in the exhibitor hall.
 - ii. We are likely to get funding for submetering for operational energy and cost efficiency. This will create opportunity for engagement, dashboards, and data. Metering for energy and gas.
 1. Megan asks about water metering. Not on radar yet.

- iii. No leads on off campus large scale solar project. Not feasible on current lands. Skidmore would need to work with a contractor to find suitable sites (for purchase or leasing). A third party offered quotes and options for rooftop solar, which was 3 MW on 15 buildings (14-year payback).
- 3. Campus Sustainability Plan – Next Steps/Wrapping Up
 - a. The Campus Climate Commitment requires sign on from College leadership, but this is something the committee could bring to the community through various stakeholder groups.
 - b. Our Sustainability Plan progress is essentially flat and no significant progress will move the needle by 2025. The Sustainable Landscape Management plan is moving ahead, which is a piece of the lands goal around broad campus land management. Engagement is moving ahead with surveying this Fall and the geothermal art installation may move ahead with sculptor John Galt. We're considering various signage with Communications. Food is challenging- it's largely a cost.
 - c. Feedback on how to wrap up the plan
 - i. Rik notes leadership from the top is essential. To get even progress, we need Marc's support and direction for cabinet members to step up. Years ago Skidmore was a leader and now "we've just dropped off a cliff." This is certainly important to new faculty, students, and alumni. It needs to start with leadership.
 - ii. Mark advocates for the next 2 years to laying the groundwork for the next plan. This should include buy in from cabinet and admin and the new people coming on board.
 - iii. Darren notes that a new plan may catch attention and funding.
 - iv. Megan notes that the new bore holes going in are a good educational opportunity. This may be a good opportunity for communications and marketing.
 - v. Rik notes a sustainability tour would be a good addition to admissions, advancement
 - vi. Tarah mentions a proposed ADA trail for North Woods from ESS Capstones, and costing could be significant. It's a good engagement opportunity and equity connection.
 - vii. Beth asks if it would be helpful to have a Communications staff person on the CSS Committee
 - viii. Jen notes the College's Strategic Plan coming up for 2025, with planning to begin next year. Mark notes it would be good for the Climate Plan and Strategic Plan to rise up in parallel.
 - ix. Jen notes that the group could explore purchasing policy that's integrated in College operations, including plastics, food, potential item bans.
 - x. Jen notes ROI formalized for project, potentially formalized in the construction policy. Mark notes consistency is important, so a formal policy on ROI and values and parameters that can withhold the test of time. Higher Ed has so much turnover so standards are important.
 - xi. Mark notes that financially the College is stronger than it has ever been. Mark notes that externalities are not felt in various college costs, such as water for the College.
- 4. A Climate Commitment
 - a. Tarah notes that this commitment (a Second Nature Climate Leadership Network climate neutrality commitment) should be brought up in various circles around campus.
- 5. Other Business
 - a. Tarah notes formalizing metrics of student learning with surveys on sustainability literacy. Rik underscores this point and adds that this could be a general education

requirement. Mark will have data on sustainability-focused and sustainability-related courses through registrar's office and curriculum committee.

- b. Grace notes that she's heard positive feedback about work with the Sustainability Office from the student perspective and that folks would be interested in more jobs.
- c. Tarah notes that AASHE STARS reporting is every 3 years generally. It's a tool to inventory and measure operations. Skidmore is due to submit next Spring, and Tarah and Mark are in favor of waiting an extra year (submitting in FY 2025), so that there's a full year of academic data.