Meeting Minutes
KPU Decarbonization Roadmap – ESC Meeting

Date: November 24, 2021

Time: 2:00-3:00pm

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees:

Jaret Lang	Associate Vice President, Campus and Community Planning
Brent Elliott	Director, Planning, Sustainability, and Development
David Stewart	Executive Director, Facilities Services; Co-Chair
Iain Hunter	Director, Maintenance and Operations
Dan Brown	Campus Planning and Facilities Contractor
Todd Mundle	University Librarian
Alan Davis	President & Vice Chancellor; Co-Chair
Reza Khakbaznejad	Chief Information Officer; Interim VP, Administration
Thomas Kwadzovia	Director, Procurement Services
Ellen Pond	KPU Climate+ Challenge co-coordinator; Instructor in Policy Studies & Urban Ecosystems; Interim Chair, Policy Studies
Gidget Maguire	Conf. Asst. to Executive Director, Facilities
Rebecca Harbut	Sustainable Agriculture Instructor
Aaron Wu	3rd year policy student
Adam Rhode	Kwantlen Student Association
Caroline Lillico	Conf. Asst. to Univ Secretary
Jason Creighton	Environmental Policy Student
Jaya Dhillon	President, Kwantlen Student Association
Melissa Drury	Instructor, Environmental Protection; Chair of Env Tech program (Langley)
Josh Caplan	Senior Strategic Energy Management (SEM) Coach, Prism Engineering
Charlene Ponto	Sustainability Specialist, Prism Engineering

Discussion notes

1. **Presentation**

   - Campus and Community Planning along with Prism Engineering presented to the Environmental Sustainability Committee
   - See PowerPoint Presentation and Mentimeter results for additional feedback provided by polling questions
   - Supplementary information (Backgrounder) was provided in advance of the session

2. **Discussion**

   Discussion notes following include both verbal comments and comments provided in the chat

- Alan Davis: Recently came from President's Council discussion - some people are saying 2050 is too far out for our GHG reduction targets. We should go for 2030. There is appetite to go more aggressively than we had thought. Appetite to do this quicker if possible.
- Josh Caplan: We will be looking at risk, expediency, and cost as part of the pathways evaluation.
- Ellen Pond: Is there not a fourth approach, which is between incremental and windfall?
    - Josh Caplan: yes, the pathways can be re-evaluated and altered as needed.
- Jason Creighton: Has any thought been put into alternative technologies, e.g. geothermal?
    - Josh Caplan: Yes, there are Electrification and geothermal synergies. Will look at this in phase 2 and any gaps not yet explored.
    - Brent Elliott: Alternatives can intersect and provide opportunities to showcase KPU – sewer heat reclaim, solar, etc.
- David Stewart: In looking at the difference between the incremental vs windfall approach, its about whether KPU funds electrification vs the change be provincially funded. There are also degrees within the windfall approach. There could be small vs big windfall.
- Ellen Pond: For consideration going forward, I might also suggest a fourth evaluation criteria, which is in alignment with University values (not technical values, but ethical values, like public university, public systems, for example - we might need to define that).
    - Values as a university are important to consider – not just technical options
    - Reductions targets are set and very urgent
    - We need to understand what other values exist that reflect KPU as a public university
    - Do we believe in public private partnerships or work in partnership with other crown corps or institutions?
- Alan Davis: Priority is a value – we will meet or exceed targets. Money is only a way of getting things done. What our purpose is as a university is established in the Vision 2023 and this work should align with the university's mission / vision. There is an expectation for the university to be a leader.
- Iain Hunter: If we don't just look at technologies, but we look at ethics, from a facilities perspective we see the incremental and windfall approaches as almost same thing. Either way the roadmap will be developed. The timescale is different: the roadmap stays the same and timescale may adjust.
- David Stewart: With the incremental approach there could also be a windfall 10 years from now.
- Brent Elliott: We should be cautious about analysis paralysis. All three approaches – incremental, windfall, outsourcing – will likely include different technology choices with different funding needs. We can't always anticipate when change may occur either, but we can build in flexibility into all three approaches to accommodate future divergent opportunities (e.g. if we get money we can make bigger changes, faster).
- Rebecca Harbut: If we stick to aggressive timeline it is a radical transformation to our buildings. Presents an amazing opportunity to community. It should be felt throughout the community. Both internally (how we teach) and in community. We should anticipate pain as we transition. The more we engage people, we can demystify transition for our communities and societies.
- Ellen Pond: agree with Rebecca. Sometimes users will not notice technical changes, but there are huge opportunities for education.

- Ellen Pond: On urgency: All the others [priorities in Mentimeter poll] are good, if they do not slow us down (e.g. R&D, do we really have time for that, or need it?).
- Jason Creighton: I think that we need to have a real idea of what cost means. Dollars are just numbers but the cost of doing nothing is clear. Real world effects are already being felt and we are hand wringing over money while facing an extinction level event
- Ellen Pond: Agree on momentum!
- Alan Davis: Bring this item back in the new year following further smaller group discussions.