Campus Sustainability Committee
October 12, 2011
BCC 200
1-2:30 pm

Members Present: Jim Biardi, Tom Curran Jim Fitzpatrick, David Frasinelli (DaF), Antonio Grau-Sempere, Terry O’Brien, Ophelie Rowe-Allen
Marketing and Communications Liaison: Meg McCaffrey
Visitors: Dana August, Dina Franceschi (DiF)

1) Announcements (~15 minutes)

   Introduction of new faculty members

DiF introduced the following members to the Faculty Committee on Sustainability (FCS), which have been appointed by the Committee on Committees of the General Faculty: Jim Biardi (3 yr term), Michael Cavanaugh (1 yr term), Dina Franceschi (1 yr term), Antonio Grau-Sempere (3 yr term), Jen Klug (2 yr term), and Michael Tucker (2 yr term). The Director of the Program on the Environment holds an ex officio seat with a vote, the Academic Vice President holds an ex officio seat with no vote, and there is one student member, appointed by FUSA (currently pending).

Beginning this spring the General Faculty will elect two new members per year, starting with the positions currently held by MC and DF.

DiF was elected chair of the FCS at their first meeting on 9/28. The FCS is charged with selecting faculty representatives to the CSC. These representatives are JB, JK, AGS, and MT. The other faculty members of the FCS will attend CSC meetings as visitors.

Assignment of new faculty members to CSP subcommittees

MT has agreed to lead the Finance subcommittee of the CSP. MC will also serve on the Finance subcommittee. AGS has agreed to serve on the Operations subcommittee of the CSC. JB, DiF, and JK will continue their current roles on CSP subcommittees.

Discussion

Some members of the CSC were unfamiliar with the charge of the FCS. JF expressed concern about overlap in charge, and DF briefly presented differences in responsibilities between the committees. The charge of the FCS, approved by the General Faculty, President of the University, and Board, will be forwarded to members of the CSC.

JF suggested a change to membership of the FCS to include a graduate student representative. Members of the FCS present welcomed that suggestion, and will investigate how that change in membership would be made.
2) Review of past minutes (~5 minutes) – please review before the meeting

There were no members present suggesting changes to the minutes.

Minutes are now available on the campus intranet.

3) Catholic Climate Covenant (~10 minutes) – Jim Fitzpatrick

– please review http://catholicclimatecovenant.org/ before the meeting

JF briefly presented information on this initiative. He has signed the Campus up for the regular newsletters from this organization. No other university is currently signed on to this initiative, and there is little information available on what membership would mean.

TC will reach out to the AJCU Sustainability Subcommittee to see if this group has additional information.

JF suggested putting this on hold pending further information, and there was general agreement.

5) Discussion of University planning and design process – (30 minutes)

- how does the CSC fit into this process?

DaF presented a general outline of major projects on campus, using the recent student housing projects as an example:

- Conception when strategic need identified (by senior administration, others?)
- Outside firm hired to develop a master plan
- Board of Directors approve master plan
- Develop designs and select architect and construction managers
- Preliminary schematics suitable for Town approval
  - Building footprint
  - Drainage
  - Site Civil Engineering
- Town approval process
  - Code review, may also include Conservation Commission
  - Planning and Zoning approval
- Finalize drawings incorporating town feedback
- Prepare ‘100% construction documents’
- Board of Directors approval to proceed with construction
- Bid and issue contracts
- Start construction
- Complete construction
- Work with contractors to solve continuing
DaF noted that value engineering may occur during design development phase. Some changes can occur without going back to the town for approval, others would not. In general, upgrades could occur via this process; value engineering out approved features would likely require returning to P&Z. One criteria would be whether the external visual appearance of the building.

DaF suggested CSC review would be appropriate for some portions of this process:

- Drainage/runoff
- Setbacks due to code
- Impact on trees, grass
- Concept before completion of schematic
- Further discussions during the balance of the project

JB suggested review after Town approval, and DaF agreed if changes were ‘material’ to the design, or in other cases where significant changes to the project were made—including value engineering elements out of original design. Prior to construction contracts being awarded might be appropriate because bids will contain varied proposals to achieve requirements during construction.

Members discussed when input can be meaningful. JF asked about cost of suggested changes by the CSC, and how costs for a particular change might increase depending on when it is suggested. DaF pointed out there is no single answer to this question because changes may involve reengineering structure vs. simple changes to interior finishes, for example.

DaF and TC stated their commitment to considering sustainability during all phases of this process, and also that they must consider a variety of other limitations potentially counter to CSC concerns. DaF also stated the University policy of following LEED Silver design standards, but not official certification.

MC asked about opportunities for academic classes to view projects during these stages. DaF was supportive of this. He highlighted the geothermal system of the Jesuit Residence and the energy dashboards as examples of educational opportunities.

6) Discussion of upcoming campus projects – (30 minutes) David Frassinelli

- discussion of #6 will start at 2 pm and be limited to CSC members only

Closed session ensued, with DA remaining as a guest with permission of DaF and the other committee members.