

Campus Sustainability Subcommittee (CSS)  
MEETING MINUTES  
Monday, September 13, 2010 4:00 pm

Present: Apple Alvarez, Beth Brukner, Megan Buchanan, Grace Geurijzen Natyzak (note taker), Christine Page, Dan Rodecker, Tarah (Chav) Carsthnitzer, Mark Youndt

Absent: Darren Drabek

This meeting was held in person.

Meeting Agenda

1. Institutional Sustainability Initiatives Update

a. Palmertown Range update (Mark)

- i. Skidmore owns over 1500 acres of land. The underway Sarah B Foulke Friendship Trail connects Saratoga Springs with Moreau State Park. The project includes the northern most parcel of Skidmore land and supports economic development with a trail segment behind Artisanal Brewery Skidmore's land next to the stable, serves as the southern terminus.
- ii. Skidmore is one of the founding members of the Sarah B Foulke Friendship Trails a project led by Saratoga PLAN, with 10 partners.
- iii. The trail segment at the north end is flagged and needs approval from the Village of Greenfield. The site needs a stewardship plan. The DEC area is for improving the access.
- v. D

**f. Solar rooftop installations being considered. The I**

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

Monday, October 16, 2023, 2:30-4:00 pm

**Present:** Beth Brucker-Kane, Megan Buchanan, Darren Drabek, Bruce Murray (invited guest), Jen Natyzak (note taker), Christine Page, Dan Rodecker, Tarah Rowse (Chair)

**Absent:** Apple Alvarez, Grace Geurin, Carol Schnitzer, Mark Youndt

This meeting was held in person in the Advancement conference room.

**Meeting Agenda**

1.

- iv. Tarah made the point that the policy does not require an alternatives analysis (comparing at least two different building design options). Instead, the policy notes that the life cycle analyses should be used to discuss alternatives. This conversation at Skidmore would be general and not concrete, given that we would not be discussing actual modeled alternatives. Many building policies (especially at research institutions with engineering and technical schools) required alternatives analysis with one or two additional building alternatives.
  - v. General acknowledgement and agreement that requiring educational signage and promoting visibility and access to systems is appropriate and important.
  - vi. Tarah notes potentially updating the checklist for Appendix A.
  - vii. Within Appendix, space efficiency standards should be removed since there are currently guidelines being developed through the Space Planning Working Group. We should reference this work and the guidelines.
  - viii. Discussed whether the group felt comfortable endorsing. The committee agreed that some adjustments still needed to be made and feedback from missing committee members would be valuable. Dan clarified that there are no new major building projects moving forward immediately and that there is time to continue to revise and develop the policy. Thus, an endorsement vote was delayed.
  - ix. Next steps: Minutes to be sent out this week to the full committee. Tarah will work on a few edits based on the committee conversation with the committee
- rbTatt4-2.6 mcoeev8(S)12.56 (t)-4.7e)915 (h3 TD(025( o)2 (0.6 (t)-e10. Tc 915 (k9b)2(T)-d6 (ee h

Monday, November 6, 2023, 2:30-4:00 pm

Present: Apple Alvarez, Beth Brucker-Kane, Darren Drabek, Grace Geurin, Bruce Murray (guest), Jen Natyzak (note taker), Christine Page, Tarah Rowse (Chair), Mark Youndt

Absent: Megan Buchanan, Dan Rodecker, Carol Schnitzer

This meeting was held in person in the North Hall large conference room.

**M**

1. Approval of Minutes – October 16 – passed.
2. Sustainable Construction and Renovation Policy Proposed Changes
  - a. Tarah notes new text for responsibility identifies project managers and project teams as having primary responsibility.
    - i. Mark asks if specific responsibility should be considered for VP roles.
      1. General agreement that project managers are the right individuals.
    - ii. Bruce notes that there may be further cost for managing alternative recycling streams, such as ceiling tiles and carpet.
    - iii. All accept.
  - b. Tarah notes that life cycle analysis additions add specificity on operational metrics and suggest conducting a comparative analysis.
    - i. Mark comments that some models may include a baseline, but not guaranteed, and agrees with new comparative language.
    - ii. Darren asks for an example. Tarah suggests the hypothetical possibility that a steel building might need to be compared to a timber frame building. You would need a comparative LLCA and LCA (and baseline) for decision-making.
    - iii. Bruce, Mark, others agree that more expertise would be helpful to clarify if this is sufficient.
    - iv. Jen suggests that we could get input from past project design partners.
  - c. Tarah clarified that there are different LEED rating systems that might be relevant to Skidmore, depending on project type. Examples include Building Design and Construction (new construction and major renovations), Interior Design and Construction (complete interior fit-outs), and Building Operations and Maintenance (existing buildings undergoing improvement work).
  - d. Tarah suggests that we should consider making metering a requirement (instead of discretionary).
    - i. Bruce notes additional cost of metering. Tarah notes a rough estimate for metering of \$5,000-8,000/meter though potentially less costly once an energy performance monitoring system is in place.
  - e. Tarah notes that the content for standards should be reviewed to be up to date LEED standards.
    - i. Mark notes that this can have additional text noting that LEED standard should be up to date every year or on a regular cycle.
  - f. Moving ahead- vote in this meeting and ask those not present to vote via email (Dan, Carol, Megan). Next this will go thru IPPC early next spring.

- i. Tarah confirms LCAA clarification, requiring metering, up to date LEED checklist, and review cycle consistent with LEED version updates (for LEED definitions and standards only).

g. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

h. SCRP Education and Outreach.

- i. Targeted stakeholder meetings to communicate this policy, email to directors and chairs meeting (Dorothy manages this) and Academic Affairs leadership (Dorothy), send thru VPs for remaining departments.
- ii. Improve integration to the College website, tie to capital & minor project request info.
- iii. Consider having announcement of the policy simultaneous to capital budget request announcements- aim for this cycle, this year, given that the policy is active now.

3. Purchasing Policy

- a. This is housed on the Sustainability Office webpage alone. It does not note who approved it or when it was approved (though it is believed to be in 2016). It is not on the Purchasing website.

- i. Only the paper section has requirements, all other sections have recommendations and preferences.
- ii. Tarah notes controls thru WB Mason make it possible to manage paper purchases, but some fall through the cracks, such as through Print Services.
- iii. Bruce notes all janitorial paper products are from the vendor of Hill and Markes and purchased by Facilities through Pam Davis.
  - 1. We do not believe that all toilet paper and paper towel products follow the policy for 100% recycled or approved sustainability certification. We can check on this.
  - 2. Cleaning products (preference only) are also primarily purchased through Pam Davis in Facilities.

iv. Purchased from [REDACTED]

Pama (g)/0 -1.152 TD(P)TJe3asedp71.3 (r)-2 (en)2 (15 0 Td(It)-42 (s)10.5e2.002 Tw )2 (r)-2 (ch) Ptef0.002 Tc -0.03

s.

**Impact Sustainability Committee (SS)**  
**MEMO**

Mo 4:00 pm n

Rose -Ka Mega Grace Coale, Darre Grace n n  
Geuri n  
Sch n  
Abse n  
Ms meeti n

**Minda**

1. Mi Approved – November 6 . n .
2. Sustai . Policy Proposed Cha n
  - a. Recappi . n  
process with a lead focus o clear n  
for co n
  - b. ~~IP~~ Policy . n  
office for each i policy n  
i. Ere is curre n  
ii. IP reviews provides i e . ies, while the Cabi n  
c. Da . who fees th **TOTOT29** .

ii The origin  
was  
1 Apple  
apply the policy  
ier . . . n  
n



**Community Committee (SS)**  
**EMS**

Wednesday, January 24, 2024, 8:30-10:00 am

Present: Apple Alvarez, Beth Brucker-

- i. Beth asks about College policy on return on investment. Dan says this is higher than desired and that there is no formal policy.
- e. Assessment updates from Tarah
  - i. EPA Green Power Partnership Reporting was just submitted. Skidmore joined the program and has been reporting since 2011. To be a member institution (at our level/size), Skidmore must have 10% of our electricity from renewable sources.
    - 1. All of Skidmore's Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) from our solar and hydro projects are now officially being tracked and retired in the New York Generation Attribute Tracking System (NYGATS). This ensures the accuracy and verification of green power claims.
  - ii. Annual campus sustainability plan reporting for the year is underway. This will align with the next submission (the College's 3<sup>rd</sup>) for the AASHE Sustainability Tracking Assessment and Rating System (STARS). The last submissions were in 2017 (silver rating) and 2021 (gold rating). The next submission is targeted for late fall. Assessment may provide input and support d