

REPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

University Senate Committee: Physical Plant Planning Committee

Brief History of Issue - why the issue is being considered:

A companion motion, from which this one was modified for the University Senate, was passed unanimously by the Student on October 22, 2019. The Director of the Student Office of Sustainability, a Student Senate commission, requested that the University Senate take up a related resolution with the intent of expressing solidarity with the student body and broadening support for the initiative. This topic is entirely within the purview of the Physical Plant Planning Committee.

If we are to aspire to meet our commitment to reach net carbon neutrality by 2050, consistent with the Climate Action Plan unanimously passed by all campus governance bodies in 2018, it is crucial that our buildings be sustainable, high-performing, and energy efficient. And the best way to verify performance is through third-party certification. Approximately 2/3 of campus greenhouse gas emissions are from building use. It is equally important that UW-Eau Claire demonstrates community leadership as the City of Eau Claire, Eau Claire County, and the Eau Claire Area School District commit to analogous renewable energy commitments.

We are beginning the process to build a new science building on campus, and these typically are the highest energy consuming academic buildings (per square meter) on any university campus. The UW-Eau Claire Foundation will soon be building a new Campus Welcome Center and the University is poised to participate in construction of the Sonnentag Athletic Center. None of the last three buildings constructed on campus (Davies Student Center, Centennial Hall, and The Suites residence hall) and in collaboration with the community (Pablo Center at the Confluence) have been certified.

Points Discussed by Committee:

1. Some recommendations to harmonize text (inconsistencies between “administration” vs. “administration and staff”) in the Whereas statements. The solution simply was to excise the references; these changes were adopted in the motion as indicated below.
2. Could similar performance verifications be accomplished by University staff? Troy Terhark, who was present at the meeting on other business, felt that this was not a realistic expectation, especially given the technical complexity of the impending science building.
3. Questions regarding the nature of certification of buildings on other campuses across UW-System and in the Chippewa Valley. Response: There are LEED certified (**L**eadership in **E**nergy and **E**nvironmental **D**esign) buildings in the UW-System. In the Chippewa Valley there are certified buildings including QuickTrip and at least one elementary school.
4. Possibility of more broadly requesting achievement of a certain standard rather than specifying certification. However, the resolution was written to be broad by not requiring a particular certification body.

Pros of Recommendation:

1. This is in support of and consistent with the earlier resolution passed in Student Senate.
2. Sustainability of buildings, not just intent, are established through performance measurement, which is an integral element of third-party certification.
3. Architect advice that, in absence of certification verifying building performance, standards are often not met during construction phase.

Campus Building Resolution

4. While sustainable features needed to achieve certification may reach 2-5% of total construction costs, the actual cost of certification may be as little as tens of thousands. As a percentage of the total building costs, this is miniscule.

Cons of Recommendation:

1. Policies and/or decisions of the State DOA may prevent UW-EC from meeting these goals.
2. Costs of third-party certification might instead be invested into additional sustainable features.

Technology/Human Resource/Workload Impact:

None; as a non-binding resolution all actions are taken at the discretion of the administration and facilities staff

Committee Recommendation: That the attached Campus Building Resolution be approved

MOTION FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The University Senate Committee: Physical Plant Planning Committee

by a vote of 9 for to 0 against on 11/19/2019 (Date)

That the attached Campus Building Resolution be approved.

Implementation Date: Immediate

Signed: _____
Chair of the Committee

Send to: University Senate Office