UCSF Advisory Committee on Sustainability

Sept 25, 2019

Sheila Antrum, Chair
Agenda

- Academic Senate Fossil Fuel Divestment Memorial (Tom Newman)
- UC Sustainability Policy updates (Ryan Bell, UCOP)
- Bay Area Youth Climate Strike on 9/20 (Katherine Gundling)
- Carbon Neutrality Campaign posters (Gail Lee)
- Carbon Offset Selection Committee (Gail Lee)
- Last Words – (Sheila Antrum)
Proposed Procedural Updates

- Clean Energy Policy
- Sustainable Foodservices Policy
- Zero Waste Policy
Academic Senate Divestment Memorial

By Jagdeep Singh Bachher and Richard Sherman

Our job is to make money for the University of California, and we’re betting we can do that without fossil fuels investments.

We are investors and fiduciaries for what is widely considered the best public research university in the world. That makes us fiscally conservative by nature and by policy — “Risk rules” is one of the 10 pillars of what we call the UC Investments Way. We want to ensure that the more than 320,000 people currently receiving a UC pension actually get paid, that we can continue to fund research and scholarships throughout the UC system, and that our campuses and medical centers earn the best possible return on their investments.

We believe hanging on to fossil fuel assets is a financial risk. That’s why we will have made our $13.4-billion endowment “fossil free” as of the end of this month, and why our $70-billion pension will soon be that way as well.

This risk-adverse reasoning might not jibe with what you will read in a newspaper headline or scroll through in a news feed on your phone. Some might see our action as born of political pressure, or as green movement idealism or perhaps political correctness run amok. So be it; we are part of a university system where diversity of opinion thrives.
All of this is by way of saying that we don’t make investment decisions simply based on the preferences of one group or another of our stakeholders, which is not to say we don’t listen to them. We should and we do, such as when the UC Academic Senate presented a “memorial” to the UC Board of Regents in July calling on us to divest our endowment of fossil fuels. We were already going there, or as Richard said in a statement at the time, we were “on a glide path to zero.” The same applies to the pension as well.

While our rationale may not be the moral imperative that many activists embrace, our investment decision-making process leads us to the same result. We’re in the business of helping to ensure the financial viability of a great university whose stakeholders frequently come at an issue — even one as terrifyingly consequential as climate change — from different perspectives.

The reason we sold some $150 million in fossil fuel assets from our endowment was the reason we sell other assets: They posed a long-term risk to generating strong returns for UC’s diversified portfolios.

We have been looking years, decades and centuries ahead as we place our bets that clean energy will fuel the world’s future. That means we believe there is money to be made. We have chosen to invest for a better planet, and reap the financial rewards for UC, rather than simply divest for a headline.

Jagdeep Singh Bachher is the University of California’s chief investment officer and treasurer. Richard Sherman is chairman of the UC Board of Regents’ Investments Committee.
Clean Energy Policy Changes

Current Policy Summary
Each location will implement energy efficiency actions to reduce energy use intensity (EUI, energy use per square foot) by an average of least 2% annually.

Background
The proposed policy language update does not modify the main policy text, but is requesting a change in the procedures section to the EUI baseline approach. It would change the baseline from rolling five years prior to a fixed period by campus, in order to:

- Reflect campus-specific EE accomplishments beyond current 5 year period
- Address the lack of a target date for policy goals (ongoing 2% reduction)
- Ensure the policy approach sets reasonable and achievable goals
Summary of Proposed Changes

III.B.1 (POLICY TEXT) Energy Efficiency [UNCHANGED]
Each location will implement energy efficiency actions in buildings and infrastructure systems to reduce the location’s energy use intensity by an average of least 2 percent annually.

V.B.1 (PROCEDURES) Energy Efficiency
Each location’s percent reduction in energy use intensity (EUI) will be reported annually based on the sum of weather-adjusted energy use divided by the sum of the maintained gross square footage (OGSF50). The average annual reduction will be calculated by comparing the current year EUI to the EUI five years prior [DELETE] using an established baseline as detailed in the UC EUI Tracking Methods and References. [ADD] UCOP will use energy usage data from the systemwide purchased utility database for reporting campus energy use intensity, based on the campus-specified set of utility accounts and associated maintained gross square footage. Electric and gas site energy will be converted to kBTU and normalized for weather. Policy goals will be evaluated and adjusted as appropriate following the 2025 reporting year. [ADD]
Recommended Action

The working group requests a vote on this policy update today. This would allow the campuses to use the revised baseline approach for the Chancellor reporting in November.

The revised baseline approach would resolve issues seen in the initial calculation approach, resulting in more appropriate annual reporting while allowing campuses to track toward annual and 2025 targets.
Assessing Scope 1 Emissions

Background
Updates address concerns around long term reliance on offsets and the lack of long term plans to phase out natural gas. This policy does not commit campuses to a course of action, rather only requires an assessment of alternatives.

Proposed Addition to the Climate Change Policy

V.C.6 (PROCEDURES TEXT) [NEW ARTICLE]

6. Each campus will complete an assessment of Scope 1 emissions from natural gas combustion in 2035 or at the date when that location’s CHP (or any other major fossil fuel-using campus infrastructure) debt obligation held as of 2019 has been amortized, or such infrastructure is planned for capital renewal or major repair.

This assessment should determine the best pathway, at that point, to decarbonize at least 80 percent of Scope 1 emissions through means other than offsets. The assessment should evaluate,

a. progress toward de-carbonization of piped gas,
b. feasibility of developing or procuring more biogas,
c. feasibility of installing on-site carbon capture, electrification of carbon-emitting plant equipment with zero-carbon alternatives,
d. implementing hydrogen or synthetic methane injection into the fuel stream of combined heat and power (and other combustion machines), and
e. emergent technologies that could reduce Scope 1 CO₂ emissions. [ADD BETWEEN EXISTING SECTIONS 5 & 6]
Assessing Scope 1 Emissions

Next Steps

• Gather feedback from the Energy Governing Board & Green Building WG
• Submit to the Steering Committee for a vote in January

Questions for the Committee

• Does this proposed policy change raise any concerns?
• Are there additional factors that the Working Group should consider?
Proposed Sustainable Foodservices Policy Update

Background

- The current policy will be outdated.
  - It has a 2020 goal that all UC locations should purchase 20% food by 2020.
  - Most locations have met this goal.
  - The certifications and label claims recognized by the policy do not reflect the changes in the marketplace.

- The UC Sustainable Food Service Working Group (SFWG) outlined new goals to be completed by 2030 in the policy draft.
Proposed Sustainable Foodservices Policy Update

Summary of Changes

- Policy draft aligns the definition of “Sustainable Food” with AASHE STARS 2.2 and Practice Green Health definitions, two respected organizations that all campuses and health systems are members of and already reporting to.

- Policy draft provides a reporting structure to also recognize campuses for prioritizing plant-forward menus.

- Policy draft has eliminated parts of previous policy that were no longer attainable due to changes outside of the campus’ control.

- Policy draft aligns with other policies within the UC Sustainability Practices Policy – for example, it refers to the Sustainable Procurement section and the Sustainable Procurement Guidelines will be revised to reflect the new definition of “Sustainable Food”.
Proposed Sustainable Foodservices Policy Update

Next Steps

• UCSFWG is participating in a baseline study using FY 18-19 food purchasing data under the new proposed definition of sustainable food during the summer of 2019.
  o UCSFWG is determining what % of sustainable spend to set as a goal based on that baseline.

• UCSFWG is reviewing the work necessary to participate in the Cool Food Pledge and determining if this is a process we want to complete annually
  o The Cool Food Pledge measures the climate impact of protein purchases and helps set goals to reduce this impact.

• UCSFWG is reviewing the proposed policy language outside of the “Sustainable Food” definition to include food security, affordability, etc.

• Finalize the Policy update and resent to the Committee in January

Question for the Committee

• Is there anything the Working Group should consider as we finalize the policy between now and January?
Zero Waste Definition & Target

Overview

• Waste Reduction: On target
  ○ Most campuses have reduced waste generation below 2015-16 levels

• Waste Diversion:
  ○ 68% Diversion rate in 2018
  ○ 90% goal

• Why are we falling short of our diversion target
  ○ Shrinking disposal options (international recycling markets)
  ○ Lack of infrastructure (recycling/compost bins, collection)
  ○ Difficulty in measuring certain areas (landscaping, reduction)
  ○ Education / Individual Behavior (contamination)
  ○ Need for stakeholder engagement and accountability across campus (all departments, third party vendors, buyers)
  ○ Lack of dedicated staff (many campuses)
Zero Waste Definition & Target

Approaches Others Are Taking

- Focus on waste minimization and contamination rates.
- Expanding infrastructure for diversion and creating markets.
- Focusing on items of concern (foam, bags, single use food ware, organics, etc.).
  - Eliminating single use plastics.

New Target Proposal

Keep the intent of the current targets, but refocus on waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle/compost).

- Integrate waste reduction into UC’s zero waste definition and target.
- Shift to waste reduction as a primary focus.
- Maintain the current diversion goal - as soon as feasible.
- Reassess and report annually.
Zero Waste Definition & Target

Proposed Policy Language

1. The University will achieve zero waste through prioritizing waste reduction in the following order: reduce, reuse, and then recycle and compost or anaerobically digest as described in section V.F.5. Minimum compliance for zero waste, at all locations other than health locations, is as follows:
   a. Reduce per capita total municipal solid waste generation:
      i. by 25% per capita from FY2015/16 levels by 2025
      ii. by 50% per capita from FY2015/16 levels by 2030
   b. Divert 90% of the municipal solid waste generated from landfills

      Health locations will set targets for their facilities for waste diversion and reduction in accordance with the schedule outlined in section III.J.

Procedures

Additional language being added to:

- Increase annual reporting
- Commit to developing guidance on calculation and reporting methods
Zero Waste Definition & Target

Next Actions

- Prepare a Zero Waste update based on campus zero waste plans with greater detail on:
  - Reason for the current shortfall
  - Assessment of what it will take to meet the new target
  - Next steps campuses are taking.
- Develop a communications strategy & schedule around the updated target (*to be implemented in early 2020*)
- Review and finalize Policy language
# Addressing Single-Use Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Policies</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Items Affected</th>
<th>Similar Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate plastic bags in retail and foodservice establishments</td>
<td>1/1/2021</td>
<td>Plastic bags</td>
<td>SB-270; 135 CA cities/counties; CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace single-use plastic foodware accessory items with locally compostables or reusables provided on request</td>
<td>7/1/2021</td>
<td>utensils, straws, stirrers, chopsticks, cup lids &amp; sleeves, trays, condiments, toothpicks</td>
<td>Berkeley; Manhattan Beach; San Anselmo; SF; LA (straws/stirrers); EU; CSU (straws); AB-1884 (straws on request)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dine-in facilities provide reusable foodware items with food consumed onsite</td>
<td>7/1/2022</td>
<td>cups, bowls, plates, and hinged containers</td>
<td>Berkeley; San Anselmo; Santa Monica; SB-1335 (state facilities);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To-go facilities replace single-use plastic foodware items with reusables or locally compostables</td>
<td>7/1/2022</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berkeley; San Anselmo; Santa Monica; SB-1335 (state facilities);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the sale of single-use plastic water bottles</td>
<td>1/1/2023</td>
<td>Plastic water bottles</td>
<td>CSU; San Francisco; SFO Alameda County (operations),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus waste plans will assess the feasibility of eliminating single-use products</td>
<td>2023 update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Addressing Single-Use Items

Next Actions

• Gather stakeholder feedback
  o Procurement (Commodity Managers, Buying staff)
  o Market, Retail, & Dining Managers
  o Disabilities Communities
  o Healthy and Wellness

• To be discusses
  o Exemptions: ADA, Economic hardship, lack of alternatives
  o Current contracts
  o Infrastructure needs
    (dishwashing facilities, hydration stations)
  o Local compost infrastructure

• Develop guidance
  o Moving to reusable alternatives
  o What products are in-scope
Next Steps and Questions

Other Efforts to Advance Zero Waste

- Finalizing campus zero waste action plans
- Developing guidelines and best practices to
  - Better assess progress and the feasibility of reaching the Zero Waste Goals
  - Capture climate and other benefits
- Partnering more closely with Sustainable Procurement
  - Identify opportunities to engage with large retailers/vendors
- Looking at food recovery and organics recycling (SB 1383)

Next Steps

- Coordinate with campus stakeholders
- Finalize and present recommended Policy language to the Committee in January

Questions

- Feedback?
- Who else should we be working with?
- Recommendations for increasing support for zero waste across the campus?
Bay Area Youth Climate Strike – Sept 20
Advocacy at Representative Barbara Lee’s office

Advocating for climate action at Senator Diane Feinstein’s office
Advocacy at Kamala Harris’ Office
Carbon Neutrality by 2025 Campaign

Three Phases
- Positive informational messages
- Call to Action
- Data on progress

Designs for:
- Banners
- Shuttle signs
- Posters and stickers
- Digital signage on CLS controlled displays, Food & Nutrition Services, Facilities Services, others?
Carbon Neutrality Campaign

UCSF CARBON NEUTRAL BY 2025

Yes

we can use less power.

Choose only Energy Star products and unplug equipment not in use to help reduce the health impact on our planet.

Together, we can get to Carbon Neutrality by 2025.

livinggreen.ucsf.edu
Yes

we can prevent wildfires.
Reducing carbon emissions, reduces risk of drought and wildfires.

Together, we can get to Carbon Neutrality by 2025.

livinggreen.ucsf.edu
Yes

we can slow global warming.

Selecting all-electric transportation directly reduces air pollution and protect public health and our planet.

Together, we can get to Carbon Neutrality by 2025.

livinggreen.ucsf.edu
UCSF
CARBON NEUTRAL
BY 2025

we can
compost more!
If it was alive, it goes into compost. Applied compost absorbs carbon from the air, and directly reduces air pollution.

Together, we can get to Carbon Neutrality by 2025.

livinggreen.ucsf.edu