MEETING NOTES
I²SL University Alliance Group (UAG) Conference Call/Webinar
September 12, 2014, 1PM EDT

Participants:

1. Aubrey Batchelor, University of Washington
2. Michael Bloom, GSA Office of Federal High-Performance Green Buildings
3. Wendell Brase, UC Irvine
4. Trisha Castranio, NIH
5. Lifang Chiang, calling on behalf of Matthew St. Clair, UC Office of the President
6. Victoria Collins, OMB
7. Allen Doyle, UC Davis
8. Mary Fischietto, OMB
9. Chuck Frost, UC Berkeley
10. Amorette Getty, UC Santa Barbara
11. Jonathan Herz, HHS Office of the Assistant Secretary of Administration
12. Debra Kuehl, CDC
13. Gail Lee, UC San Francisco
14. Klara Olofsdotter Otis, UC Los Angelos
15. Brenda Petrella, Dartmouth College
16. Kathy Ramirez-Aguilar, CU-Boulder (Chair)
17. Sudhakar Reddy, University of Michigan
18. Sheryl Soucy-Lubell, UC Davis
19. Bill Tschudi, LBNL
20. Kristen Taddonio, DOE EERE
21. John Ullman, Johns Hopkins University
22. Susan Vargas, Stanford University
23. Phil Wirdzek, I²SL (I²SL Board Representative)

Kathy Ramirez began the meeting with a power point presentation on behalf of the UAG to introduce the I²SL University Alliance Group (UAG) to federal agency representatives on the webinar call, provide background information on missing sustainability connections to federally supported research on university campuses, and to invite federal grant-making agencies to work together with the UAG to develop possible solutions to this issue. To the best of the knowledge of the group, there are no other groups working to address this issue. Several initial ideas from the UAG were presented. The meeting encouraged discussion on those ideas and the opportunity to bring up new ideas. The UAG believes there are win-win solutions to be identified (good for scientists, universities, & fed govt) which would encompass partnerships, test projects and policy incentives which could be explored to increase energy efficiency and environmental sustainability in university research facilities.

The need for sub-metering of university research facilities was a topic that was discussed, so universities can gain access to funding sources for conservation opportunities (such as those through utilities) that require demonstrated reductions in consumption. Phil Wirdzek described examples of utilities that have ample money to give away for conservation opportunities, but many universities are not taking advantage of these opportunities because universities have to

front the money for the project and then prove the reductions in consumption. Without the sub-metering infrastructure in place and with the ongoing changing dynamics in laboratory research facilities (resulting in changes in consumption such as energy use), universities typically are not willing to take the risk that they will be able to prove reductions when they only have meters at the building level.

Mary Fischietto from OMB mentioned how the 1.3 percentage point utility cost adjustment in the recent "Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards" document (that was finalized by the federal government 12/26/2013 and will go into effect 12/26/2014) could encourage universities to invest in more metering infrastructure so they can justify increased F&A (ICR) funds that they receive from the federal government for utility costs (by weighting research space in the utility calculation to address the fact that research labs use more energy than other spaces such as office space or teaching spaces). Mary explained that there have been a number of universities on a particular list that have automatically gotten the 1.3 percentage point adjustment for quite some time. The changes in these rules means that now those universities will no longer automatically get that adjustment and that the opportunity is open to all research universities to justify that they should get more funding for utilities (up to a 1.3 percentage points). But there is the need to prove it and thus comes the encouragement for more metering.

Here is an excerpt from the document that Mary was referring to on the 1.3 percentage point utility cost adjustment (which is located in the appendix of the document):

> **Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards**
>
> A Rule by the Management and Budget Office on 12/26/2013
> **Appendix III to Part 200—Indirect (F&A) Costs Identification and Assignment, and Rate Determination for Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)**
>
> **B. Identification and Assignment of Indirect (F&A) Costs**
>
> **4. Operation and Maintenance Expenses**
>
> c. A utility cost adjustment of up to 1.3 percentage points may be included in the negotiated indirect cost rate of the IHE for organized research, per the computation alternatives in paragraphs (c)(1) and (2) of this section:
> (1) Where space is devoted to a single function and metering allows unambiguous measurement of usage related to that space, costs must be assigned to the function located in that space.
> (2) Where space is allocated to different functions and metering does not allow unambiguous measurement of usage by function, costs must be allocated as follows:
> (i) Utilities costs should be apportioned to functions in the same manner as depreciation, based on the calculated difference between the site or building actual square footage for monitored research laboratory space (site, building, floor, or room), and a separate calculation prepared by the IHE using the "effective square footage" described in subsection (c)(2)(ii) of this section.

> (ii) "Effective square footage" allocated to research laboratory space must be calculated as the actual square footage times the relative energy utilization index (REUI) posted on the OMB Web site at the time of a rate determination.
> A. This index is the ratio of a laboratory energy use index (lab EUI) to the corresponding index for overall average college or university space (college EUI).
> B. In July 2012, values for these two indices (taken respectively from the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory "Labs for the 21st Century" benchmarking tool *http://labs21benchmarking.lbl.gov/CompareData.php* and the US Department of Energy "Buildings Energy Databook" and *http://buildingsdatabook.eren.doe.gov/CBECS.aspx*) were 310 kBtu/sq ft-yr. and 155 kBtu/sq ft-yr., so that the adjustment ratio is 2.0 by this methodology. To retain currency, OMB will adjust the EUI numbers from time to time (no more often than annually nor less often than every 5 years), using reliable and publicly disclosed data. Current values of both the EUIs and the REUI will be posted on the OMB Web site.

Another topic that was discussed was the need for at least "encouragement" from the federal government to conserve resources (such as buying energy efficient equipment) in connection with the research funding received from the federal government ("encouragement" rather than "requirement" to help avoid the need for development of rules and regulations, additional forms, & govt employees to enforce that is expensive to the federal govt and scientists do not want).

- It was generally agreed that there is a lack of encouragement at this point from the federal govt.
- Victoria Collins from OMB mentioned that in working to develop the "Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards", there was discussion about addressing these types of issues, but there was uncertainty about how to go about doing that and thus it ultimately was not incorporated into the document (except the utility cost adjustment described above). Victoria made the point, however, that that issue certainly could still be addressed outside of that document.
- Kathy brought up the fact that NIH has been working on a guide to energy efficient equipment selection that they intend to use to encourage their grantees to purchase energy efficient equipment and that this effort could act as an example to other granting agencies about how they can encourage energy conservation in connection with grant dollars, at least as a first step. [Kathy also added that NIH had previously expressed the hope is that encouraging energy efficient equipment selection with their grantees would promote market changes so there is greater availability of choices of energy efficient equipment.] Kathy mentioned that she had not heard where that effort stood since June, but that she would check in with NIH colleagues to find out.
- Kristin Taddonio from DOE mentioned that if NIH was to go forward with such a leadership example that it would enable her to bring up this topic with DOE and suggest similar action by pointing out NIH's effort. Others from other agencies could do the same.

While in general the issue was raised that granting agencies cannot include environmental sustainability (such as efficient use of resources and "green" efforts) in selection criteria for grant awards, Jonathan Herz from HHS did bring up the fact that HHS has previously included these items in criteria for selection of HRSA grants for facility improvement. Jonathan brought this up

as an example of what can be accomplished, through existing channels, to update HHS grants in a way that lessens negative human health impacts through "green" building practices. Here is additional information that Jonathan provided by email:

> Here's HRSA's grant info:
>
> The Grant was: Affordable Care Act, Patient Centered Medical Home – Facility Improvements (P-FI) Grant Program (Announcement Number: HRSA-14-073). Section V. Application Review Information included Criterion 3: Impact (15 points):
>
> 1) The extent to which the proposed project will create immediate and tangible benefits for the health center upon completion.
> 2) The extent to which the proposed project responds to expected outcomes in terms of improved efficiencies that would otherwise not be available in the health center's operations, and enhance the quality of care and patient outcomes, based on the PCMH model.
> 3) The extent to which the proposed project clearly outlines how it will incorporate sustainable/green design, construction practices, and products.
>
> Subsequent sections on Sustainable Design stressed the Department's commitment "to leading the way on implementation of sustainable practices and provision of climate-resilient health and human services. In support of this policy, HRSA places a priority on incorporation of sustainable design principles in the design, construction, and operations of facilities that we support through federal funds… To the greatest extent practicable for this project, applicants must demonstrate incorporation of appropriate sustainability principles and federal green building requirements in the following federal statutes…"

Some additional points that were made on the call include the following:

- Researchers should be actively involved and that O&M staff and others (i.e., EH&S) should be involved in coordinating the improvement of the lab's energy and environmental performance.
- Michael Bloom (GSA) offered in the chat box: www.SFTool.gov is one-stop plan, design, and procure resource for building and buying green. We worked with Kathy and other stakeholders on a Lab module that can serve as a resource for furthering this discussion. Check it out at: https://sftool.gov/explore/green-workspace/89/laboratory
- Michael Bloom also offered in the chat box: Another GSA resource that addresses training of O&M is http://www.fmi.gov/. This is a resource for mostly free Facility Manager Training

Previous in the meeting, Kathy had mentioned the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP, http://sites.nationalacademies.org/pga/fdp/index.htm) as a place where the UAG could possibly bring up this topic. The FDP is connected with the National Academy of Sciences which has 3 meets per year in DC. This group is about redefining the Government University Research Partnership. Members include over 100 universities and 10 federal agencies. An affiliate of the group is also the COGR (Council of Governmental Relations) which was discussed at our UAG last meeting.

- Mary Fischietto from OMB mentioned that, as someone who has worked with that group, she thought that was a really good idea for the UAG to reach out to them on this topic.

- Victoria said she would provide the group with a good contact in the FDP to reach out to.
- The meeting's consensus was that the UAG should initiate dialog with the FDP

Next UAG meeting is a face to face meeting on Sept 23 at the 2014 I^2SL Annual Conference in Orlando.