I. Call to Order & Roll Call

II. Approval of the Minutes
   a. September 27, 2018

III. Open Microphone

IV. Announcements and Reports
   a. EVP Anderson- City of Ithaca Commissions

V. Business of the Day
   a. Resolution 10: Approving Revisions to Appendix C

VI. New Business
   a. Resolution 11: Establishing an Investigative Ad-Hoc Committee on Cornell University’s Campus Printing System and Stewardship in IT Governance
   b. Resolution 12: Instituting Bi-Weekly Reports for Representatives
   c. Resolution 13: Creating the Advocacy Agenda ad-hoc Committee
   d. Resolution 14: Increasing the Minimum LEED Certification

VII. Executive Session
   a. Appointments to the Appropriations Committee

VIII. Adjournment
I. Call to Order & Roll Call
   a. V. Devatha called the meeting to order at 4:50 pm.
   b. Roll Call:
      i. Present: J. Anderson [0], D. Barbaria [0], V. Devatha [0], J. Dominguez [0], N.
         Hernandez [0], S. Iruvanti [0], K. Kebebeh [0], S. Lim [0], N. Matolka [0], U. Mustafa
         [0], D. Nyakaru [0], M. Peralta-Ochoa [1.25], E. Shapiro [0], J. Sim [0], M. Stefanko
         [0], F. Uribe-Rheinbolt [0], I. Wallace [0], B. Weintraub [0]
      ii. Absent: O. Din [2.5], O. Egharevba [1], A. Hailu [1], S. Harshwardhan [0], C. Huang
           [0], A. Jain [0], G. Park [0], I. Pavlov [0], M. Shovik [0], V. Xu [0]

II. Approval of the Minutes
    a. There was a motion to approve the September 20, 2018 minutes – approved.

III. Open Microphone
    a. No speakers at the open microphone.

IV. Announcements and Reports
    a. I. Wallace moved to amend the agenda such that Resolution 10 would be added to the
       agenda as a late agenda item.
    b. I. Wallace said that project applications for the SAIFC would close soon, and that the
       committee will meet from 11:30 to 1:30 on Sunday to hold a hearing for project applications.
       He added that he encourages everyone to attend, and that he will email Resolution 10 and its
       appendix to the members of the SA.
    c. D. Barbaria said that since these were passed after the agenda was finalized, there would
       need to be a 2/3rd majority to amend it to the agenda. He added that he would not be in
       favor of this addition.
    d. I. Wallace moved to amend the agenda to add this resolution in new business – amended 10-
       3-1.
    e. E. Shapiro said that he is on the Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee, and that they
       are looking at revising the list of course meeting times. He added that if any member of the
       SA is interested in this and has any thoughts, they should reach out to him.
    f. D. Barbaria asked for E. Shapiro to keep everyone in the loop regarding proceedings of the
       committee.

V. Oath of Office
    a. The oath of office was completed for new members U. Mustafa and M. Stefanko at 5:02 pm.

VI. Business of the Day
    a. Resolution 7: Denouncing University Guideline Related to Event Security
i. There was a motion to table Resolution 7 indefinitely – tabled 15-1-2.

VII. New Business

a. Resolution 9: Creating an ad-hoc Oversight Committee on CUTonight

i. J. Anderson explained the function of the resolution.

ii. I. Wallace asked whether the proponents of the resolution would be open to allowing non-SA members to sit on the committee. He also asked if this is just an advisory committee, or if it would administer CUTonight’s funds.

iii. J. Anderson said that the committee would oversee the funding process and make sure the guidelines are being followed, and that it would look at the end results of the process but not the process itself.

iv. V. Devatha said that in the past, CUTonight hadn’t been following its guidelines historically, and that moving forward the oversight committee will be restructuring the guidelines to be in accordance with the mission of CUTonight.

v. D. Barbaria said that non-SA members can serve on an ad-hoc committee regardless of how it’s formed, and that only the chair must be an assembly member, but the point of this committee is for SA members to be in the process. He added that the best place for non-SA members to go to get involved in this regard would be to become commissioners, and that this committee would advise the faculty advisor of CUTonight. He also said that the committee would prevent events such as last semester’s, where there was a big spectacle without any resources being committed.

vi. N. Matolka asked what the current status of CUTonight is.

vii. D. Barbaria said that, officially speaking, the organization only has an advisor at the moment.

viii. N. Matolka asked whether or not there should be one or two outside members on the committee.

ix. J. Anderson said that this was answered in D. Barbaria’s last point, and that it is strictly an advisory committee.

x. D. Barbaria moved to amend the resolution.

1. Following line 27, the following lines would be added:

a. “Be it further resolved, that this Committee will assist the Advisor of CUTonight in recruiting commissioners;”

b. “Be it further resolved, that this Committee will not have a strict timeline and will work collaboratively with the Advisor and future commissioners of CUTonight to promote autonomy and success of CUTonight in the future;”

xi. There was a motion to move this resolution to Business of the Day – approved.

xii. There was a motion to amend the resolution such that the use of the word “the” in line 27 would be removed – amended.

xiii. There was a motion to approve the amendments previously stated by D. Barbaria – amended 17-0-1.

xiv. S. Iruvanti asked what would happen if the advisory committee found that CUTonight did not follow their guidelines once again this semester.

xv. J. Anderson said that, if the committee finds that this is the case, then that would be a larger conversation that would involve formally applying Appendix B to the organization, and that this committee was made to act such that this point would not be reached.

xvi. D. Barbaria said that many of last year’s problems came from following their guidelines too closely.

xvii. Shivani Parikh said that it was her understanding that they did not give organizations any feedback as to why they were not funded, and asked whether or not that contradicts D. Barbaria’s previous point.
J. Anderson said that there were many issues.

There was a motion to vote on Resolution 9 – approved 17-0-1.

**Resolution 10: Approving Revisions to Appendix C**

1. I. Wallace said that, since this resolution entails a change of charter, it cannot be voted on this week. He also explained the background of the SAIFC and Appendix C’s relation to it, and described the changes made in the resolution.

2. D. Barbaria asked if any member of the audience would like a copy of these changes.

3. I. Wallace said that the relevant sections of Appendix C had never been amended throughout the SAIFC’s entire existence.

4. V. Devatha said that his issue with the amendments is that it would take all of the money and put it into the fund.

5. I. Wallace said that this is how it was done in the past.

6. J. Anderson said that, reading it the way he and V. Devatha did, this would take all of the endowment out and use it.

7. V. Devatha said that the resolution states right now that the endowment has a certain amount of money and a certain amount of return, and that this will eventually be a problem due to inflation.

8. Matthew Battaglia made a statement.

9. V. Devatha said that, regardless of whether this has been the procedure in the past, that it should not happen in the future, and that he will draft some language in this regard at a later time.

10. D. Barbaria said that the Office of the Assemblies has told the assembly that the money cannot be put back into anything, and that they have never been given a reason why.

11. V. Devatha said that this could be something to look at next week before any changes are made. He also referenced a different section of the appendix amendments that, and said that the necessary changes would be made next week.

12. D. Barbaria said that he is hugely in support of this resolution, and that he thinks it is inappropriate for us to include this resolution next week. He added that he believes that it is rushed and a transparency issue, and that the SA should wait to pass this until the Thursday after fall break.

13. I. Wallace said that, since SAIFC meets on Wednesdays, anything that is passed at one of their meetings has to be a late-agenda item.

14. D. Barbaria said that it is for the purposes of transparency.

15. N. Matolka asked if an accountability order could be included regarding the publicity plan.

16. I. Wallace said that the appendix already says that the plan must be passed by the second regularly-scheduled SA meeting, and a timeline must be released by the third meeting. He added that there are things that are part of the publicity plan that are due directly after that.

17. D. Barbaria said that the SA often discusses stupid things in its rules, and that this resolution is not that, and that it is very important. He added that if these changes are made, the SAIFC can become a more effective committee.

18. V. Devatha asked if there is a typeform available for SAIFC funding requests.

19. I. Wallace replied in the affirmative, saying that it had been done in the past through Google Sheets, but will now be done through Qualtrics.

20. V. Devatha asked if it can be put on the SA website.

21. I. Wallace replied in the affirmative.

22. N. Hernandez asked why the deadline is so quick relative to the start of the semester.
xxiii. I. Wallace said that, in the past, the SAIFC hasn’t had hearings until mid-November, and since the committee has dropped the ball on things for the past two years, he wanted to make sure that things started off punctually.

xxiv. J. Anderson asked a question.

xxv. I. Wallace said that, in the past, the SAIFC has only accepted applications in the fall, and that they could theoretically open things in the spring, but that the problem would be that there might not be enough time in the spring for some of these projects, and that the application could just be on a rolling basis.

xxvi. J. Anderson asked if a potential solution would be to open the application for projects that have a cap limit in the spring, and would therefore only be small projects.

xxvii. I. Wallace replied in the affirmative.

xxviii. D. Barbaria said that the committee members and the applicants don’t really decide how things are going to cost, and that he does not think that the SAIFC should reject applications in the spring. He added that applicants are not requesting money, but that something gets done.

xxix. I. Wallace said that one of the reasons that it was not done last year was just tradition, and that he is hoping that they can start new traditions and really institutionalize the committee.

xxx. J. Anderson asked if there were any members of the SA that did not understand the current proceedings, and that he would like everyone to be involved.

xxxi. D. Barbaria said that there is one vacancy on the SAIFC that must be filled by an assembly member, and that this will probably be done next week.

xxxii. There was a motion to table the resolution until next week – tabled 17-0-1.

VIII. Adjournment

a. V. Devatha adjourned the meeting at 5:42 pm.

IX. Executive Session

Respectfully Submitted,

John Hannan
Clerk of the Assembly
S.A. Resolution #10
Approving Revisions to Appendix C

ABSTRACT: This resolution proposes amendments to the section of the SA Charter that contains guidelines for allocating the Student Assembly Infrastructure Fund to the Student Assembly Infrastructure Fund Commission.

Sponsored by: Ian Wallace ‘20

Whereas, Appendix C has not been revised since it was first approved during the 2014-15 school year;

Whereas, the timeline as layed out in the current language has never been followed by SAIFC;

Whereas, the unclear wording makes it difficult for the committee to follow the procedures as established in the charter;

Be it therefore resolved, the Student Assembly amends Appendix C of the Student Assembly Charter in accordance with the attached document.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ian Wallace ‘20
Chair, Student Assembly Infrastructure Fund Commission
LGBTQ+ Liaison At-Large, Student Assembly

Reviewed by: SAIFC, 11-0-1, 09/27/2018
APPENDIX C: GUIDELINES FOR THE ALLOCATION OF THE
STUDENT ASSEMBLY INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

Section 1: Preamble

The Student Assembly (the Assembly), is charged with the allocation of the Student Assembly Infrastructure Fund (SAIF). Applications for funding provided by the SAIF must be reviewed annually by the SAIF Committee and are subject to overview by the Appropriations Committee.

Section 2: Sources of Funding

By the first of November of every year, the annual pay-out of the SAF endowment fund will be transferred into the SAIF under the Student Disbursement Account of the Assembly.

Section 3: Closing of Account at Year End

By the last regularly scheduled Student Assembly meeting of the fall semester, the chair of the SAIFC will deliver a report to the Assembly of all funds, committed, spent and unspent, remaining in the SAIF Disbursement Account.

Section 4: Definitions

The following terms, which appear frequently in this Appendix, shall be defined as follows:

A. Organization: a registered Independent or University organization that has authorization to receive funding.
B. Application: the request to receive a funding award from the SAIF for a project or initiative.
C. Applicant: any individual student, group of students, organization, or group of organizations who submits an application to receive a funding award from the SAIF.
D. SAFC: Student Activities Funding Commission, a committee of the Student Assembly, as outlined in the Student Assembly Bylaws.
E. Byline funding: line item funding that comes directly from the SAF as described under Appendix A of the Student Assembly Charter.
F. Appropriations Committee: a committee of the Student Assembly, as outlined in the Student Assembly Bylaws.

Section 5: Purpose

The purpose of the SAIF is to financially support projects and/or initiatives that improve infrastructure or facilities on campus that contribute to the undergraduate experience of Cornell students.
Section 6: Eligibility

To be eligible to receive a funding award from the SAIF, an application for a project or initiative must:

A. be developed, organized, and submitted by Cornell undergraduates;
B. allow Cornell undergraduate students equal access to the benefits of the project;
C. be an initiative located on the Ithaca campus of Cornell University;
D. be reliant on SAIF funding award in order to be completed in a timely fashion;
E. not have previously requested and received a funding award from the SAIF for the same purpose.

Section 7: Permitted Applications

The following applications represent some, but not all, of the eligible projects or initiatives that, if they are not among the list of prohibited applications, may receive funding awards from the SAIF:

A. a renovation of a room or building
B. the construction of new infrastructure (ex. Bike racks, electrical outlets, water fountains)
C. an opportunity to increase the size of a capital goods expenditure to receive an unforeseen benefit (i.e. a planned renovation by the administration could be substantively expanded via student support); and
D. a project or initiative that needs initial start-up funding before it can become eligible for other sources of funding on campus.
E. A web-based application that provides benefits to Cornell undergraduate students.

Section 8: Prohibited Applications

The following applications are prohibited from receiving funding awards from the SAIF:

A. an application that did not receive funding or failed to get reimbursed from other sources due to an error on behalf of the applicant;
B. requests to help an applicant avoid running a deficit resulting from a lack of adequate planning;
C. an application to cover the costs of a regularly occurring project or initiative; and
D. an application that directly or indirectly subsidizes the cost of tuition of an individual student.

Section 9: Procedure for Determining Funding Awards

A. Release of Application
   i. The chair of the SAIF Commission (SAIFC) is responsible for submitting the application to receive funding from the SAIF to the Office of the Assemblies by the second regularly scheduled Student Assembly meeting;
ii. The Office of the Assemblies shall make the application provided by the chair of the SAIFC available to all eligible applicants by the third regularly scheduled Student Assembly meeting, or one week following the meeting with the SAIFC Chair, whichever is sooner.

iii. The chair of the SAIFC shall create a publicity plan, in conjunction with the Executive Committee of the Student Assembly, detailing how the SA will make all students aware of the SAIFC. This plan shall be approved by the Executive Committee by the second regularly scheduled Student Assembly meeting of the Fall semester.

iv. The chair of the SAIFC is responsible for releasing a timeline by third regularly scheduled Student Assembly meeting of the Student Assembly each semester consisting of the deadline for applications, when those applications will be reviewed by the SAIFC, and when those funding awards will be announced.

v. The chair of the SAIFC may choose to hold additional SAIFC meetings to evaluate all received applications that have not yet been reviewed in addition to the dates released in the timeline on the first day of each semester.

B. Funding Award Evaluation Process

i. For each application, the SAIFC will:
   a. arrange a hearing where the proposers of the application may address questions of the committee,
   b. determine if the application is eligible to receive a funding award from the SAIFC,
   c. decide the order in which applications are voted upon to receive funding awards by first holding a ranked order vote by committee members. Once SAIFC has established application rankings, the vote on funding awards will proceed from the highest ranked application and so on in descending order.

ii. After the SAIFC evaluates an application, the chair of the SAIFC must issue a written report which includes the:
   a. name of the applicant,
   b. project or initiative requested in the application,
   c. date that the SAIFC reviewed the application,
   d. funding award amount requested by the applicant,
   e. funding award granted by the SAIFC and what that funding award is as a percentage of the available funding in the SAIF at the beginning of that academic year, and
   f. rationale explaining the SAIFC's decision

iii. All funding awards granted by the SAIFC must be approved by the Dean of Students before becoming finalized.

iv. If the applicant has a University operating account with internally controlled funds and oversight by a Cornell-employed advisor, the Vice President for Finance will approve the transfer of funds from the SAIFC into their account. If the applicant does not have an account that meets these eligibility requirements, the amount of the funding award will be separated from the remaining balance of the
SAIF and expenses will be processed through regular university accounting procedures through the Office of Assemblies, like all others under the Student Assembly budget.

v. At each meeting of the Assembly immediately following the final approval of a funding award by the Dean of Students, the report associated with the application must be included in the meeting’s agenda.

vi. The chair of the SAIFC will file any reports or minutes of committee meetings pertaining to the SAIF with the Office of the Assemblies.

vii. The chair of the SAIFC shall regularly report to the Assembly on the progress of projects and shall inform the Assembly of any setbacks the Commission faces in implementing its projects.
S.A. Resolution #11
Establishing an Investigative Ad-Hoc Committee on Cornell University’s Campus Printing System and Stewardship in IT Governance

ABSTRACT: This resolution establishes an ad-hoc committee with the responsibility of investigating Cornell’s campus-wide printing system to issue recommendations to the S.A. and the Cornell Administration on improving the system’s pricing scheme, accessibility, and environmental sustainability. While maintaining its focus on the campus-wide printing system, the committee is also charged with broader inquiries into Cornell University’s stewardship in IT governance practices, and the lack of student involvement in said practices.

Sponsored by: Jaewon Sim ‘21, Elisabeth Crotty ‘20, John Dominguez ‘20, Sushruta Iruvanti ‘19, Grace Park ‘19

Whereas, the Task Force on Net-Print System Reform (hereafter: TF) – established in Spring 2018 with approval of the voting members of the 2017-2018 Student Assembly – has been leading the Assembly’s investigation into the campus-wide printing system at Cornell;

Whereas, the TF has obtained the Administration’s acknowledgement that “Cornell University is highly unusual in that a printing allocation is not provided to all undergraduate students every semester;”

Whereas, the TF has obtained the Administration’s acknowledgment that “[b]ecause there is no one central organization which […] provides printing allocations to all undergraduates, the result is patchy where some students are given free printing and others are not;”

Whereas, the TF – during a meeting with the University’s IT leadership team in August 2018 – obtained the Administration’s acknowledgement that a comprehensive review of the current printing system is necessary to address the ineffectiveness of the decentralized printing system model;

Whereas, while “[d]uring the fiscal year from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017, Net-Print users printed 7.8 million sides,” the TF – due to the lack of publicly available data on the matter, and CIT and the Cornell University IT Governance Council’s unresponsiveness to the TF’s request for data – has been unable to verify CIT’s income from the Net-Print enterprise;

Whereas, such lack of transparency raises questions about whether or not Cornell University’s IT leadership is practicing good stewardship in keeping the Net-Print enterprise fiscally responsible;

Whereas, based on the TF’s research, the current Net-Print rates of $0.09/side for black-and-white-printing and $0.25/side for color-printing far exceeds the rates offered by third-party printing system vendors, and those offered to students at other peer institutions;
Whereas, the TF has been coordinating with the University’s inaugural Director of First Generation and Low Income Student Support and Associate Dean of Student for Student Empowerment to provide extended assistance to reduce costs of living for undergraduates in need of financial support;

Whereas, on the Spring 2018 Undergraduate Printing Survey\(^1\) with 641 respondents, 98% of students are or have been enrolled in courses that require assignments to be printed out before submission;

Whereas, on the aforementioned survey, 77% of students with printers responded that they would not have purchased a printer if Net-Print printing costs were cheaper;

Whereas, on the aforementioned survey, 51% of students with printers responded that they would not have purchased a printer if Net-Print printers were more accessible;

Whereas, 4 out of 8 Ivy League institutions provide students with free printing credits but Cornell does not;

Whereas, unlike at 5 out of 8 Ivy League institutions, Cornell students do not have financial incentives to reduce paper consumption as it charges students an equal fee for printing double-sided in black and white;

Whereas, when compared to compared to Ivy League institutions that provide free printing credits, Cornell does not fare well in the STARS® (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System™) subscore for office paper purchasing due to its use of less- or non-recycled paper;

Whereas, unlike at Cornell, 5 out of 8 Ivy League institutions charge students less for printing double-sided in black and white;

Be it therefore resolved, that the S.A. establish an ad-hoc committee titled “Investigative Committee on Stewardship in IT Governance and Campus Printing System” (hereafter: Committee) effective immediately;

Be it further resolved, that the Committee be recognized as the successor to the TF established in Spring 2018 through S.A. Resolution #27: Establishing an Ad-Hoc Committee for Investigating Net-Print System Reform;

Be it further resolved, that the Committee be charged with the updated responsibilities outlined in Section 1 of Appendix A of this resolution;

---

1 The full report is available online on the Cornell Student Assembly website at https://cornellsa.com/netprint/.
Be it further resolved, that all current and future efforts of the S.A. to restructure the campus-wide printing system, or address issues of the University’s stewardship in IT governance practices, and communications between the S.A., and Cornell IT and the Administration on such matters be settled exclusively through the Committee;

Be it further resolved, that the Committee retains its predecessor organization’s membership structure, as outlined in Section 2 of Appendix A of this resolution;

Be it further resolved, that the Committee convenes on an as-needed-basis, as determined by the Chairs of the Committee;

Be it finally resolved, that the members of the Student Assembly affirm the body’s commitment to improving students’ lives by reducing financial burden placed on undergraduates and ensuring that essential services provided the University are done so at a fair and reasonable rate.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jaewon Sim ’21
Vice President of Internal Operations, Student Assembly
Chair, Cornell Student Assembly Task Force on Net-Print System Reform

Elisabeth Crotty ’20
Chair, Cornell Student Assembly Task Force on Net-Print System Reform

John Dominguez ’20
School of Industrial and Labor Relations Representative, Student Assembly
Voting Member, Cornell Student Assembly Task Force on Net-Print System Reform

Sushruta Iruvanti ’19
College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Representative, Student Assembly
Voting Member, Cornell Student Assembly Task Force on Net-Print System Reform

Grace Park ’19
College of Architecture, Art and Planning Representative, Student Assembly
Voting Member, Cornell Student Assembly Task Force on Net-Print System Reform

(Reviewed by: Executive Committee, 5-0-0, 10/2/2018)
S.A. Resolution #12
Instituting Bi-Weekly Reports for Representatives

ABSTRACT: This resolution seeks to amend the Standing Rules to mandate that all voting representatives submit weekly reports in an effort to improve accountability.

Sponsored by: Joe Anderson ‘20

Whereas, much of the work of Student Assembly members happens outside of Student Assembly meetings;

Whereas, submitting bi-weekly reports would allow representatives to show the meetings they attend weekly for Student Assembly related work;

Whereas, these bi-weekly reports would also improve the accountability of representatives as these reports would be reported in conjunction with the meeting minutes from the previous meeting;

Whereas, these bi-weekly reports would allow representatives to also report on any current initiatives;

Be it therefore resolved, insert on line 147 of the Standing Rules:

“N. Rule 14: Every voting member of the Student Assembly shall submit their weekly report for the previous week to the Executive Vice President at least 72 hours in advance of the next regularly scheduled meeting to be included with the meeting minutes for the previous Student Assembly meeting. Failure to provide a bi-weekly report will result in a quarter absence unless the representative provided a reasonable excuse to the Executive Vice President.”

Be it finally resolved, the form shall be the same for all representatives and will be included in all the weekly Calls for Agenda Items.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joe Anderson ‘20
Executive Vice President, Student Assembly

(Reviewed by: Executive Committee, 5-0-0, 10/2/2018)
S.A. Resolution #13
Creating the Advocacy Agenda ad-hoc Committee

ABSTRACT: This resolution seeks to create a living document of the Student Assembly named the Advocacy Agenda to help advance long-term goals of the undergraduate community.

Sponsored by: Joe Anderson '20

Whereas, the Student Assembly focuses on a variety of issues throughout the academic year;

Whereas, many of these issues arise on an immediate basis, which causes many long-term advocacy goals to take a back seat in the process and prevents positive change on a variety of issues;

Whereas, the implementation of a long-term planning document will both help with positive change with administration and provide a chance for members of the assembly and the community to actively collaborate on a variety of issues in a transparent manner;

Be it therefore resolved, that the Student Assembly creates a living document called the Advocacy Agenda and creates the Advocacy Agenda ad-hoc Committee to create the full document;

Be it further resolved, the committee will consist of three voting members of the Student Assembly;

Be it further resolved, the committee will solicit advocacy ideas from the Student Assembly and consult with necessary student organizations to best craft the document;

Be it further resolved, the Executive Archivist of the Student Assembly will be an ex-officio member of the committee;

Be it further resolved, the committee will include a record of all projects worked on by Student Assembly members in the Advocacy Agenda and will note at the end of each Assembly term which projects remain incomplete;

Be it finally resolved, the committee will look to release the formal document by the end of the Fall 2018 semester.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joe Anderson '20
Executive Vice President, Student Assembly

(Reviewed by: Executive Committee, 5-0-0, 10/2/2018)
S.A. Resolution #14
Increasing the Minimum LEED Certification

Abstract: This resolution urges the Board of Trustees to increase the minimum LEED certification from Silver to Platinum for campus buildings in the Climate Action Plan and conduct an Environmental Impact Statement for the North Campus Residential Expansion.

Sponsored by: Grace Park ‘19

Whereas, Cornell President Martha Pollack has taken a positive step towards a fossil fuel-free world by reaffirming Cornell’s 2015 commitment to the American Campuses Act on Climate Pledge, which echoes the terms of the Paris Agreement;

Whereas, Cornell University has publicly committed to achieve carbon neutrality by 2035;

Whereas, While Cornell has reduced carbon emissions by over 30 percent since 2008, and by almost 50 percent since 1990 despite a 20 percent growth in square footage, this figure does not include emissions from upstream methane leakage which has increased;

Whereas, when upstream methane emissions are taken into consideration, as required by the State Environmental Quality Review, total greenhouse gas emissions have increased 10-fold since 2008 to over 600,000 metric tonnes of CO2;

Whereas, currently Cornell has committed to LEED Silver certification for all projects over $5 million under the Climate Action Plan, with the NCRE project set to meet LEED Gold;

Whereas, LEED certification alone is insufficient to account for energy impacts;

Whereas, the Passive House metric prioritizes building energy performance of buildings and was used for the CornellTech buildings on the New York City campus;

Whereas, per the current design, the residential rooms will have a 22% window to wall ratio, despite the sustainably optimal ratio being 15%, leading to inefficient insulation and increased energy consumption;

Whereas, there is insufficient information regarding the cumulative window to wall ratio that includes the ground floor common areas, which are depicted as fully glass and when accounted for, would exacerbate the possibility of energy inefficiency;

Whereas, this decision for window area was influenced by aesthetic purposes and concerns for mental health, yet neither students nor student groups dedicated to the issue of mental health, like Cornell Minds Matter, were consulted;
Whereas, the timeframe to engage students and to submit input on the project was limited as students only received one minimally publicized email about opportunities to provide comment;

Be it therefore resolved, that Cornell undergo an Environmental Impact Statement for the North Campus Residential Expansion project;

Be it further resolved, that Cornell use the Passive House metric and commit to obtaining LEED Platinum certification;

Be it further resolved, as part of an effort to improve energy efficiency of the new dorms that the common area window to wall ratio is very conspicuously stated publicly and is significantly reduced, and that the window to wall ratio is decreased from 22% to 15%;

Be it finally resolved, that NCRE project meet the time constraints of the Climate Action Plan, of being carbon neutral by 2035 and publicly and clearly announce when other impacts (such as upstream methane leakage) require the purchase of carbon offsets;

Be it finally resolved, that Cornell Administration establish updated and plentiful communication prior to construction to voice concerns, and throughout the process to regard the immediate wellbeing of students, by providing a platform for students to communicate concerns or requests with administration in the form of a public panel or forum

Respectfully Submitted,

Grace Park ‘19  
Art, Architecture, and Planning Representative, Student Assembly

Julie Kapuvari ‘19  
Climate Justice Cornell

Jenny Xie ‘20  
Climate Justice Cornell

Zoya Mohasin ‘21  
Climate Justice Cornell

(Reviewed by: Environmental Committee, 5-0-1, 10/2/2018)