

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES**

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Wednesday, **April 17, 2003**, at 9:00 a.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

**PRESENT:**       **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Devasia, Pace and Rorabaugh;  
                  **Ex officio members** Chapman, Jennerich, McCray and Waddell;  
                  **Guests** Jan Arntz, Environmental Planner, Capital Projects Office, assistant to  
                  Environmental Stewardship Task Force; Max deLaubenfels, Systems Analyst,  
                  Environmental Health and Safety; J. R. Fulton, Project Manager, Capital Projects Office,  
                  Environmental Stewardship Task Force; Vicky M. Peltzer, Police Chief; and Karen  
                  VanDusen, Director, Environmental Health and Safety, Environmental Stewardship Task  
                  Force.

**ABSENT:**       **Professors** Andersen, Bramhall, Korshin, Souders and Souter;  
                  **ex officio members** Coulter, Cox, Fales, Martynowych and Pike.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of March 5, 2003 were approved as written.

**University Environmental Stewardship Policy – Karen VanDusen, Director, Environmental Health and Safety**

VanDusen said Executive Vice President Weldon Ihrig established the University of Washington Environmental Policy Task Force, in part as a response to a request from UW faculty. Considerable early work was carried out by Professor John Palka of the Program on the Environment and the ad Hoc Committee on Environmental Policy.

Members of the Environmental Policy Task Force include: faculty members John Banks, Kern Ewing, Charles Henry, Philip Malte and Iain Robertson; administrative members John Chapman, J. R. Fulton, Jeanette Henderson, Diana Perey and Karen VanDusen; former ASUW President Jasmine Weaver and ASUW Alternate William Schenken; with assistance from Jan Arntz, Anne Eskridge, Susan McCrary, Sharon Murphy and John Palka.

VanDusen said the next steps with the Policy recommendations are to have them reviewed by groups such as the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services, to present the input and comments of those groups to Weldon Ihrig, to seek final adoption of the Policy, to publish the Policy, and to implement strategic actions resulting from the Policy.

The charge to the Task Force, said VanDusen, was to create recommendations and action steps toward development of an official UW Environmental Policy. The Executive Vice President, the Provost, and the President would then review and consider the recommendations. A Policy Statement would then be formalized. Policy goals would be clarified. And steps would be finalized to facilitate targeted action for implementation of the Policy. These implementation strategies would be the culmination of a long process of consultation with groups and units campus-wide, as well as considerable contributions from the chief administrative officers of the University, and other officers such as University Police Chief Vicky Peltzer.

VanDusen said additional considerations included the resolve to work with ten other institutions to develop a policy on hazardous waste. A statement of that resolve is as follows: “The executive leadership of the Institution embraces, supports, states, and carries out the commitment to minimize the potential for harm to human health and the environment and to promote excellence in environmental stewardship.”

As part of the process in developing the Policy, VanDusen said: ad Hoc findings were reviewed; the Task Force met with the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency); an Environmental Management Self-

Assessment was conducted (“We found that we were at 50% of the level we needed to reach,” VanDusen said, adding that this finding helped make clear what was needed to achieve the remaining 50%.); a review of “What is” was conducted; “gaps” and the future were addressed; several drafts of the Policy were prepared and studied and a 10-point action plan was created; a review was conducted of the work on the Policy by upper Administration; and final recommendations and Policy and Guidance were prepared. “We were forerunners in this process,” said VanDusen, “but we realized that we needed a written commitment.” She said EPA was brought in to the University. “We talked extensively with EPA, and they thought the environmental stewardship policy to be absolutely vital. EPA is very interested in higher education environmental management.”

VanDusen said, “The written Policy *makes sense*. There is strong faculty interest in this area. The campus is already involved in this kind of activity, but nobody *knew* what was being done at the University. We needed better communication. We needed a linkage, quite specifically, for better communication between Administration, faculty and students.”

Addressing the “Policy vision,” VanDusen said there are four major components: value, commitment, legacy for the future, and leadership. “Environmental stewardship is important to the University,” she stressed. “And we wanted to leave a legacy for the future of the University.” She said students “have come out as leaders” in helping to formulate the Policy vision. “The students need guidance, but they have excellent ideas and bring enormous energy to the process.”

VanDusen said “environmentally responsible citizens” make an important contribution to the vision of the Policy. And, of course, the invaluable intellectual resources at the University are a vital asset for sustainability. “We want the University to be an environmentally, economically, and socially responsible institution. We want to form partnerships with other institutions. And we want continued improvements that will benefit generations and natural ecosystems alike.”

Regarding “the Policy” itself, VanDusen said there are six essential concepts. 1) regulatory compliance; teaching, research and service, which fosters environmental stewardship and sustainable practices; operations that reduce resource consumption; land use, development, and construction practices that optimize environmental stewardship and sustainability; commitment to protect, preserve and restore natural environment in UW trust; and leadership.

As for future steps, VanDusen said the Task Force, in assessing the important language of the Policy, and in seeking the most apposite language to represent the Policy, “felt comfortable with our present version.” That language will hopefully help units and departments within the University to implement the Policy, and to “own” the Policy in ways appropriate to the level of the individual unit or department in question. Another step will be the recognition of UW diversity/multiple campuses. Respecting fiscal limits will be a crucial factor for individual units and departments. And respecting multiple demands on students and faculty will be necessary as well.

VanDusen said that “a lot has been done on campus with respect to strategic planning for implementing environmental policy.” An important aspect of this effort is the ease of incorporation [of strategic planning] into existing responsibilities. Regulatory compliance is also key to this effort.

As to the “Product” of the Policy, VanDusen mentioned four categories: guidance document, seven strategic goals, suggestions for actions, and envisioning “opportunities” (or “thinking about the goals that have been set”).

Strategic Goal #1 is: Regulatory compliance throughout the University, including reprisal-free reporting, and sufficient support. “We need to know if there are compliance issues,” VanDusen stressed. Goal #1 implications include: EPA enforcement, SPCC plan, wetlands protection, and clean-up issues.

Strategic Goal #2 is: Strong commitment to environmental education (“The campus is well-served by a strong commitment to environmental education,” said VanDusen), including: integration, seeking new opportunities (such as the excellent new “Program on the Environment”), and promoting research.

Strategic Goal #3 is: Implementation of Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability principles in day-to-day operations and management of University facilities and activities, including: reducing resource consumption (“A lot of this is already going on; word; people are getting the word out to the campus community,” said VanDusen.), waste reduction (e.g., there are excellent recycling programs on campus), purchasing policies (“There are many different environmentally-friendly materials out there now.”), and reducing diesel (the Transportation Services Group is currently assessing this issue).

Strategic Goal #4 is: Implementation of Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability Principles in planning, development and management of University lands, buildings, ecosystems and capital projects, including: grounds management (e.g., using low resource-consuming plants), I.P.M., policy for protecting and enhancing natural areas, LEED standards (low energy-use and effective environmental standards in capital projects; mindfulness of the cost issues surrounding LEED standards), and end user accountability (“Currently, there is not very much accountability.”).

Strategic Goal #5 is: Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability efforts fostered in student governance activities, partnered with faculty and administrative efforts, including: student impact on compliance (“It is important for students to do this in their governance programs,” said VanDusen.), students as powerful allies (“Students influence clients, in the area of compliance issues, in a major way.”), and ideas for action.

Strategic Goal #6 is: A centralized focus and administration of the University’s Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability efforts (“This is a goal that Weldon Ihrig is still struggling with: to formalize a centralized focus and commitment to keep this going.”), including: strong central support for continuous commitment and high level visibility, Environmental Management System: comprehensive approach emerging (“This is for the tracking of accountability; we need centralized people to make it work.”), University-wide Advisory Board, interdisciplinary research, demonstration and education center (“We could use a center to pull expertise together in an interdisciplinary way.”), recognition (“We could have formal recognition of significant student and faculty contributions.”), and long term clean-up funding.

Strategic Goal #7 is: Internal and External Strategic Partnerships (“We needed to strategically form partnerships within and without the University: statewide and national partnerships, not just regional,” said VanDusen), including: leveraging ongoing efforts and expertise, exploration of faculty – ADM links (“We need to pull in more faculty expertise.”), and more committee communication (“There are other committees on campus studying these issues, but there is not a good centralized advisory board to link them.”).

As for the next steps that need to be taken, VanDusen said recommendations are under review (coming to FCUFS is one example of that review process). She said the Task Force has officially been disbanded, and that “we are waiting for our next direction.” She emphasized that it is “now up to individuals to look closely at options, and to determine, both individually and collectively, where we are.” This will be part of another step: to share information with various groups. After these steps are taken, the input and suggestions from the various groups will be shared with Weldon Ihrig. Then, final adoption and publication of the Policy will occur. And strategic actions will be taken to disseminate and maintain the official University of Washington Environmental Policy.

Finally, VanDusen quoted a statement setting out the University’s reality and legacy with respect to environmental policy and stewardship: “The University is committed to promoting environmental stewardship and sustainability principles as it conducts its teaching, research and service missions as well as its facility operations in all its locations.

Balick commended VanDusen and all those who worked on the Policy; the entire council concurred. VanDusen thanked the council and said, “This has not been an easy task. There were many preconceived notions to overcome, and a large-scale coordination of many individuals and groups.”

Pace wondered if some of the statements in the Policy “could be stronger.” VanDusen said, “We *had* stronger statements. But there was a backlash, and we had to ‘come back’ and call these ‘opportunities,’ and get away from mandates.”

Chapman said, “We have a variety of funding sources on campus, and have to take their realities and needs into consideration. We *try* to satisfy everyone, and *try* to keep the ‘door open’ through the design process, to get as good a LEED standard as possible. But it truly is impossible to satisfy everyone. We *will* get LEED certified with Merrill Hall. And we’re trying to get LEED certified in the new project at Harborview Hospital. But we do need to weigh off the funding sources.”

Balick said, “There are actions that departments can take, such as appointing a liaison officer, to help monitor the Policy at the departmental level. VanDusen said, “That’s a good point.” Balick said, “Please take another look. Our students, for example [in Astronomy], give very good advice. A liaison officer could be helpful.”

Schaufelberger said to VanDusen, “I would strongly recommend that you create a Web site for the Policy to serve as a point of contact for units across the campus. Whoever runs the Web site could serve as an institutional expert for the University.” VanDusen said, “We have not yet created a Web site for the Policy that suggests what could be done with the Policy. But you’re right: a stewardship and sustainability Web page is an excellent idea.” Balick corroborated the wisdom of Schaufelberger’s observation: “John’s suggestion is a good one.”

Schaufelberger said, “In Strategic Goal #7, it would be politically desirable to reach out to the City. The City grapples with this same issue, and it would be good in a great many ways to form such a partnership.”

Schaufelberger also strongly recommended to VanDusen that a Faculty Senate representative be included in the Advisory Board on Environmental Stewardship. “It could be a member from this council. That faculty representative could help disseminate valuable information to important faculty groups campus-wide.”

VanDusen asked, “Could you take this issue to the Faculty Senate?” Schaufelberger said, “A good step would be to write a summary of what you’ve done, and what the Policy consists of, and put it in *University Week*. You and I together could work on that.”

Balick said, “I’d challenge you to review individual departments [with respect to implementation of the Policy]. As a department chair, I can tell you it would be a valuable service to consult at least with department and unit chairs. It could be an informal consultation. But whatever form it takes, it could help disseminate the Policy’s practices that we’re not aware of.”

Scharufelberger said, “You might speak with Weldon Ihrig about getting on the agenda of the Autumn Administrators’ Workshop. That would be a valuable forum in which to present the Policy and its goals.”

### **Security of Research Activities – Karen VanDusen: Director, Environmental Health and Safety**

VanDusen said that, both prior to and following September 11, 2001, many changes have been instituted in universities across the country concerning the security of research activities, and other changes are in process or on the way.

VanDusen apprised the council of a “culture change” in research institutions that commenced because of the concern over “access to biological agents that could be used for weapons of mass destruction.” A 1989 Biological Weapons Act Enhanced CDC Regulations. This was a major effort to identify biological agents threatening to public health. An “Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act” (PL 104-132) was one result of this heightened focus on the potentially destructive use of biological agents. “A series of federal legislation bills were passed,” noted VanDusen.

VanDusen said that, with respect to facility / design emphasis, “You have to have certain designs [in research labs] if you are doing certain activities.” She said there are new CDC guidance – biosafety levels that must be met by researchers using biological agents. This is related to “worker and community

protection and infection-prevention,” she said. There are new security measures affecting radioactive materials, and mandatory DOH inspections.

VanDusen said that, since September 11, 2001, there have been “huge changes in the perception of research activity at universities involving biological agents, and the kinds of safety measures that govern those activities.” And significant legislative restrictions have been passed at the federal level, in part as a result of this perception. The overwhelming media blitz in this area since September 11, 2001 has been a major contributing factor.

“There are new demands governing facility changes at the University,” VanDusen stressed. Factors necessitating these demands are: changed risk perception; the changed view of researchers; legislative restrictions; and Homeland Security.

New federal mandates include: the October 2001 – USA Patriot Act “Uniting and strengthening America by proving appropriate tools required to intercept and obstruct terrorism” (HR 3162); the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Response Act, passed in July 2002; the “Select Agent Rule” (42CFR Part 73); and the Agricultural Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2002 (9CFR 121), that added “significant new restrictions.”

The Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness Response Act of 2002 “provides for regulation of certain biological agents and toxins by DHHS and the Department of Agriculture.” “This provides additional agents on both the human and the plant sides,” said VanDusen. Listed agents “pose severe threat to human health or to animal / plant health or products.” The Act authorized “promulgation of new regulations (i.e. CFRs) and empowers certain agencies.” The Act also requires federal “Notification of Possession.” “Faculty have been wonderful in this task,” VanDusen observed.

The Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness Response Act of 2002 also requires “prompt notification of release to involve Public Health agencies.” The Act “grants the Justice Department authority to conduct background checks of those registered (in possession of SA). “This happens through the Department of Justice,” said VanDusen. “If anyone is working with certain agents, security is the key issue.” The Act further allows federal inspections of facilities for SA possession.

VanDusen described a three-pronged network entitled “Security = A System Approach.” “University of Washington Police Chief Vicky Peltzer and I are coming up with a Policy, and will come back to the council to present it when it’s completed.” The first prong is “Administrative Controls,” including: processes (deliveries), and procedures (escorts). The second prong is “Engineering Controls,” including: physical changes (internal and external), and equipment. (“This gets somewhat dicey: How do you pay for upgrades if someone does not have controls already in place?”) The third prong is “Personnel Controls,” including: background checks, behavioral change / cultural change, and training.

Under the heading “UW Progress,” are included: Designation of a responsible official (“If someone is going to use select agents, I have to sign off on that,” she informed the council.), Documentation of possession, lab access controls, involving high risk research areas, and monies, (“Many of these controls have been upgraded in the Health Sciences.”), and Security reviews of high risk areas / proposed research (“Faculty need to document all aspects of security before going ahead,” VanDusen stressed; and added, “We work with Grants and Contracts in this area.”).

Also included under “UW Progress (and Initiatives) are: Lab registration, USA Patriot Notification, Security Policy (under way), *Who* accesses (“There are all kinds of questions here,” said VanDusen.), Materials to FBI, Fingerprinting Process, Eliminating Option of Magnetic Hold-Opens, and UWPD in PRB (VanDusen said the “Project Review Board helps us think about security issues in new ways.”).

Types of potential physical security include: perimeter, building, lab and storage. Examples include: Card / Key Control, electronic building access, batter-proof doors / windows, motion detectors, perimeter fencing, security camera, and locked freezers / “Lock Boxes.” The types of physical security will need to be “complex,” not “one size” for all.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is “the design of redesign of an environment to reduce crime opportunity through natural, mechanical, and procedural means.” VanDusen said, “This is the designing of the environment with the concept of crime prevention in mind.” Peltzer pointed out – in a building shown as an example – that the building “has no open windows on the first floor, which is helpful.” VanDusen said, “These safety features need to be included in the design phase of new buildings.”

The CPTED premise is “crime prevention philosophy based on the theory that proper design and effective use of the build environment can lead to a reduction in the fear and incidence of crime, as well as an improvement in the quality of life.” CPTED key concepts include: natural surveillance, natural access control, natural territorial reinforcement (“where to put trees, bushes, etc.”), image and maintenance, and location setting and place considerations. “The best time to apply this philosophy is in the design phase, before a building or neighborhood is built. You can also successfully apply it later, but retrofitting an existing environment can sometimes become costly, or cost prohibitive.”

VanDusen said, “One thing we are strongly emphasizing in the Policy is that no ‘hold open’ doors will be allowed under the new restrictions. These are simply too dangerous in situations involving an outbreak of fire or other catastrophes. Also, ventilation intake systems must be a minimum of 10 feet off the ground. Ground-floor windows are to be avoided whenever possible in the design phase. These are open invitations to break-in and looting. Peltzer pointed out that there are alternative measures that can be taken with ground-floor windows, such as windows that only open out, but not in, and bars as an extreme measure. But it is much better to simply keep ground-floor windows out of the design in the first place.

“Target hardening,” said VanDusen, “is *not* a CPTED principle. Target hardening focuses predominantly on denying access to a crime target through physical or artificial barrier techniques, such as a gate to protect unloading and loading areas. Target hardening also leads to constraints on use, access, and enjoyment of the hardened environment by legitimate users.

As for the impacts of physical changes resulting from the new security measures, accessibility of faculty offices and student – faculty interactions may be adversely affected to varying degrees, depending on the nature of the change. Faculty research synergy may also be affected (“One researcher may be allowed in a lab in which another researcher may not be allowed,” said VanDusen.). Costs will definitely be impacted. And conveniences will definitely be impacted, such as the one previously mentioned concerning the disallowance of “hold open” doors.

VanDusen said the two “contact” people for those having questions or concerns about security issues are: Lieutenant Ray Wittmier at [rcop@u.washington.edu](mailto:rcop@u.washington.edu), telephone: 206-543-9331; and Officer Allen Beard at [beardla@u.washington.edu](mailto:beardla@u.washington.edu), telephone: 206-543-9331, or Voice mail: 206-616-7827.

### **Next meeting**

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Thursday, May 22, 2003, at 9:00 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder