

Environmental Issues Committee 2006-07 Annual Report

Executive Summary

The 2006-2007 Committee discussed and researched several issues. Subcommittees were created for four of the issues:

- Energy
- Transportation
- Environmental Tobacco Smoke
- Green Dorm Room

Other issues included:

- 2008 Olympic Trials
- Center for the Advancement of Sustainable Living
- Recycled Paper Policy
- Full-time Sustainability Coordinator
- Plastic water bottles
- Sustainability endowment

The committee recommends the following actions should be undertaken in the immediate future:

1. Create a Campus Energy Policy and a long-term energy plan.
2. Update the Campus Transportation Plan.
3. Enforce the Heart of Campus traffic rules.
4. Create a campus-wide committee to review the current smoking policy with special consideration of a smoke-free campus.
5. Expand the sustainability coordinator position to full-time.

In addition, the committee looks for Administrative leadership in the following:

1. Ensuring the 2008 Olympic Trials are conducted with as small as environmental impact as possible.
2. Developing an efficient and enforceable business process so that the recycled paper policy will be followed.

Finally, the committee believes that funding should be allocated for education and awareness of environmental issues, specifically those related to energy and transportation.

Introduction

The Environmental Issues Committee met monthly from October through June. A list of members can be found in the appendix. The committee considered several issues and subcommittees were formed to further investigate four of the issues. The following provides a review of discussions and recommendations concerning these issues.

Subcommittee Issues

The following subcommittees were formed:

- **Energy:** to identify issues concerned with energy use and sustainability which are of immediate concern with respect to global warming and conservation. Members: Karyn Kaplan, Bill Cresko, and Jim Blick.
- **Transportation:** to identify transportation issues which are of environmental concern. Members: Ken Boegli, Christine Thompson, and Jim Blick.
- **Environmental Tobacco Smoke:** continuing last year's investigation of the issue of secondhand smoke, and specifically the idea of a smoke-free campus. Members: Paula Staight, Ben Farrell, JR Gaddis, and Jim Blick.
- **Green Dorm Room:** to investigate the possibility of having Housing set up one or more dorm rooms demonstrating how a student might live on campus with a smaller environmental footprint. Members: Kay Coots, Robyn Hathcock, and Cathy Soutar.

1. Energy

With the signing of the President's Climate Commitment by President Frohnmayer, the University will be focusing on several issues related to energy, sustainability and climate neutrality. We have identified the following action items which should receive attention in the near future.

1. **Campus Energy Policy:** The University needs to have a visible energy policy similar to the recycled paper policy. It should be relatively brief and readable, posted on the web and circulated to staff and students. A regular schedule of education and reminders about the policy should be implemented. Some of the items it should cover include:
 - Shutting off lights in dorm rooms, offices and classrooms
 - Shutting off computers, monitors and printers
 - Use of motion sensors or timers
 - Best practices for heating and cooling

- Using recycled paper
 - Recycling and reusing
 - Best practices for purchasing, especially electronic equipment
 - Use of thin-client (no hard drive) computer networks in large departments and offices (saves energy and money, and is more secure)
2. **Long-range Energy Plan:** A comprehensive long-term energy policy which prescribes how the University will deal with energy issues over the next ten years is needed.
 3. **Education and Awareness:** Funding and support are needed for the following ways of expanding awareness and knowledge about energy issues:
 - Web page and email newsletter devoted to energy issues and facts
 - Kiosks and/or tasteful billboards with energy and transportation data, facts, alternatives, etc.
 - Inside Oregon – articles about energy use and ways to save
 - Journalism Advertising group – promote awareness
 - Internet based portal which all students and staff would log in to – offers a way to spread information of all kinds

Recommendations

Direct the EIC or other ad hoc committee to develop a campus energy policy by Spring 2008, and long-range energy plan by Spring 2009. Allocate funding for energy awareness and education.

2. Transportation

Transportation issues are intimately connected with sustainability and climate neutrality. In general, the University should strive to limit the use of vehicles coming to and driving through campus as much as possible. We have identified the following action items which should receive attention in the near future.

1. **Update the Campus Transportation Plan.** The current Campus Transportation Plan was approved in 1976. Although ahead of its time when written, it needs to be reviewed and updated by incorporating transportation tools that have been developed more recently.
2. **Enforce rules for the Heart of Campus.** The Heart of Campus was successful for its first year or two. Recently, despite signage to the contrary, vehicles regularly drive right through. This is not just a safety issue - it also sends the message that driving through campus is acceptable. The original rules for the Heart of Campus are explicitly stated in the Campus Plan, but they are simply not being enforced. DPS is looking at this issue, but there needs to be administrative support to really make this effective. Enforcing the Heart of Campus rules is also

a necessary first step for enforcing driving restrictions elsewhere in central campus.

3. **Promote education and advertising of transportation alternatives.** A common theme related to environmental issues is the need to educate students and staff about the issues and their possible solutions. Alternative transportation is no different – the University needs to have a plan for disseminating information at regular intervals. Brochures, emails, posters, websites, kiosks and tasteful billboards are all useful tools. The University does not yet have a web portal, but a portal would enhance communication greatly. There needs to be funding and support for all of these tools.
4. **Establish more bicycle parking, especially covered and secure.** Although there is a good deal of bicycle racks currently, more covered and secure parking would encourage even more people to bicycle to and around campus.
5. **Create more efficient use of auto parking areas.** Parking spaces are costly to build and take up valuable space. Therefore, they should be used as efficiently as possible. Evaluate the current parking assignment system to identify ways to more efficiently use available spaces.
6. **Separate budget for alternative transportation.** We believe alternative transportation is important enough to have its own budget. This will demonstrate the University's commitment to alternative transportation and removes the conflict within DPS. In addition, this would help establish a much needed integrated transportation demand management (alternative transportation) program as exists at nearly all other similarly sized institution).
7. **Encourage faculty, staff, and students to live close to campus.** In general, the closer faculty, staff, and students live to campus, the more likely they are willing to use alternate transportation modes. Review existing university policies and work with the city of Eugene to encourage faculty, staff, and students to live close to campus.

Recommendations

Direct the Planning Office to begin updating the Campus Transportation Plan in 2008.
Direct Public Safety to implement strategies to enforce the Heart of Campus rules by January 2008.

3. Environmental Tobacco Smoke

The complete report of the ETS subcommittee can be found in the Appendix. Please refer to this report for further details and references.

Environmental tobacco smoke (ETS), otherwise known as secondhand smoke, has been a public health issue for many years. In June 2006, the Surgeon General released its strongest findings yet implicating ETS as a significant health hazard. Although many, if not most universities now prohibit smoking inside buildings, there is a nationwide movement to curtail smoking on campuses altogether. Currently, the University of Oregon prohibits smoking indoors and within 10 feet of building entrances. With more than 40 universities around the country prohibiting all smoking on campus and several more moving towards smoke-free campuses, we believe it is time for the UO to begin a campus-wide discussion of this issue.

More than 250 toxic or carcinogenic chemicals have been identified in ETS, and the EPA has classified ETS as a Group A carcinogen (known to cause cancer in humans with no acceptable safe level). The 2006 Surgeon General's report concluded that exposure to secondhand smoke is a "serious public health hazard", causing heart disease and lung cancer, with no risk-free level of exposure. While most people recognize the dangers of smoking indoors, the question is whether ETS outside buildings is hazardous as well. Studies conducted at the University of Maryland Baltimore campus and Stanford concluded that smoke levels outside can be comparable to indoor levels under certain circumstances.

Over 40 university and college campuses now have smoke-free policies. Of these, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis is the largest with over 29,000 students. The IUPUI campus went entirely tobacco-free in late summer 2006 (as did another branch of IU – IU East), and the Indiana University president has stated that he wants all eight of the IU campuses to go smoke-free by the end of 2007. The University of North Dakota (enrollment ~ 13,000) will be going tobacco-free in October 2007. Boise State, with an enrollment around 18,000 is looking into going totally smoke-free by 2008. The president of the University of Iowa (enrollment ~ 30,000) has recommended that the campus go totally smoke-free by July 1, 2008. In Oregon, all tobacco has been prohibited on Oregon K-12 school grounds since January 2006 and PeaceHealth instituted a tobacco-free policy on all of its property in November 2006.

In order to determine the level of concern among our faculty, staff and OA's to exposure to ETS and their interest in moving towards a smoke-free campus, the ETS sub-committee sent out a survey via campus mail to 500 randomized faculty, staff and OA's. 177 surveys were returned, for a response rate of 35.4%. Results indicate that 79% of respondents are bothered by ETS at least occasionally, 93% feel something needs to change with respect to ETS, and 72% at least somewhat support a smoke-free campus.

Recommendations

We recommend that the Administration convene a campus-wide ad hoc committee to investigate the advisability of revising the current smoking policy, with special consideration of implementing a smoke-free campus, with a report due by Fall 2008.

4. Green Dorm Room

The Green Dorm Room subcommittee looked at a "green" dorm room proposal by meeting and discussing possible ways to promote environmental stewardship among residence hall occupants. The subcommittee favored the approach of a dorm room being "green" through its amenities over advocating structural changes to existing halls. This approach seemed to be one that could produce early results by educating future residents in how they personally can improve the environmental performance of their room. University Housing was asked and agreed to assist us by having Tenaya Meaux, Housing Director for Marketing and Communications, meet with the subcommittee.

Ideas generated included inserting a green component into existing activities at Housing. Specifically, we looked at the "show room" and considered opportunities to displaying energy star appliances with those items marked in some way as "green". We also discussed using the existing the "Better Rooms" contest by adding a "greenest" room category.

The group felt that there are plenty of opportunities for collaboration across units. Tenaya suggested that the university may want to consider developing a green campaign that all departments could tap into, which would create an economy of scale and more impactful messaging that would include a university "branding" for sustainability (e.g. a logo, a communications strategy, etc.). This would make it easy for departments beyond Housing to tap into. Tenaya felt that regardless, it would make it easy (and in fact already in progress) for Housing to move forward with table tents, posters, adding "green" options/recommendations to information sent to students on what to bring/what not to bring on move-in day. Other possibilities include using IntroDUCkTion as an opportunity to promote greening of the student's living space. In general, however, depending on the size and scope of projects, staffing may become an issue.

Recommendations

Encourage University Housing and Campus Recycling to work together on promoting opportunities for students to 'green' their rooms/halls.

General Committee Issues

1. Olympic Trials

Committee member Karyn Kaplan sits on the sustainability subcommittee for the larger organizing committee for the 2008 Olympic Trials. This event is a golden opportunity for the UO to demonstrate its commitment to and leadership in sustainability and environmental affairs. A letter (see appendix) was drafted and sent to Frances Dyke encouraging her to help convey the importance of sustainability to the events organizers.

2. Center for the Advancement of Sustainable Living (CASL)

Committee member Cathy Soutar provided monthly updates of the progress of obtaining a house for CASL. We continue to support CASL and welcome the news that progress is being made.

3. Recycled Paper

A presentation by student guest Tara Burke on the need to get away from wood products led to a discussion of the recycled paper policy. It was reported by some committee members that not all departments were following the policy. It was agreed that the university needs to do a better job of educating and enforcing the policy. This led to a discussion about how policies in general are enforced on campus. In response to the fact that many departments were not following the policy, Harriet Merrick in the Business Affairs Office began an investigation of costs and sources of recycled paper, with the idea that the University should have a sole source contract for paper. This would cut down on departmental time researching prices and should also provide an overall cheaper price. We look forward to Harriet's report and recommend that next year's committee review the report with a goal of creating a policy which is easier to follow and to enforce.

4. Full-time Sustainability Coordinator

The committee briefly considered the idea that the sustainability coordinator position should be full-time and perhaps housed in Johnson Hall. This would send the message that the University is serious about sustainability issues and has top administrative support. This issue has been discussed in previous years, but we think it needs immediate attention.

5. Plastic Water Bottles

Plastic water bottles contribute heavily to the waste stream on campus. As an alternative, the University should provide refill stations (with perhaps filtered water) around campus.

6. Sustainability Endowment: Discussions and plans are needed to begin a sustainability endowment fund.

Appendix

1. List of members.
2. Letter to Frances Dyke concerning sustainability of 2008 Olympic Trials
3. Environmental Tobacco Smoke subcommittee report..

Environmental Issues Committee Membership, 2006-2007

Term 2006-07:

Anne Forrestal, Lundquist College of Business
Catherine Soutar, University Planning
Ben Farrell, Law Library

Term 2006-08:

Jim Blick, Registrar's Office (Chair for 2006-07)
William Cresko, Biology
Charles Kalnbach, Lundquist College of Business
Tim King, Facilities Services
Paula Staight, University Health Center

Ex officio:

Ken Boegli, Public Safety (designee)
Christine Thompson, University Planner (designee)
George Hecht, Director, Campus Operations
Karyn Kaplan, Recycling Program Manager
Kay Coots, Director, Environmental Health and Safety
J.R. Gaddis, Director, University Printing
Robyn Hathcock, University Housing

Students:

Kelly Hansen, ASUO

June 22, 2007

Frances Dyke
Vice President, Finance and Administration
114 Johnson Hall

In late June 2008, many thousands of people are expected to descend on Eugene and Hayward Field to view the Olympic Track Trials. This event provides a tremendous opportunity for the UO to showcase to the rest of the nation and the world how seriously the UO believes in sustainability. For the Olympic Trials to be environmentally successful, sustainability needs to be at the forefront of the overall planning process.

We believe it would be very helpful if you could communicate with Olympic Trial leaders to convey the importance of the sustainability mission. The sustainability message needs to be repeated and amplified throughout the planning process so that it does not get short circuited by too many last minute details. Your leadership in the process will be of great advantage not only to the Olympic Trials event but will provide a model for the University and the city of Eugene as well. A successful major event like the Olympic Trials sets the stage for more successful sustainable events in the future.

Currently there are several people from the UO who are on organizing committees related to the trials. There is a sustainability sub-committee that recently had a sustainability mission statement approved by the lead organizing committee. We want to make sure that the message is also coming from the UO Administration, not just sub-committee members.

An example of a highly successful sustainable event like this is the 2000 Sydney Australia Olympic Games. Touted as the "Green Games", the Sydney Olympics were acclaimed for environmental commitment throughout all phases of the planning process. For the upcoming winter Olympics in 2010, Vancouver is equally committed to sustainability as part of its planning. The University, along with the city of Eugene, needs to make sure that the Eugene Trials are focused on sustainability issues as well.

A recent graduate Management seminar project by Mary Ellen Mansfield and Danna Newburg summarizes very nicely the potential to diminish the environmental footprint of the Olympic Trials by implementing sustainable practices. Some of the things they consider include transportation, alternative energy sources, a carbon offset fund, and an alternative to plastic water bottles. I am sending by email their report and slides for your review.

Thank you for your work and consideration of this world class opportunity.

Sincerely,

Jim Blick, Chair
Environmental Issues Committee

Environmental Tobacco Smoke Subcommittee Report

Environmental tobacco smoke (ETS), otherwise known as secondhand smoke, has been a public health issue for many years. In June 2006, the Surgeon General released its strongest findings yet implicating ETS as a significant health hazard. Although many, if not most universities now prohibit smoking inside buildings, there is a nationwide movement to curtail smoking on campuses altogether. Currently, the University of Oregon prohibits smoking indoors and within 10 feet of building entrances. With more than 40 universities around the country prohibiting all smoking on campus and several more moving towards smoke-free campuses, we believe it is time for the UO to begin a campus-wide discussion of this issue.

Health Issues

More than 250 toxic or carcinogenic chemicals have been identified in ETS¹, and ETS has been classified as a Group A carcinogen by the EPA². Group A carcinogens are known to cause cancer in humans and there is no acceptable safe level of exposure. The 2006 Surgeon General's report made the following conclusions³:

- Exposure to secondhand smoke is a “serious public health hazard” which has “immediate adverse effects on the cardiovascular system and causes coronary heart disease and lung cancer.”
- “Secondhand smoke causes premature death and disease in children and in adults who do not smoke.”
- “The scientific evidence indicates there is no risk-free level of exposure.”
- “Establishing smoke-free workplaces is the only effective way to ensure that secondhand smoke exposure does not occur in the workplace.”

While most people recognize the dangers of smoking indoors, the question is whether ETS outside buildings is hazardous as well. A study conducted at the University of Maryland Baltimore campus⁴ concluded that “. . . smoke levels do not approach background levels for fine particles or carcinogens until about 7 meters or 23 feet from the source . . .” This was for 1-2 smokers, and it was noted that a higher number of smokers together could substantially increase concentrations and at further distances. Another study at Stanford⁵ confirmed these conclusions. The authors of that study noted: “We were surprised to discover that being within a few feet of a smoker outdoors may expose you to air pollution levels that are comparable, on average, to indoor levels that we measured in previous studies of homes and taverns.”

¹ <http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/secondhandsmoke/factsheets/factsheet9.html>

² <http://www.epa.gov/history/topics/smoke/01.htm>

³ <http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/secondhandsmoke/report/executivesummary.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.repace.com/pdf/outdoorair.pdf>

⁵ <http://news-service.stanford.edu/news/2007/may9/smoking-050907.html>

Precedents for a Smoke-Free Campus

Over 40 university and college campuses now have smoke-free policies⁶. Most of these are small schools or medical/health schools. Of these, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis is the largest with over 29,000 students. The IUPUI campus went entirely tobacco-free in late summer 2006 (as did another branch of IU – IU East), and the Indiana University president has stated that he wants all eight of the IU campuses to go smoke-free by the end of 2007⁷. The University of North Dakota (enrollment ~ 13,000) will be going tobacco-free in October 2007⁸. Boise State, with an enrollment around 18,000 is looking into going totally smoke-free by 2008⁹. Finally, a campus-wide committee at the University of Iowa (enrollment ~ 30,000) has recommended that UI institute a 25-foot smoke-free perimeter around all buildings (including athletic facilities and parking facilities) on July 1, 2007, and that the entire campus go smoke-free two years later¹⁰. The UI president rejected the latter recommendation, asking instead that the campus go totally smoke-free by July 1, 2008. Closer to home, all tobacco has been prohibited on Oregon K-12 school grounds since January 2006¹¹. PeaceHealth instituted a tobacco-free policy on all of its property in November 2006¹².

Pros and Cons for a Smoke-free Campus

Arguments for a totally smoke-free campus include:

1. **Right to clean air:** Non-smokers should not have to breathe toxic air during their time on campus. Because students and staff have to move from building to building, the entire campus is rightfully considered the workplace, and students and staff are entitled to smoke-free workplace as recommended by the Surgeon General.
2. **Save money:** A smoke-free campus would save the University money through decreased health care, less litter and fewer fires and smoke damage
3. **Uniform enforcement:** A totally smoke-free campus would actually be easier to enforce than a policy of smoke-free perimeters, and/or designated areas. The policy would be uniform and straightforward.

Arguments against a smoke-free campus include:

1. **Right to smoke:** since smoking is legal, smokers have the right to smoke.

⁶ <http://216.70.75.85/pdf/smokefreecollegesuniversities.pdf>

⁷ <http://www.thestarpress.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070415/NEWS01/704150343/1002>

⁸ http://www2.und.edu/our/news/print_news.php?id=2047

⁹ http://www.law.capital.edu/tobacco/workplace/casestudies_boise.html

¹⁰ <http://news-releases.uiowa.edu/2007/april/042607fethkesmokingproposal.html>

¹¹ http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_500/OAR_581/581_021.html

¹² <http://www.peacehealth.org/Oregon/TobaccoFree/FAQ.htm>

2. **Impossible to enforce:** a completely smoke-free campus would be unenforceable.
3. **Low priority:** there are much more important environmental issues to spend time and energy on; e.g., vehicle emission is more pervasive than ETS.
4. **Not a problem:** ETS outdoors is so dilute it is not a problem.
5. **Decreased recruitment:** admissions of new students, and perhaps especially international students, would be diminished.
6. **Big brother:** the University should not be in the business of telling students or staff how to run their lives.

We realize that the idea of a smoke-free campus is an emotional issue which will have several viewpoints. Some rebuttals to the above arguments against a smoke-free campus include the following points:

1. There has never been any legal justification to the notion of “smokers’ rights”. Just because smoking is legal in general, does not mean it is legal everywhere. Similarly, it is legal to drive a car, but that does not mean one can drive a car anywhere. As Surgeon General Koop wrote in 1986: “The right of smokers to smoke ends where their behavior affects the health and well-being of others.”
2. As noted above, in some ways a smoke-free campus would be easier to enforce because there is no confusion in the rule: no smoking is allowed anywhere. The question though is how the university deals with someone who decides to smoke anyway. This argument is really not specific to a smoke-free policy – it could apply to smoking indoors, driving through “Do Not Enter” signs, drinking on campus, biking on sidewalks, etc. The solutions are the same in all cases: education, culture change, peer pressure, and standard procedures which govern student and staff behavior. According to IUPUI (pers. comm.), 95% of the campus is smoke-free, with the remaining 5% being “hot spots” where some individuals continue to smoke. IUPUI expects this to improve with time, but the fact that 95% of the campus is smoke-free within a year is still a noteworthy achievement.
3. The argument that there are more important environmental problems to work on loses sight of the fact that the solution to ETS is relatively simple and has a potentially very large return on investment. A simple change in policy with the appropriate education, advertising and signage can bring about a significant savings. This is because smoking does not serve the university in any positive way. Contrast this to the problem of curtailing vehicle exhaust where restricting driving (especially of service/delivery vehicles) could entail a significant cost to implementing some alternative system.
4. The idea that outdoor ETS is an insignificant health issue is contradicted by the recent reports cited above that suggest levels of outdoor ETS can be as high as

indoors. Given that there is no risk-free level of exposure to ETS, the hazard of outdoor ETS is very real.

5. It is difficult to say how recruitment of future students would be affected by a smoke-free policy. IUPUI has not noticed any change in recruitment in any type of student over the last year (pers. comm.). In fact, a smoke-free campus may be seen as an attractant rather than a deterrent for many students and parents.
6. A tobacco-free policy might be interpreted as the university dictating a certain lifestyle. However, a smoke-free policy is about preventing toxic pollution, not about telling individuals how to lead their lives. If individuals want to leave campus to smoke, they may do so.

Survey Results

During the 2006 IntroDucktion, the University Health Center's Health Promotion Director surveyed parents regarding their concerns about ETS on their students, and asked if they would support a smoke-free campus. Although the survey was not random and the sample size was small (n = 92), the results showed that 77% were concerned about their student being exposed to secondhand smoke on campus, and that 75 % supported a policy prohibiting tobacco use throughout the UO campus. For IntroDucktion 2007, the plan is to survey parents again with a more comprehensive survey and to capture a larger sample size.

In order to determine the level of concern among our faculty, staff and OA's to exposure to ETS and their interest in moving towards a smoke-free campus, the ETS sub-committee put together a survey, with the input from the entire EIC (a copy of the survey can be found in the appendix). This survey was sent out via campus mail to 500 randomized faculty, staff and OA's, and 177 surveys were returned, for a response rate of 35.4%. Below are some of the preliminary results from the survey (a more thorough analysis will be completed this summer):

- **Bothered by secondhand smoke on campus?**

Often	19%
Occasionally	60%
Never	21%

- **What should UO do to minimize contact with ETS?**

Smoking in isolated areas only	59%
Not allow smoking on campus	34%
Nothing	7%

- **Do you support or oppose the UO becoming a smoke-free campus?**

Highly support	44%
Somewhat support	28%
Somewhat oppose	16%
Highly oppose	13%

- **The right to breathe clean air should take precedence over the right to smoke?**

Strongly agree	69%
Somewhat agree	21%
Somewhat disagree	4%
Strongly disagree	5%

- **Do you smoke?**

Every day	4%
Often but not daily	1%
Never	95%

- **Gender?**

Female	69%
Male	31%

- **Type?**

Faculty	34%
Staff	46%
OA	20%

Note that 79% of respondents are bothered by ETS at least occasionally, 93% feel something needs to change with respect to ETS, and 72% at least somewhat support a smoke-free campus.

The survey also provided a space for comments. The complete set of comments can be found in the appendix.

Implementing a Smoke-free Policy

Some universities have taken the bold step of implementing a smoke-free campus in a year or two. An alternative would be to take 4-5 years to phase in such a policy. This allows smoking staff the time to transition or search for new employment, and means that most students that are affected will be ones that enter the university with the knowledge that the policy will be implemented. Any policy should include a comprehensive cessation plan to help smokers quit smoking.

Recommendations

We recommend that the Administration convene a campus-wide ad hoc committee to investigate the advisability of revising the current smoking policy, with special

consideration of implementing a smoke-free campus. The University of Iowa's experience might provide a useful model¹³.

We believe it is just a matter of time when most major universities will become smoke-free, the question is when. The University of Oregon has a chance to become a leader in the state and nation on this issue, demonstrating that it believes in creating and maintaining a healthy environment for all its members.

¹³ http://www.uiowa.edu/president/task-forces/smoking_policy/index.htm

Appendix to ETS Subcommittee Report

1. Copy of survey sent to faculty and staff concerning environmental tobacco smoke by the ETS subcommittee.
2. Comments recorded from surveys.

The Environmental Issues Committee is studying the issue of secondhand tobacco smoke on campus.

Please take a minute to complete the following, tear off at perforation to remove your name, fold and drop in campus mail with Paula's address to outside. If you have questions you may contact Paula Staight, Director of Health Promotion at the University Health Center at 346-2728 or pstaight@uoregon.edu. If you'd like to comment, use the back page that remains intact and does not have the return address. Please return by May 18.

Thank you,

Jim Blick, Ben Farrell, JR Gaddis and Paula Staight, Members of the Environmental Issues Committee

Please clearly check the box that represents your answer.

1. Are you ever bothered by secondhand smoke on campus? Often Occasionally Never
2. Do you have any allergy/sensitivity (i.e. asthma, sneezing, watery eyes, etc.) that are triggered by exposure to tobacco smoke? Yes No
3. To what extent are you ever concerned about secondhand smoke on campus?
 Very concerned Somewhat concerned Not very concerned Not at all concerned
4. The Surgeon General reported in June 2006 that "there is no risk-free level of secondhand smoke exposure". Does this conclusion affect your level of concern?
 More concerned No Change Less Concerned
5. What should UO do to minimize contact with secondhand smoke? Check only one.
 Nothing Allow smoking in isolated areas only Do not allow smoking anywhere on campus
6. Do you support or oppose the UO becoming a smoke-free campus (no smoking anywhere on campus)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Highly Support	Somewhat Support	Somewhat Oppose	Highly Oppose
7. Please respond to this statement:
The right to breathe clean air should take precedence over the right to smoke.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. Your gender: Female Male
9. You are? Faculty Staff OA
10. Your age? 16-19 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60+
11. Do you smoke? Every day Often but not daily Never

**** IF YOU CHECKED "NEVER" YOU ARE DONE WITH THE SURVEY ****

12. Do you plan to quit or would you like to quit sometime in the future? Yes No
13. Do you know of resources for help in quitting smoking? Yes No
14. Do you smoke on campus? Yes No

If yes, please indicate *where* you usually smoke on campus: _____

Survey Comments

- Smoke comes through the ventilation system into my office!
- When I try to sit outside on the porch at Oregon Hall I have to sit at the other end.
- People congregate near entrances to buildings to smoke. On occasion it creates a real zone that one has to pass through. The overhang in the Lawrence courtyard creates a particularly noticeable cloud.
- Keep smoke away from windows or doors. My office always gets smoke by passersbys in the Cascade Fountain area at Pacific Hall.
- The entrance to my building always looks trashy and you have to run the gauntlet through the smokers to get in.
- In some cases the "50 feet from the door" rule doesn't work because the wind still blows the smoke in the doors and windows.
- Thanks for looking into this issue! The university needs better signage around buildings (especially PLC!) that limits smoking. Smoke comes right in the windows which causes a pregnant woman much anxiety!!
- I do not smoke but feel smokers have a right to smoke. They should have to go away from the building however, as the smell at the entrances is terrible and not that great for visitors and prospective students. Maybe several smokers' stations on campus.
- Why is this an issue? Frankly I'm more concerned with the fumes from over use of automobiles and feel efforts to reduce car use a higher priority.
- Allow smoking FAR from doorways to buildings.
- Highly supports smoke-free campus because campus is an Arboretum.
- Thank you for this survey! I wish we could do the same concerning asbestos – is “abatement” really enough?
- Could the smoke-free status apply to UO buildings off the campus? (I hope!)
- Occasionally bothered by secondhand smoke when passing people smoking.
- I think this is partly a diversity issue. With our Asian students smoking is still prevalent and accepted in Asia and we need to help them adjust.
- The wording of questions telegraphs the opinion of those who wrote them. They should have been vetted for neutrality.
- Student smokers are disregarding signs asking them to smoke away from the building.
- I am particularly bothered that people are allowed to smoke by the doorways to buildings. They should not be allowed there. Only in designated areas away from others.
- What I find annoying is the smell of diesel that filters thru halls and into windows of my office. I call them diesel days and they are not healthy.
- I worked with tobacco related cancers at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center in Seattle. Would love to see the UO set an example and make it smoke-free campus!
- I'm a realist. My father died of self-inflicted lung cancer. So I hate smoking with a passion, but can't see outlawing it completely.
- Clearly far from entrances and have DPS enforce it.
- Ban smoking in certain areas by airway ducts, doorways etc and enforce ban.
- Enforce existing guidelines.
- In response to the Surgeon General's statement one person wrote, “I don't think this statement is proactive enough or strong enough about the risks.”