Environmental Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
January 25, 2005

In Attendance: Bruce Coull, Mike Matthews, Tom Knowles, Stuart Hunter, Jim Demarest, Glen Kelly, Michael Dixon, Christy Friend, Michael Koman, Mike Scheffres, Scott Lindenberg, Tom Syfert, Laura Pergolizzi, Jim Sherry, and Laura Sima, Whit Ashley, Rosa Fankhauser (with SAGE),

Staff and Students: Trish Jerman, Elaine Durr

Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 22nd @ 12:30 in Osborne 107. Lunch will be served

Members introduced themselves.

Issues:

Campus-wide Smoking Policy:
Short version: The policy, amended to be as short and simple as possible was approved (see attached) and will be forwarded through proper channels for approval by the Board, with probable support from resolutions by Student Government and possibly Faculty Senate. Details of the debate are attached as an appendix below for later use, and for those who missed the meeting and are interested.

Updates and Additional Announcements:

Hazardous Materials Transport: In response to the Graniteville train wreck and chemical spill, efforts are underway to ensure that USC is prepared if such an event should occur on campus. The train tracks that pass through campus near the Swearingen Building, West Quad, and Bates Hall often carry tankers containing hazardous materials. Tom Syfert reported that he has spoken with Norfolk Southern and will be able to obtain information regarding what and how much hazardous material is transported through campus. Tom would like to do a drill to prepare the University community for an emergency situation. USC Aiken is willing to work with and help the Columbia campus. The Columbia Fire Department is also willing to partner with the University. The consensus of the Committee was that this is something the University should pursue. Bruce said the University should try to get funding through FEMA for disaster preparedness planning.

Recycling: In the interest of time, discussion regarding recycling was postponed for the next meeting.

Submitted by Elaine Durr

Suggested University of South Carolina Campus-Wide Smoking Policy
To promote a healthy working and learning environment and to reduce costs associated with structural damage from smoking and associated litter, the University of South Carolina prohibits smoking or the possession of lighted smoking material inside all University owned buildings and vehicles. Smoking is also prohibited within 25 feet of a building’s entrance. This policy applies to individual offices as well as the entire footprint of each building including any interior courtyard or exterior balcony that may exist. This policy is consistent with Section 44-95-20 of the South Carolina Code of Laws Chapter 95, the Clean Indoor Air Act of 1990.

Appendix: Detailed Discussion regarding smoking policy
Bruce Coull opened the floor for discussion. Stuart Hunter asked if there was a standard procedure for enforcement and violations regarding University policies. For students, there is a procedure that goes through the campus judicial system. For faculty and staff, the procedure tends to vary depending on the situation and policy. Jim Demarest suggested including an implementation plan to detail communication and education regarding the policy. There was discussion about wording; whether or not to include “exit or opened window.” The idea of using “operable window” was considered as well as including proximity to a ventilation intake.
Michael Dixon suggested including designated areas, which led to the question of who would designate areas and how he or she would do so. Mike Matthews offered the idea of having the senior administrator in each building be responsible for designating areas. This led to a discussion on placement of ashtrays; whether they should be close to entrances or 25 feet from buildings. Rosa Fankhauser commented that students tend to smoke as they walk to and from classes and would likely drop their cigarette butts as litter if an ashtray were not close to the door. Jim suggested keeping the policy broad and including a list of expectations: what is expected of smokers. Tom Knowles said that he would like input from students and smokers. Rosa replied by saying she did not think the policy was practical in its current state. Whit Ashley said it would be hard to convince students that this was a “real” policy and implementation and education would be difficult. Bruce stressed the importance and need to educate the campus community on the policy. Michael Dixon commented that the education effort would need to be continued in the future as the study body changes. Bruce offered the following changes: remove “exit or opened window” and the last sentence of Section I. Stuart suggested removing the reference to University Housing’s smoking policy. Whit expressed concern that specifying 25 feet might allow the policy to be taken to the extreme in certain circumstances. Jim thought 25 feet should be specified in the list of expectations and not in the policy itself. Trish Jerman said that the 25 feet specification should be included in the policy because of difficulty in distributing a list of expectations. Tom Knowles agreed and added that taking the 25 feet specification out of the policy made it weak. Christy Friend said that the University policy should be consistent with EPA recommendations, which the 25 feet specification is. Bruce moved to vote upon the policy with his above mentioned changes and Stuart’s regarding omitting the reference to University Housing’s smoking policy. The Committee approved the changed policy. Then the issue of enforcement was addressed. Mike Matthews offered the idea of repeated violations having a punishment possibly related to one’s raises. Stuart and Michael Koman suggested that enforcement and violation issues be left out of the policy. Stuart further commented that the Committee should consult with George Lampl regarding enforcement and violation issues if they are to be included in the policy. Bruce put a hold on discussing enforcement and violation issues so other items on the agenda could be addressed. Before the meeting was adjourned, Trish said that the smoking policy as voted upon and approved by the committee (minus enforcement and violation issues) should be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval. Following their approval, the issues of enforcement and violation will be discussed if needed. In an effort to get approval from the Board, the idea of partnering with Student Government and possibly Faculty Senate was mentioned. Michael Dixon and Whit said Student Government would likely be willing to do so. Bruce said he would pursue the idea of involving Faculty Senate.