



CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE
RIVERSIDE DIVISION
UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING, RM 225

JASON STAJICH
PROFESSOR OF BIOINFORMATICS
RIVERSIDE, CA 92521-0217
TEL: (951) 827-6193
EMAIL: JASON.STAJICH@UCR.EDU

November 10, 2021

Robert Horwitz, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices

Dear Robert,

I write to provide the Riverside Division's response to *Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices* that the Riverside Executive Council discussed on November 8, 2021 with no additional comments to the attached local committee memos.

Sincerely yours,

/s/Jason

Jason Stajich

Professor of Bioinformatics and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate Office



Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL RESOURCES PLANNING

October 27, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Chandra Reynolds, Chair 
Committee on Physical Resources Planning

Re: Systemwide Review: Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices

The Committee on Physical Resources Planning reviewed the Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices and offer the following comments:

With respect to “Green Building Design”, a tangible way in which UCR could further enhance their leadership in sustainable buildings would be to add greater detail to the requirement for “cool roofs”, that may be part of the extant CA building code. To be more ambitious, a further requirement to the “whiteness” of the paint may add a lot of value for negligible cost.

[c.f. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acsami.1c02368> and popular press explanation here: <https://www.purdue.edu/newsroom/releases/2021/Q2/the-whitest-paint-is-here-and-its-the-coolest.-literally..html>]

The description of the CBC requirements for new buildings and major renovations would benefit from clarification (document page 9 of 43; section A.1.a): i.e., a clearer statement that exceeding 20% is required whereas exceeding 30% is a goal. Added clarity here will avoid possible confusion in Section V.A.1.b (document page 21 of 43), where it is stated that new buildings and major renovations must “outperform CBC energy efficiency standards by at least 20%”.

A minimum indoor air quality standard should be described. This is interconnected with sustainability, health and well-being, and climate/environment on page 22 of the PDF, section L. Health and Well-being” (document page 19 of 43). Co-benefit solutions should be sought. Overall, Section L was positively viewed as potentially impactful. However, policy goal 1 is so broad that almost any work conducted by the Healthy Campus Network (HCN) will be viewed as a success. Thus, some refinement and specifics would be helpful, such as that suggested with respect to an indoor air quality standard. Health equity should be defined in the document.

Does the "parking management and pricing strategies" in Section IV.D.4 and IV.D.8.b. consider the potentially uneven burden of aggressive pricing on students who commute and are unable to utilize alternative modes of transportation; or on students who live on campus, but depend on single occupancy commuting to get to off-campus jobs or continuing medical care; or, is this covered by financial aid, and not in the form of student loans?

November 1, 2021

Jason Stajich, Division Chair, Riverside Division
Academic Senate
University Office Building 221
University of California, Riverside

BCOE Executive Committee Response to Selected Campus and Systemwide Review

Dear Jason,

For the following request for campus and systemwide review, BCOE has no comment.

1. Campus Review

- [Request for Senate Consultation on Draft WSCUC Special Visit Report](#)
- [Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion](#)
- [Proposed New Guidelines for Courses and Instruction](#)
- [Research Integrated Safety Committee \(RISC\) Charge Revisions](#)
- [Proposed Change to Graduate Council Bylaws 8.14.02 Membership](#)

2. Systemwide Review

- [Revised Presidential Policy Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment](#)
- [Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 478 \(IGETC\)](#)
- [Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices](#)

With Kindness,
Victor G. J. Rodgers
Chair of the Faculty of the BCOE Executive Committee



College of Humanities, Arts, and
Social Sciences
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

October 13, 2021

TO: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: Peter Graham, Chair 
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices

The CHASS Executive Committee reviewed the Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices. The committee declines to comment.

From: [Joseph Kahne](#)
To: [Cherysa P Cortez](#)
Subject: Re: FW: [Systemwide Review] (Proposed Policy) Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices
Date: Monday, October 4, 2021 7:26:13 PM
Attachments: [@imagesrsenatenew-ucr-logo-2020.png](#)

Hi Cherysa,
The SOE FEC had no feedback.
Thanks,
Joe

On Mon, Sep 27, 2021 at 12:03 PM Cherysa P Cortez <cherysa.cortez@ucr.edu> wrote:

Dear Prof. Kahne – Please see the attached and below for the attention of the SOE FEC.

Many thanks,

Cherysa Cortez

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail communication and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information for the use of the designated recipients named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error and that any review, disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the Academic Senate Office immediately by telephone at [\(951\) 827-6154](tel:9518276154) or email at cherysa.cortez@ucr.edu and permanently delete all copies of this communication and any attachments.

From: Academic Senate <senate@ucr.edu>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 11:56 AM
To: Leondra Michelle Jacobs <leondra.jacobs@ucr.edu>; Ana Kafie <ana.kafie@ucr.edu>; Rod <rsmith@engr.ucr.edu>; Denise Correll <denise.correll@ucr.edu>; Gabrielle Brewer <gabrielle.brewer@ucr.edu>; Monique <Monique.Tessier@medsch.ucr.edu>; Jennifer Kelsheimer <jennifer.kelsheimer@ucr.edu>
Cc: Cherysa P Cortez <cherysa.cortez@ucr.edu>
Subject: [Systemwide Review] (Proposed Policy) Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices



[Systemwide Review] Proposed Policy: *Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices*

Distributed for Review: 09/27/21
Committee Due Date: 11/01/21

On behalf of Senate Division Chair Stajich, I am forwarding for review a proposed UC systemwide Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices. Included are clean and red-lined versions.

Please submit comments to via IMS or senate@ucr.edu (cc cherysac@ucr.edu) by November 1, 2021. Thank you.

The proposed revisions address the following key issues:

- **Green Building Design:** The updates to this policy section align with industry practice by providing an option for building design teams to further customize their use of energy efficiency performance targets for laboratory buildings. The updates also specify a reporting procedure for the existing policy requirement for energy efficient new buildings.
- **Climate Protection:** First, this policy section is revised to add criteria addressing concerns around the quality of potential carbon offsets that locations may purchase to meet greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals. Historically, no constraints have been in place for the purchase of offsets. Second, consistent with the expanded, more comprehensive and inclusive mission of the Carbon Neutrality Initiative and in response to input from many faculty and students, campus climate action plans that have previously focused exclusively on emissions reductions will be required to also integrate environmental justice, adaptation and resilience. Third, in response to some confusion regarding whether the policy would allow locations to increase greenhouse gas emissions after meeting the 2020 emissions target, the revisions clarify that greenhouse gas emissions reductions should be maintained after the 2020 target date.
- **Sustainable Transportation:** Technological advances in zero emission vehicles and new State policy goals for zero emission vehicles led to a need and opportunity to update the fleet goals in this policy section. Secondly, changes in work and commuting patterns during the pandemic created an opportunity and need for campus sustainable transportation programs to promote telecommuting opportunities.
- **Sustainable Water Systems:** Updated the section to make it easier to read and removed expired dates and details that are already regulatory requirements.
- **Sustainability at UC Health:** Some health locations had not yet adopted waste and water reduction goals. All health locations will now have the same waste and water reduction goals.

Tasked Committees:

- Physical Resources Planning
- Executive Committee - School of Business
- Executive Committee - College of Engineering
- Executive Committee - College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

- Executive Committee - College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
- Executive Committee - School of Education
- Executive Committee - School of Medicine
- Executive Committee - School of Public Policy

--

Joseph Kahne
Dutton Presidential Chair for Education Policy and Politics
Co-Director, Civic Engagement Research Group
University of California, Riverside
www.civicsurvey.org
[@jkahne](https://twitter.com/jkahne)
Pronouns: he, him, his



October 29, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division

From: Declan McCole, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, UCR School of Medicine

Subject: [Systemwide Review] Proposed Policy: *Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices*

Dear Jason,

The SOM Faculty Executive Committee has reviewed the Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices. We approve of the policy and have the following additional comments for consideration. The Committee offered feedback that there is no incentive for anyone who drives an electric car. The charging stations are few and far between and they charge too much to charge one's car.

Possible solutions/incentives to EV cars for UC students, faculty, and staff could include:

1. Add more charging stations.
2. Add fast charging stations, perhaps inviting Electrify America and Tesla to add a few at their own cost (hence one would need only 10-30 min to recharge).
Users would have their own paying plans with those companies, this in theory would be at zero cost to UC.
3. Include a daily parking pass with the cost of the EV charging and/or provide discounted parking passes for EV vehicles (follow same CA rules used for HOV stickers for example).
4. The current rate of 0.75/hr (UCR level II stations provide max 6-7 kWh depending on the car – some cars can only draw max 3 kW per hour) is at the best similar to the one offered at UCSD (\$0.15 per kWh). However it jumps to \$0.5-0.6 per kWh after 2 hours. At UCSD it is constant at \$0.15/kWh. The UCSD pricing seems more reasonable and fair (pay for what you draw).

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Declan McCole".

Declan F. McCole, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee School of Medicine