January 12, 2023

Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: [Systemwide Senate Review] Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices

Dear Susan,

The Riverside Executive Council discussed the *Revisions to the Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices* as a part of their agenda on January 9, 2023, alongside the comments from the consulted committees: Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW), Committee on Physical Resources Planning (PRP), and Executives Committees from CHASS, School of Education, School of Medicine, and School of Public Policy.

The need to engage faculty to ensure that sustainable practices articulate with research demands was raised in the comments by the School of Public Policy Faculty Executive Committee and the Senate Committee on Physical Resources Planning. This point was discussed further during the Executive Council meeting and was emphatically endorsed by the members of the Executive Council.

Sincerely yours,

Sang-Hee Lee
Professor of Anthropology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Monica Lin, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate Office
December 6, 2022

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
    Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: John Kim, Chair
      CHASS Executive Committee

RE: [Systemwide Review] Proposed Revisions to Policy: Proposed Revisions to
     Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices

The CHASS Executive Committee has reviewed the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices. We did not notice any major issues and are generally happy with the leadership position the UC aspires to take in the field of environmental sustainability.

We would, however, like to note a number of concerns that we would like to see addressed in the next version of the document.

1) Some of the goals – e.g. the procurement of sustainable food products and plant-based foods – lack baseline numbers. Without context the goals of 25%/30% seem rather low.
2) The section on water does not address the issue of sustainable (desert) landscaping
3) Environmental justice is only mentioned once, but arguably should inform all sustainability decisions the UC takes. For example, there is no discussion on how the switch to sustainable food products will affect food prices (and who would bear the burden of the potentially increased costs).
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

November 9, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
    Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Robert Clare, Chair
    Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices

Faculty Welfare reviewed the proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices at their November 8, 2022 meeting and was supportive of the policy.
COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL RESOURCES PLANNING

December 19, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee
   Chair, Riverside Division

From: Linda Walling, Chair
       Committee on Physical Resources Planning

Re: [Systemwide Review] Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices

The Physical Resources Planning (PRP) Committee reviewed the Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices document. Overall, PRP supports the initiatives within the document and the revisions proposed. We provide the following comments.

- The PRP Committee supports the efforts for sustainable practices on all UC campuses. Perhaps we missed it, but it is not clear how the progress and use of purchased offsets for each campus is monitored and evaluated. It is also not how these sustainability initiatives are communicated to its students, faculty, and staff. More transparent processes and better communication would allow each campus to better embrace the principles of sustainability.

- The Committee expressed concern about the ability of our campus to support the energy-savings initiatives planned for LEEDs buildings. The maintenance of these systems must be considered in the planning process. One recurring limitation on our campus is having an insufficient number of staff to keep the systems working as planned. The LEEDs initiatives proposed must be more carefully aligned with future building residents. For example, LEEDs initiatives resulted in MRB1 having insufficient power to support the ultracold freezers of the faculty who moved into this building. PRP understands that this mandated the purchase of new ultracolds. The replacement of expensive functional equipment might not be considered a “green” policy.

- Throughout the proposal, one transitional strategy to achieve carbon neutrality is to purchase carbon offsets. Several questions arise. How is the use of purchased carbon offsets monitored on each campus? Are there ramifications for the heavy reliance on purchased carbon offsets? How will the UC system decrease the use of purchased carbon offsets? There is the Offsets Technical Committee in place, but it appears that projects are viewed independently. Is the impact of a project on a campus’ overall sustainability plan evaluated at the time of project discussion? Is there a mechanism to motivate campuses to implement more sustainability proactive measures rather than the use of purchased carbon offsets? This might provoke more rapid change.
• In Section V.C.10.g., the proposal suggests that the UC system should prioritize development of its own carbon offsets. Are there such plans for each campus? How are they prioritized? How are they communicated to students, faculty, and staff?

• Section III. A.1.e. We wondered why parking structures are recommended to have a "Silver" rating rather than a "Gold" rating.

• Section III B.1. The rationale behind a “2%” annual average reduction in energy use is not clear. This seems like a modest goal for energy use reduction. Furthermore, there is no timeframe for achievement of this annual reduction or what the desired end result would be (since we cannot reduce energy use to zero).

• Section III. H.1.c.i. appears to be missing.

• Section III. H.1.c.ii. The campuses and health locations will strive to increase amounts of plant-based foods. We are hoping that the campuses are seriously looking at the salt and fat content of the plant-based meat substitutes that might be used. Some of the meat alternatives are as high in fat and higher in salt than meat and their carbon-footprint is not currently understood as components are imported from around the globe and not produced locally. While avoiding meat does indeed decrease our carbon footprint, in some cases the plant-based meat alternatives are not a healthier alternative and may not be as “green” as touted.

• Section III.I.3. It is an important advance to pursue more sustainable water systems on our campuses. The use of water-to-waste systems is an admirable goal. However, the campuses must consider the quality of their city’s water system when pursuing such goals. The high salt content of the Riverside water system wreaks havoc with current autoclaves causing lost time and mandating constant and costly repairs.

• Section III.L.2.i. “will” is misspelled.

• Section III.L.2.b.i. We question the “eye-level placement of vending machines”. Will this easily accommodate the average standing human and a human confined to a wheel-chair?

• Section V.A.3.a. We strongly support the green design of new buildings and for building renovations. However, is there a mechanism to assure that a sufficient number of sustainable measures proposed in a building renovation project are actually implemented? This may be addressed elsewhere in this document. Perhaps directing the reader to the correct location of the implementation policy would be sufficient to resolve this comment.

• Section V.C.6. The revision and review process for the Framework for Incorporating Environmental & Climate Justice into Climate Action is not clearly indicated.

• Section V.D.4. Parking is expensive for our commuting students. We would like to know if parking pricing for students be adjusted or compensated to ensure affordability for all UC students.

• It was not clear if there are procedures or provisions for consultation or feedback from local Native Nations at each campus location. This should be clarified.
December 13, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Division Chair of the UCR Division of the Academic Senate and Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of the UCR Academic Senate

From: Raquel M. Rall, Ph.D., Faculty Chair of the School of Education Executive Committee


The SOE Executive Committee reviewed the [Systemwide Review] Proposed Revisions to Policy: Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices and discussed any comments/feedback at our executive committee meeting on November 22, 2022. Additional comments were also received via email.

At this time the School of Education does not have any major questions or comments regarding this policy. The revisions were clear. Once the policy is adopted, we would like to see more guidance regarding how each department might work to support these goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

Raquel M. Rall, Ph.D.
Faculty Executive Committee Chair 2022-2025
School of Education
University of California, Riverside
TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division
FROM: Marcus Kaul, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, UCR School of Medicine

Dear Sang-Hee,

The SOM Faculty Executive Committee has reviewed the Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices. The committee expressed concerns about:

- The practicability for research requirements, for example, are shipping and packaging practices being considered where the use of styrofoam is required or running freezers continuously,
- How do we ensure this policy is not going to affect current research,
- Is building construction considering the need to control temperature and maintain proper ventilation/airflow?

In addition, the committee agrees there is a need for more faculty involvement on planning committees/planning phases. The committee wants to avoid having to go back and retrofit buildings in the event that buildings are not properly equipped.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus Kaul, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee School of Medicine
TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair  
Riverside Division

FR: Richard M. Carpiano, Chair  
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy


Date: December 12, 2022

The Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy reviewed the documentation for “[Systemwide Review] Proposed Revisions to Policy: Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices.”

We have no comments to submit.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Carpiano, Ph.D., M.P.H.  
Professor of Public Policy