

**UW-Eau Claire University Senate
Physical Plant Planning Committee
Minutes
10/26/2020**

Present: Renee Strehlau, Jill Markgraf, Katie Wilson, Sasha Showsh, Sean Hartnett, Karen O’Day, Peter Hart-Brinson, Linda Pratt, Trenton Phillippi, *Jim Boulter (note-taker)*

0) Minutes passed by acclamation without opposition

1) Trenton Phillippi introduced

2) Feedback from key campus/community stakeholders

- University Senate Exec.
Concerns regarding EDI – first generation, lower socioeconomic groups, etc.
Putnam drive and thoroughfares
City-owned sidewalks, streets – hazardous behaviors
Enforcement vs. community expectation
Chancellor – wall of people smoking adjacent to Hibbard – is this a real hazard?
- Student Senate Exec.
Hasn’t come up yet formally... Trenton will let us know when it does
Precedent in 2017 – likely that there would be no change?
- RHA/Housing & Residence Life
Possible loss of housing contracts?
Hurt campus recruitment?
Need to protect cultural use of tobacco products (“commercial tobacco-free” may be a helpful alternative wording)
- University Staff Council:
Jackson spoke last meeting – no clearly articulated opposition to this or maybe generalized concerns – J. Boulter will reach out to Jackson about this... (this may be a population that might have concerns about such a policy)
- Third Ward Neighborhood Association:
have reached out, but no response yet (Kevin Rosenberg, chair)
- Sodexo:
Armondo Chaconne, General Manager, via K. Wilson: Concerned about prevalence of smoking in back loading dock – OUT OF CONTROL amongst employees outside of allowed areas
- Facilities: talked with managers group but not much conversation about it
Some that will be for and others that will be against (trades union members not represented)

- Legal:
T. O'Halloran & Jay Dobson regarding Putnam Drive implications: they would not enforce a smoking policy there – they would agree on a policy "...properties owned or maintained by the University"

3) Discussion

Has the Chancellor's position changed on this? he's not against this personally, but there are still some challenges to overcome – if they can be dealt with, he's not opposed

Why do we always start at the state minimum policies? Can we be more ambitious?

If we're not enforcing the policy now, then we may as well have a stronger policy we support

This would be consistent with the current University strategic planning and health emphasis

May be possible to phase in such a policy; time to prepare for the new policy, for employee cessation programs, etc.; also possible to mandate 5-year review/renewal of policy

A phased-in plan may hedge fears of a difficult transition; also strongly indicate that we've been thoughtful in the policymaking

LGBTQIA+ population much more likely to use commercial tobacco products than others because of targeted marketing; also intentional product placement in lower-income (e.g. food desert) communities; how would such a policy better serve those populations?

What about Barron County – J. Boulter will reach out to Tammi Perzichilli

Straw-poll and comments:

- All committee members present spoke to the adoption of a non-smoking/vaping policy: most spoke in favor; several were ambivalent; none opposed
- Clear articulation that other critical work of this committee (other area of institutional concern) must not be neglected; decide and move to accomplish the policy
- Need support from decision makers
- Challenges to implementation
- Consistent with university emphasis on health
- Simpler policy to discuss and create narrative & signage
- Outreach to USC & Sodexo (& Facilities trades)
- Graduated approach; need to move on to other crucial issues
- Central to educational mission of the University; timing is appropriate (Mayo & 2025)
- Time to be bold in our action; there is static thinking in the administration but populations using commercial tobacco are changing; must demonstrate leadership in ideas – take a strong position

Next steps:

1. Draft plan based on earlier proposals (J. Boulter, K. Wilson)
2. Circulate policy proposal to committee for comments in next weeks
3. Consider how to engage key campus groups in conversation to build a foundation for passage of campus policy; draft/model legislation in-hand for discussion

4) Ran out of time – will begin next meeting agenda with other critical issues to be addressed

6) Adjourned as members fell below quorum