

POLICY CONCEPT FORM

Name and UO Title/Affiliation:	Krista Dillon Director of Operations, Safety and Risk Services
Policy Title/# (if applicable):	Security- Physical Space and Environment
Submitted on Behalf Of:	University of Oregon Police Department
Responsible Executive Officer:	Andre Le Duc AVP Safety and Risk Services and Chief Resilience Officer

SELECT ONE: **New Policy** **Revision** **Repeal**

Click the box to select

HAS THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL REVIEWED THIS CONCEPT: **Yes** **No**

If yes, which attorney(s): Doug Park

GENERAL SUBJECT MATTER

Include the policy name and number of any existing policies associated with this concept.

Creation of a policy to guide physical security elements and projects on campus. Establishes the University of Oregon Police Department and Campus Vulnerability Assessment Team as the lead for physical security assessments and recommendations and establishes a three-tiered standard for physical security elements for new construction and remodels.

RELATED STATUTES, REGULATIONS, POLICIES, ETC.

List known statutes, regulations, policies (including unit level policies), or similar related to or impacted by the concept. Include hyperlinks where possible, excerpts when practical (e.g. a short statute), or attachments if necessary. Examples: statute that negates the need for or requires updates to an existing policy; unit level policy(ies) proposed for University-wide enactment; or existing policies used in a new, merged and updated policy.

None

STATEMENT OF NEED

What does this concept accomplish and why is it necessary?

While some standards on physical security exist on campus, they are not consistently applied and there is no clear lead department or group assigned to assess risk and determine appropriateness of physical security elements. This policy aligns existing standards and establishes a lead entity to assess risk and make recommendations on physical security.

AFFECTED PARTIES

Who is impacted by this change, and how?

Departments wishing to add new physical security elements outside of a remodel or new construction and units that are completing major remodels and new construction will be impacted by the policy. Campus Planning and Real Estate, Design and Construction, and Safety and Risk Services and the UO Police Department each will play a role in implementing the policy. In some cases this policy will require the addition of physical security elements to a project that previously were not required. Those elements may result in one-time installation costs and some system/equipment maintenance costs.

CONSULTED STAKEHOLDERS

Which offices/departments have reviewed your concept and are they confirmed as supportive? (Please do not provide a list of every individual consulted. Remain focused on stakeholders (e.g. ASUO, Office of the Provost, Registrar, Title IX Coordinator, etc.).)

Name	Office	Date
Tom Shepard	Design & Construction	11/2/17
Greg Ottoman, Judd Mentzer	Housing	11/3/17
James Stegall	UOPD	12/11/17
Ken Straw	CPFM	12/13/18
Darin Dehle	Design & Construction	1/18/18
Jeff Madsen	Design & Construction	1/18/18
Christine Thompson	Campus Planning	1/18/18
Doug Park	General Counsel	1/18/18
Tiffany Lundy	SRC	11/25/17
Brent Harrison	SRC	11/25/17
Laurie Woodward	EMU	11/25/17
Devon Shea	Athletics	11/25/17

Volga Koval	UHC	11/25/17
Matt Carmichael	UOPD	12/11/17
Jeff Butler	CPFM	12/7/17
Andy Vaughn	IS	11/14/17
Cass Moseley	VPRI	6/6/18
Amy Salmore, Sheryl Johnson, Monte Matthews, Chuck Williams, Analinda Camacho	VPRI	7/5/18
Steve Stuckermeyer	EHS	10/15/18

REVISIONS: The June 2018 PAC recommended that additional feedback be sought from the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation (“Research”). SRS provided the draft policy language to Research leadership for feedback. Policy revisions reflect the need to address fire safety concerns as part of physical safety. In addition, edits were made to incorporate feedback from Research including: clarification of the process to determine building levels under the policy, articulating a process when stakeholder parties disagree, clarification on the role of CVAT based on recent programmatic changes, and simplification of administrative responsibilities. **ORIGINAL:** While some standards on physical security exist on campus, they are not consistently applied and there is no clear lead department or group assigned to assess risk and determine appropriateness of physical security elements. This policy aligns existing standards and establishes a lead entity to assess risk and make recommendations on physical security.

Reason for Policy

This policy sets out how the University aims to protect its community members and its assets (including its buildings, property, information, and equipment) against physical threats such as crime (theft and criminal damage), fire, and terrorism through the implementation of physical fire protection and security controls. Physical fire protection and security requires appropriate 'layering' of physical and technical measures and involves a balance between prevention, detection and response.

Entities Affected by this Policy

All members of the UO community and visitors.

Web Site Address for this Policy

[to be completed when posted]

Responsible Office

For questions about this policy, please contact Safety and Risk Services: (541) 346-8070, safety@uoregon.edu

Enactment & Revision History

[to be completed upon enactment]

Policy

- I. To support a unified campus implementation of physical fire protection systems, the UO Fire Marshal Office has the responsibility and has been delegated authority to ensure the UO complies with Oregon fire and life safety regulations as adopted in Oregon Fire Code and local municipality ordinances. When these regulations are silent or in conflict, fire prevention decisions are made by the UO Fire Marshal, under guidance of nationally recognized practices or standards such as those promulgated by the National Fire Protection Association, other nationally recognized fire protection agencies, and commonly accepted fire protection practices.

- II. To support a unified campus security policy, UO has established three building security levels. Buildings are assigned security levels based on the functions that occur within the building.

- a. In certain cases, a portion or room of a building could receive additional security elements beyond the building's level. Definitions of the building levels and the accompanying security elements are located in the security standard.
- III. Based on the principles of common crime prevention, the University will incorporate appropriate and proportionate physical security measures in both the design and layout for new campus buildings and major remodels.
- IV. Security levels may apply to the internal and exterior design of campus facilities (including buildings and grounds).
- V. Determination of the building level occurs during the programming phase of the design process for major remodels and new construction to determine the plan for physical security elements and will be done in close collaboration with user groups, stakeholders and the the Campus Vulnerability Assessment Team (CVAT). Determinations shall not negatively impact the unit's activity.
 - a. In the event that involved parties disagree on security elements identified above the "Base" levels, then respective unit leadership will be consulted. If agreement cannot be reached there, the decision will go to the vice presidents of the respective units.
- VI. Physical security elements are implemented through campus standards, managed by UO Design and Construction and Facilities Services.
- VII. UO will integrate industry standard practices in building and space design to enhance crime prevention as part of the Campus Design Process.
- VIII. No Department or Auxiliary will install a standalone physical security system (e.g., alarms, cameras, outdoor emergency phone systems, etc) without consulting with the Campus Vulnerability Assessment Team. Centralized systems are encouraged to ensure interoperability.
- IX. Certain circumstances, including, but not limited to, large scale special events, temporary displays of high value, or occurrence of an emergency or incident may result in the need to temporarily increase security elements in or around a facility. In these instances, UOPD will be responsible for recommending temporary security measures.
- X. In special cases, CVAT and the user group may determine that certain physical security elements identified in the building levels are not necessary. In these cases, the reasoning will be documented and kept by CVAT.

Responsibilities

- I. Protecting the people and assets of the University of Oregon is the responsibility of the whole campus community. All university personnel are expected to support the university's safety and security policy and associated procedures.
- II. The University of Oregon Fire Marshal, an officer within the Department of Environmental Health and Safety, in accordance with agreement of the Eugene-Springfield Fire Marshal, is

- the designated authority having jurisdiction in the interpretation and application of fire protection codes and regulations and authorized to enforce applicable fire and life-safety codes, laws, regulations, and implementation of fire protection systems within campus facilities.
- III. The University of Oregon Police Department (UOPD) is the lead department responsible for assessing physical security needs and making recommendations for security improvements for campus facilities. Departments will work in partnership with UOPD to plan, coordinate and implement and install security elements in their facilities. Examples of campus security needs include but are not limited to site security, assets protection, camera systems, security alarms, and personal safety, etc.
 - IV. The UO Campus Vulnerability Assessment Team (CVAT) works on enterprise-wide safety, security, and vulnerability policies and protocols to address campus vulnerabilities and vet request for standalone security elements.
 - V. All administrators, deans, department heads, directors, supervisors and/or principal investigators are directly accountable for the provision of appropriate training and promotion of a culture of security.

Materials Supporting the Policy

This information included in this section is not part of the policy, but is considered supplementary and will be used by UOPD and the Campus Vulnerability Assessment Team in implementing the policy.

A. Security Levels

As the security level increases, the security elements from lower levels are also applied to the higher levels. The security elements are considered to be required unless financial or logistical barriers prove to be an unreasonable hardship. This will be determined by the AVP for Safety and Risk Services, or their designee.

Security Level	Building Functions Characteristics	Required Security Elements	Recommended Security Elements
Base	All UO buildings will include a minimum Low rating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exterior prox access with building access on a set schedule allowing for open access during set business hours • Exterior surveillance at entrances/exits (may be building mounted or pedestal mounted away from the building) • General security patrols performed by UOPD Police Officers and/or Security Officers • General staff training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

Security Level	Building Functions Characteristics	Required Security Elements	Recommended Security Elements
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laboratories • Lab-Support Facilities • Shops / Craft Centers • Residence Halls • Dining Facilities • Cash handling • Hazardous materials stockrooms • High content value (\$1 – 10 Million) • Childcare Centers • Healthcare Centers • Building mechanical and IT rooms • Building electrical vaults • Building loading docks • Records containing Personal Identifiable Information (HIPAA, FERPA, etc) • Counseling Centers • Activities including advising, conduct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prox access on restricted interior spaces • Interior surveillance in large open, or public spaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intrusion alarms • Duress alarms

Security Level	Building Functions Characteristics	Required Security Elements	Recommended Security Elements
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely high content value (Greater than \$10 Million) • Large events (1,000 people or more) • Radiation Sources of Concern • Controlled Substances • Select Agents • High-field magnets • Research animals Housing • Specialized research • Data Centers • HIPAA data in Data Centers • Power/Utility Generation • Department of Homeland Security Chemicals of Interest (Building Wide) • Tunnel Access • Police Operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interior surveillance beyond restricted spaces • Exterior surveillance beyond entry and exit points • On-site security and/or human monitoring public entry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intrusion alarms • On-site security and/or human monitoring public entry. • Intrusion alarms

B. Financial Impacts of Policy Implementation

This policy will result in additional costs tied to major remodels and new capital projects. The costs of purchasing and installing physical security elements will be borne by the project. Maintenance of physical security elements is dependent on the type of security component:

- Access Control – Maintenance of all campus access control systems is currently accounted for in the CPFM budget.
- Cameras – Finance and Admin Shared Services (FASS) is creating an inventory of cameras not managed by auxiliaries for the purpose of developing a maintenance budget. The approval of such as budget has not occurred as of this policy submission. Auxiliaries are responsible for maintenance of camera systems located in their facilities.

Security systems – Additional security system elements, such as duress alarms or panic buttons, are the responsibility of the individual department to purchase and